QCD in High p_T physics from ICHEP 1972 to ICHEP 1982

M. J. Tannenbaum
Brookhaven National Laboratory
Upton, NY 11973 USA

Quantum Chromodynamics:
History & Prospects
Oberwolz, Austria
Sept. 3-8, 2012

It all began at the 1968 ICHEP in Vienna. Panofsky reported on the first DIS results from SLAC which Bjorken had clarified using scaling arguments

From Panofsky ICHEP 1968-SLAC ep DIS





The old way, hard to understand
$\nu W_2(Q^2,\nu)$ vs energy loss ν

The new way, Bjorken Scaling
$\nu W_2(Q^2,\nu)$ scales vs $\omega=\nu/Q^2$
i.e. collapses onto one curve

Bjorken Scaling in Deeply Inelastic Scattering and the Parton Model---1968

- The discovery that the DIS structure function

$$F_2(Q^2,\nu) = F_2\left(\frac{Q^2}{\nu}\right) \qquad (1)$$

"SCALED" i.e just depended on the ratio

$$x = \frac{Q^2}{2M\nu} \qquad (2)$$

independently of Q^2 ($\sim 1/r^2$)

- as originally suggested by **Bjorken** Phys. Rev. **179**, 1547 (1969)
- Led to the concept of a proton composed of point-like **partons**. Phys. Rev. **185**, 1975 (1969)
  - The probability for a parton to carry a fraction x of the proton's momentum is measured by $F_2(x)$

$$\nu = \frac{Q^2}{2Mx}$$

Bj-prediction 1971 CCR discovery 1972



Bjorken-International lepton-photon Cornell 1971



CCR R. Cool, ICHEP 1972

Why were some people studying "high p_T" physics in the 1960's?

Why were some people studying "high p_T" physics in the 1960's?

They were searching for the W boson.

Why were some people studying "high p_T" physics in the 1960's?

- The first opportunity to study weak interactions at high energy was provided by the development of neutrino beams at the new accelerators in the early 1960's CERN-SpS , BNL-AGS.





- However, it was soon recognized that the intermediate (weak) boson $W^{\pm}$, might be more favorably produced in nucleon-nucleon collisions.

The 'Zichichi signature' for the W boson

Proc. 12th ICHEP, Dubna 1964

MUON-PROTON ELASTIC SCATTERING AT HIGH MOMENTUM TRANSFERS *

R. Cool, A. Maschke
Brookhaven National Laboratory, USA
L. Lederman, M. Tannenbaum
Columbia University, USA
R. Ellsworth, A. Melissinos, J. Tinlot, T. Yamanouchi
University of Rochester, USA
(Presented by J. TINLOT)

We have studied the elastic scattering of negative muons from liquid hydrogen at momentum transfers of 550 MeV/c to 1050 MeV/c ($q^2 = 7$ to 26 fermi^{-2}), using a detecting array of spark chambers and scintillation counters. The experiment was performed at the AGS accelerator of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, and the runs were divided into three stages, as shown below:

of the proton in an aluminum plate spark chamber. One also measures the directions of the recoil proton and the recoil muon. This is equivalent to measuring three independent angles, from which one can infer for each event the value of k, and still overdetermine the scattering event by two degrees of freedom. This redundancy is used to select true scattering events from the background of false events, such as random coincidences, inelastic $\mu - p$

It appears that, within the uncertainties of these preliminary results, the muon scattering cross section for momentum transfers of up to 1 Gev/c is correctly described by the Rosenbluth formula and the $e—p$ form factors. It is still too early to attempt a more quantitative definition of the possible deviation from the electron predictions.

ДИСКУССИЯ **DISCUSSION**

A. Zichichi.

I would like to ask Dr. Tinlot what is the accuracy of the measured cross section at 1 GeV/c momentum transfer.

J. Tinlot.

The accuracy of the highest point (statistical error only), at 1.05 GeV/c, is 25%; at 950 MeV/c, the error in the point is about 15%.

The ‘Zichichi signature’ for the W boson

Proc. 12th ICHEP, Dubna 1964

MUON-PROTON ELASTIC SCATTERING AT HIGH MOMENTUM TRANSFERS *

R. Cool, A. Maschke

Brookhaven National Laboratory, USA

L. Lederman, M. Tannenbaum

Columbia University, USA

R. Ellsworth, A. Melissinos, J. Tinlot, T. Yamanouchi

University of Rochester, USA

(Presented by J. TINLOT)

We have studied the elastic scattering of negative muons from liquid hydrogen at momentum transfers of 550 MeV/c to 1050 MeV/c ($q^2 = 7$ to 26 fermi^{-2}), using a detecting array of spark chambers and scintillation counters. The experiment was performed at the AGS accelerator of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, and the runs were divided into three stages, of the proton in an aluminum plate spark chamber. One also measures the directions of the recoil proton and the recoil muon. This is equivalent to measuring three independent angles, from which one can infer for each event the value of k, and still overdetermine the scattering event by two degrees of freedom. This redundancy is used to select true scattering

ДИСКУССИЯ **DISCUSSION**

A. Zichichi

In connection with the problem of observing the production of intermediate bosons, I would like to mention that we have been studying at CERN two schemes:

1) $\bar{p}+p \to W^+ + W^-$

$$W^- \to e^- + \bar{\nu}_e,\quad W^+ \to \mu^+ + \nu_\mu \quad \Big\} \to \mu^\pm, e^\mp.$$

This process is described by the following Feynman diagram



Notice that this process is proportional to α^2 where α is the electromagnetic coupling constant.

2) The second proposal studied would use the internal target of the proton synchrotron with 10^{12} protons per pulse incident onto the target. The process would be $p + \left(\frac{p}{n}\right) \to W^\pm +$ anything. We would observe the μ's from W-decays. By measuring the angular and momentum distribution at large angles of K and π's, we can predict the corresponding μ-spectrum. We then see if the μ's found at large angles agree with or exceed the expected number. A supplementary check can be made by measuring the polarization of these μ's. The polarization indicates the origin of these μ's. Notice that the cross section for this process goes with $\sqrt{g}$, where g is the β-decay coupling constant.

B. Pontecorvo

I would like to use the fact that you are all tired in order to make a remark of linguistic rather than sicentific character. All the speakers used as notations for neutral leptons the letters ν_e and ν_μ. This seems to be a very convenient notation. On the other hand, the terms which are usually used for neutral leptons-electron and muon neutrinos (and even «electron and muon type of neutrino!»), are too cumbersome. True, sometimes for ν_e the word «neutrino» is used and for ν_μ, the word «neutretto». The last term, however, is not very satisfactory since the last thirty years lost of particle including strong interacting particles had been called that way. In addition, it seems to me that both types of neutral leptons should conserve in their «name» the root «neutrino», which is widely associated with the unique

3* 35

The 'Zichichi signature' for the W boson

Proc. 12th ICHEP, Dubna 1964

MUON-PROTON ELASTIC SCATTERING AT HIGH MOMENTUM TRANSFERS *

R. Cool, A. Maschke
Brookhaven National Laboratory, USA
L. Lederman, M. Tannenbaum
Columbia University, USA
R. Ellsworth, A. Melissinos, J. Tinlot, T. Yamanouchi
University of Rochester, USA
(Presented by J. TINLOT)

We have studied the elastic scattering of negative muons from liquid hydrogen at momentum transfers of 550 MeV/c to 1050 MeV/c ($q^2 = 7$ to 26 fermi^{-2}), using a detecting array of spark chambers and scintillation counters. The experiment was performed at the AGS accelerator of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, and the runs were divided into three stages, of the proton in an aluminum plate spark chamber. One also measures the directions of the recoil proton and the recoil muon. This is equivalent to measuring three independent angles, from which one can infer for each event the value of k, and still overdetermine the scattering event by two degrees of freedom. This redundancy is used to select true scattering

ДИСКУССИЯ — DISCUSSION

A. Zichichi

In connection with the problem of observing the production of intermediate bosons, I would like to mention that we have been studying at CERN two schemes:

1) $\bar{p} + p \to W^+ + W^-$; $W^- \to e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$, $W^+ \to \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$ $\Big\} \to \mu^\pm, e^\mp$.

This process is described by the following Feynman diagram



Notice that this process is proportional to α^2 where α is the electromagnetic coupling constant.

2) The second proposal studied would use the internal target of the proton synchrotron with 10^{12} protons per pulse incident onto the target. The process would be $p + \binom{p}{n} \to W^\pm +$ anything. We would observe the μ's from W-decays. By measuring the angular and momentum distribution at large angles of K and π's, we can predict the corresponding μ-spectrum. We then see if the μ's found at large angles agree with or exceed the expected number. A supplementary check can be made by measuring the polarization of these μ's. The polarization indicates the origin of these μ's. Notice that the cross section for this process goes with $\sqrt{g}$, where g is the β-decay coupling constant.

B. Pontecorvo

I would like to use the fact that you are all tired in order to make a remark of linguistic rather than sicentific character. All the speakers used as notations for neutral leptons the letters ν_e and ν_μ. This seems to be a very convenient notation. On the other hand, the terms which are usually used for neutral leptons-electron and muon neutrinos (and even «electron and muon type of neutrino!»), are too cumbersome. True, sometimes for ν_e the word «neutrino» is used and for ν_μ, the word «neutretto». The last term, however, is not very satisfactory since the last thirty years lost of particle including strong interacting particles had been called that way. In addition, it seems to me that both types of neutral leptons should conserve in their «name» the root «neutrino», which is widely associated with the unique

3* 35

UA1,UA2, CERN 1983
W boson discovery



The ‘Zichichi signature’ for the W boson

Proc. 12th ICHEP, Dubna 1964

MUON-PROTON ELASTIC SCATTERING AT HIGH MOMENTUM TRANSFERS *

R. Cool, A. Maschke
Brookhaven National Laboratory, USA
L. Lederman, M. Tannenbaum
Columbia University, USA
R. Ellsworth, A. Melissinos, J. Tinlot, T. Yamanouchi
University of Rochester, USA
(Presented by J. TINLOT)

We have studied the elastic scattering of negative muons from liquid hydrogen at momentum transfers of 550 MeV/c to 1050 MeV/c ($q^2 = 7$ to 26 fermi^{-2}), using a detecting array of spark chambers and scintillation counters. The experiment was performed at the AGS accelerator of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, and the runs were divided into three stages, of the proton in an aluminum plate spark chamber. One also measures the directions of the recoil proton and the recoil muon. This is equivalent to measuring three independent angles, from which one can infer for each event the value of k, and still overdetermine the scattering event by two degrees of freedom. This redundancy is used to select true scattering

ДИСКУССИЯ — DISCUSSION

A. Zichichi

In connection with the problem of observing the production of intermediate bosons, I would like to mention that we have been studying at CERN two schemes:

1) $\bar{p}+p \to W^+ + W^-$, with $W^- \to e^- + \nu_e$ and $W^+ \to \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$, $\Big\} \to \mu^\pm, e^\mp$.

This process is described by the following Feynman diagram



Notice that this process is proportional to α^2 where α is the electromagnetic coupling constant.

2) The second proposal studied would use the internal target of the proton synchrotron with 10^{12} protons per pulse incident onto the target. The process would be $p + \binom{p}{n} \to W^\pm +$ anything. We would observe the μ's from W-decays. By measuring the angular and momentum distribution at large angles of K and π's, we can predict the corresponding μ-spectrum. We then see if the μ's found at large angles agree with or exceed the expected number. A supplementary check can be made by measuring the polarization of these μ's. The polarization indicates the origin of these μ's. Notice that the cross section for this process goes with $\sqrt{g}$, where g is the β-decay coupling constant.

B. Pontecorvo

I would like to use the fact that you are all tired in order to make a remark of linguistic rather than sicentific character. All the speakers used as notations for neutral leptons the letters ν_e and ν_μ. This seems to be a very convenient notation. On the other hand, the terms which are usually used for neutral leptons-electron and muon neutrinos (and even «electron and muon type of neutrino!»), are too cumbersome. True, sometimes for ν_e the word «neutrino» is used and for ν_μ, the word «neutretto». The last term, however, is not very satisfactory since the last thirty years lost of particle including strong interacting particles had been called that way. In addition, it seems to me that both types of neutral leptons should conserve in their «name» the root «neutrino», which is widely associated with the unique

3* 35





The ‘Zichichi signature’ for the W boson

Proc. 12th ICHEP, Dubna 1964

MUON-PROTON ELASTIC SCATTERING AT HIGH MOMENTUM TRANSFERS *

R. Cool, A. Maschke
Brookhaven National Laboratory, USA
L. Lederman, M. Tannenbaum
Columbia University, USA
R. Ellsworth, A. Melissinos, J. Tinlot, T. Yamanouchi
University of Rochester, USA
(Presented by J. TINLOT)

We have studied the elastic scattering of negative muons from liquid hydrogen at momentum transfers of 550 MeV/c to 1050 MeV/c ($q^2 = 7$ to 26 fermi^{-2}), using a detecting array of spark chambers and scintillation counters. The experiment was performed at the AGS accelerator of the Brookhaven National Laboratory, and the runs were divided into three stages, of the proton in an aluminum plate spark chamber. One also measures the directions of the recoil proton and the recoil muon. This is equivalent to measuring three independent angles, from which one can infer for each event the value of k, and still overdetermine the scattering event by two degrees of freedom. This redundancy is used to select true scattering

ДИСКУССИЯ DISCUSSION

A. Zichichi

In connection with the problem of observing the production of intermediate bosons, I would like to mention that we have been studying at CERN two schemes:

1) $\bar{p} + p \to W^+ + W^-$, with $W^- \to e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$ and $W^+ \to \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$; $\to \mu^\pm, e^\mp$.

This process is described by the following Feynman diagram

$\bar{p}\, p \to W^+\, W^-$

Notice that this process is proportional to α^2 where α is the electromagnetic coupling constant.

2) The second proposal studied would use the internal target of the proton synchrotron with 10^{12} protons per pulse incident onto the target. The process would be $p + \binom{p}{n} \to W^\pm +$ anything. We would observe the μ's from W-decays. By measuring the angular and momentum distribution at large angles of K and π's, we can predict the corresponding μ-spectrum. We then see if the μ's found at large angles agree with or exceed the expected number. A supplementary check can be made by measuring the polarization of these μ's. The polarization indicates the origin of these μ's. Notice that the cross section for this process goes with $\sqrt{g}$, where g is the β-decay coupling constant.

B. Pontecorvo

I would like to use the fact that you are all tired in order to make a remark of linguistic rather than sicentific character. All the speakers used as notations for neutral leptons the letters ν_e and ν_μ. This seems to be a very convenient notation. On the other hand, the terms which are usually used for neutral leptons-electron and muon neutrinos (and even «electron and muon type of neutrino!»), are too cumbersome. True, sometimes for ν_e the word «neutrino» is used and for ν_μ, the word «neutretto». The last term, however, is not very satisfactory since the last thirty years lost of particle including strong interacting particles had been called that way. In addition, it seems to me that both types of neutral leptons should conserve in their «name» the root «neutrino», which is widely associated with the unique

3* 35

PHENIX+STAR 4.0σ Parity Violation





Searches for W boson in p-p collisions

• 1965-1969 Beam dump experiments at ANL-ZGS and BNL-AGS looking for "large angle" muons didn't find any. [ZGS-Lamb, et al PRL **15**, 800 (1965), AGS-Burns, et al, ibid 830, AGS-Wanderer et al, PRL **23**,729(1969)]

• How do you know how many W should have been produced?

• Chilton, Saperstein, Shrauner [PR**148**, 1380 (1966)] emphasize the importance of the timelike form factor, which is solved by

• Y. Yamaguchi [Nuovo Cimento **43**, 193 (1966)] Timelike form factor can be found by measuring the number of lepton pairs e^+e^- or $\mu^+\mu^-$ "massive virtual photons" of the same invariant mass; BUT the individual leptons from these electromagnetically produced pairs might mask the leptons from the $W^{\pm}$.

• This set off a spate of single and di-lepton experiments, notably the discovery by Lederman et al of "Drell-Yan" production at the BNL-AGS, E70 at FNAL and CCR at the CERN-ISR.

AGS-1969-71 Discovery of ‘Drell-Yan’ and ??



$p+U \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- + X$

$\sqrt{s_{NN}}=7.4$ GeV



VIEW LETTERS 4 JANUARY 1971



FIG. 2. Experimental cross section of Christenson *et al.*, Ref. 8.

long forgotten

Christenson, Lederman…PRL **25**, 1523 (1970)

\`Theory’ Altarelli, Brant Preparata PRL **26** 42 (1971)

AGS-1969-71 Discovery of ‘Drell-Yan’ and ??



$p+U \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-}+X$

$\sqrt{s_{NN}}=7.4$ GeV



This is why I NEVER plot theory curves on any of my data

VIEW LETTERS 4 JANUARY 1971



FIG. 2. Experimental cross section of Christenson *et al.*, Ref. 8.

long forgotten

Christenson, Lederman…PRL **25**, 1523 (1970) `Theory’ Altarelli, Brant Preparata PRL **26** 42 (1971)

?? explained by J/ψ in 1974 at AGS + SLAC



VOLUME 33, NUMBER 23 PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS 2 DECEMBER 1974

Experimental Observation of a Heavy Particle J†

J. J. Aubert, U. Becker, P. J. Biggs, J. Burger, M. Chen, G. Everhart, P. Goldhagen, J. Leong, T. McCorriston, T. G. Rhoades, M. Rohde, Samuel C. C. Ting, and Sau Lan Wu
Laboratory for Nuclear Science and Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

and

Y. Y. Lee
Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973
(Received 12 November 1974)

We report the observation of a heavy particle J, with mass $m = 3.1$ GeV and width approximately zero. The observation was made from the reaction $p + \text{Be} \to e^+ + e^- + x$ by measuring the e^+e^- mass spectrum with a precise pair spectrometer at the Brookhaven National Laboratory's 30-GeV alternating-gradient synchrotron.

This experiment is part of a large program to study the behavior of timelike photons in $p + p \to e^+ + e^- + x$ reactions[1] and to search for new particles which decay into e^+e^- and $\mu^+\mu^-$ pairs.

daily with a thin Al foil. The beam spot size is 3×6 mm^2, and is monitored with closed-circuit television. Figure 1(a) shows the simplified side view of one arm of the spectrometer. The two

Discovery of a Narrow Resonance in e^+e^- Annihilation*

J.-E. Augustin,† A. M. Boyarski, M. Breidenbach, F. Bulos, J. T. Dakin, G. J. Feldman, G. E. Fischer, D. Fryberger, G. Hanson, B. Jean-Marie,† R. R. Larsen, V. Lüth, H. L. Lynch, D. Lyon, C. C. Morehouse, J. M. Paterson, M. L. Perl, B. Richter, P. Rapidis, R. F. Schwitters, W. M. Tanenbaum, and F. Vannucci‡
Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

and

G. S. Abrams, D. Briggs, W. Chinowsky, C. E. Friedberg, G. Goldhaber, R. J. Hollebeek, J. A. Kadyk, B. Lulu, F. Pierre,§ G. H. Trilling, J. S. Whitaker, J. Wiss, and J. E. Zipse
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720
(Received 13 November 1974)

We have observed a very sharp peak in the cross section for $e^+e^- \to$ hadrons, e^+e^-, and possibly $\mu^+\mu^-$ at a center-of-mass energy of 3.105 ± 0.003 GeV. The upper limit to the full width at half-maximum is 1.3 MeV.

Now, Back To Hard-Scattering

BBK 1971

S.M.Berman, J.D.Bjorken and J.B.Kogut, Phys. Rev. **D4**, 3388 (1971)

- BBK calculated for p+p collisions, the inclusive reaction

$$A+B \rightarrow C + X \qquad \text{when particle } C \text{ has } p_T >> 1 \text{ GeV/c}$$

  - The charged partons of DIS **must scatter electromagnetically** *"which may be viewed as a* **lower bound** *on the real cross section at large p_T."*



FIG. 1. Kinematics of lepton-nucleon scattering in the parton model.



BBK 1971

S.M.Berman, J.D.Bjorken and J.B.Kogut, Phys. Rev. **D4**, 3388 (1971)

- BBK calculated for p+p collisions, the inclusive reaction

$$A+B \rightarrow C + X \qquad \text{when particle } C \text{ has } p_T \gg 1 \text{ GeV/c}$$

  - The charged partons of DIS **must scatter electromagnetically** *"which may be viewed as a* **lower bound** *on the real cross section at large p_T."*





BBK 1971-continued: the era of SCALING

♡ BBK propose a **General Form** for high p_T cross sections, for the **EM** scattering, which must exist:

$$E\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3} = \frac{4\pi\alpha^2}{p_T^4}\mathcal{F}(x_1 = \frac{-\hat{u}}{\hat{s}}, x_2 = \frac{-\hat{t}}{\hat{s}}) \qquad (4)$$

♡ The two factors are a $1/p_T^4$ term, characteristic of single photon exchange and a form factor $\mathcal{F}$

♡ Note that $x_{1,2}$ are not $x_{\rm BJ}$

  □ The point is that $\mathcal{F}$ **scales**, i.e. is only a function of the ratio of momenta.

♡ Vector ($J = 1$) Gluon exchange gives the same form as Eq. 4 but much larger.

CCR at the CERN-ISR
Discovery of high p_T production in p-p



F.W. Busser, *et al.*,
CERN, Columbia, Rockefeller Collaboration
Phys. Lett. **46B**, 471 (1973)

Bj scaling → BBK scaling →
Blankenbecler, Brodsky, Gunion Scaling PL **42B**, 461 (1972)

$$E\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3} = \frac{1}{p_T^n} F\left(\frac{p_T}{\sqrt{s}}\right)$$

- e^{-6p_T} breaks to a power law at high p_T with characteristic $\sqrt{s}$ dependence
- Large rate indicates that partons interact strongly (>> EM) with other.
- Data follow BBK-BBG scaling but with n=8!, not n=4 as expected for QED

x_T scaling with n=8, not 4
Inspires Constituent Interchange Model



$$E\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3} = \frac{1}{p_T^n} F\left(\frac{p_T}{\sqrt{s}}\right)$$

$x_T = 2p_T/\sqrt{s}$

n=4 for QED or vector gluon

n=8 for quark-meson scattering by the exchange of a quark

CIM-Blankenbecler, Brodsky, Gunion, Phys.Lett.**42B**,461(1972)

Constituent Interchange Model

Blankenbecler, Brodsky, Gunion, *Inclusive Processes at High Transverse Momentum*, Phys. Lett. **42B**, 461(1972)

♡ Inspired by the *dramatic features* of pion inclusive reactions revealed by "the recent measurements at CERN ISR of single-particle inclusive scattering at 90° and large transverse momentum", Blankenbecler, Brodsky and Gunion propose a new general scaling form:

$$E\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3} = \frac{1}{p_T^n}F\left(\frac{p_T}{\sqrt{s}}\right) \qquad (5)$$

♡ n gives the form of the force-law between constituents

♡ $n = 4$ for QED or Vector Gluon

♡ Perhaps more importantly, BBG predict n=**8** for the case of quark-meson scattering by the exchange of a quark, **C.I.M.**, as apparently observed.

State of the Art
Fermilab 1977

D. Antreasyan, J. Cronin, et al., PRL **38**, 112 (1977)



Beautiful x_T scaling at all 3 fixed target energies with n=8

Totally Misleading--Not CIM or QCD but k_T

First prediction using 'QCD' 1975

R. F. Cahalan, K. A. Geer, J. Kogut and Leonard Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 1199 (1975)

"Asymptotic freedom and the "absence" of vector-gluon exchange in wide-angle hadronic collisions"

- **Abstract:** The naive, pointlike parton model of Berman, Bjorken and Kogut is generalized to scale-invariant and asymptotically free field theories. The asymptotically free field generalization is studied in detail. Although such theories contain vector fields, single vector-gluon exchange contributes insignificantly to wide-angle hadronic collisions. This follows from (1) the smallness of the invariant charge at small distances and (2) the *breakdown of naive scaling* in these theories. These effects should explain the apparent absence of vector exchange in inclusive and exclusive hadronic collisions at large momentum transfers observed at Fermilab and at the CERN ISR.
- An interesting **Acknowledgement:** ... Two of us (J. K. and L. S. also thank S. Brodsky for *emphasizing to us repeatedly* that the present data on wide-angle hadron scattering *show no evidence for vector exchange.*
- Nobody's perfect, they get *one* thing right! They introduce the "effective index" $n(x_T, \sqrt{s})$ to

account for 'scale breaking':

$$E\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3} = \frac{1}{p_T^{n(x_T,\sqrt{s})}} F(\frac{p_T}{\sqrt{s}}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}^{n(x_T,\sqrt{s})}} G(\frac{p_T}{\sqrt{s}})$$

CCOR 1978--Discovery of "REALLY high p_T>7 GeV/c" at ISR



CCOR A.L.S. Angelis, et al, Phys.Lett. **79B**, 505 (1978)

See also A.G. Clark, et al Phys.Lett **74B**, 267 (1978)

- Agrees with CCR, CCRS (Busser) data for p_T < 7 GeV/c.
- Disagrees with CCRS fit p_T > 7 GeV/c
- New fit is:

♡ $$Ed^3\sigma/dp^3 \simeq p_T^{-5.1\pm0.4}(1-x_T)^{12.1\pm0.6}$$
$$7.5 \leq p_T \leq 14.0 \text{ GeV/c},$$
$$53.1 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 62.4 \text{ GeV}$$
(including *all* systematic errors).

$n(x_T, \sqrt{s})$ WORKS $n \to 5 = 4^{++}$



Same data $Ed^3\sigma/dp^3(x_T)$ ln-ln plot

QCD: Cahalan, Geer, Kogut, Susskind, PR**D11**, 1199 (1975)

$$E\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}^{\,n(x_T,\sqrt{s})}} G(x_T)$$

$$\left(\frac{\sqrt{s_1}}{\sqrt{s_2}}\right)^{n(x_T,\sqrt{s})} = \frac{E\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3}(x_T, \sqrt{s_2})}{E\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3}(x_T, \sqrt{s_1})}$$



ISR Expt's more interested in n(x_T,√s) than absolute cross section



Athens BNL CERN Syracuse Collaboration,
C.Kourkoumelis, et al
Phys.Lett. **84B**, 279 (1979)

But n(x_T,√s) agrees



cross sections vary by factor of 2

CCRS-1974 Discovery of direct $e^{\pm}\sim 10^{-4}\pi^{\pm}$ at ISR not due to internal conversion of direct photons



CCRS PLB**53**(1974)212; NPB**113**(1976)189

Data points $(e^+ + e^-)/2$ lines 10^{-4} $(\pi^+ + \pi^-)/2$

- Farrar and Frautschi PRL**36**(1976)1017 proposed that direct leptons are due to internal conversion of direct photons with $\gamma/\pi \sim 10\text{-}20\%$ to e^+e^- ($d\sigma/dm \sim 1/m$) for $p_T > 1.3$ GeV/c. CCRS looks, finds very few events, sets limits excluding this.

95% confidence level upper limits for a particle of mass m, or a mass continuum, which decays to e^+e^- with branching ratio B, at $\sqrt{s}$ = 52.7 GeV/c

Mass (GeV/c^2)	$B\frac{d\sigma}{dy}$ ($p_T^* > 1.3$ GeV/c) (cm²)	Fraction of single electron signal
0.400	5.54×10^{-33}	0.064
0.500	8.37×10^{-33}	0.104
0.600	1.64×10^{-32}	0.178

p.s. these direct $e^{\pm}$ are due to semi-leptonic decay of charm particles not discovered until 1976, 2 year later: Hinchliffe and Llewellyn-Smith NPB**114**(1976)45

Direct photon production-simple theory hard experiment

See the classic paper of Fritzsch and Minkowski, PLB **69** (1977) 316-320

A+B→γ +X

Compton

Annihilation

small-ignore



isolated photons

q is 8/1 u/d quark in p+p

Analytical formula for γ-jet cross section for a <u>photon</u> at p_T, y_c (and *parton* (<u>jet</u>) at p_T, y_d):

$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{dp_T^2\, dy_c\, dy_d} = x_1\, g_A(x_1,Q^2)\, F_{2B}(x_2,Q^2) \frac{\pi\alpha\alpha_s(Q^2)}{3\hat{s}^2}\left(\frac{1+\cos\theta^*}{2}+\frac{2}{1+\cos\theta^*}\right)$$
$$+\; F_{2A}(x_1,Q^2)\, x_2\, g_B(x_2,Q^2) \frac{\pi\alpha\alpha_s(Q^2)}{3\hat{s}^2}\left(\frac{1-\cos\theta^*}{2}+\frac{2}{1-\cos\theta^*}\right)$$

$$\cos\theta^* = \tanh\frac{(y_c-y_d)}{2}$$

$$x_{1,2} = x_T\frac{e^{\pm y_c}+e^{\pm y_d}}{2}$$

$g(x)$ and $F_2(x)$ are g and q pdf's in nuclei A,B

Experimental problem is HUGE background from $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, etc. (But this is less of a problem in Au+Au due to suppression of π^0)



PHENIX PRL**94** (2005) 232301



$$R_\gamma = \frac{(\gamma/\pi^0)_{\text{Measured}}}{(\gamma/\pi^0)_{\text{Background}}} \approx \frac{\gamma_{\text{Measured}}}{\gamma_{\text{Background}}}$$

If $\dfrac{dn_{\pi^0}}{p_T dp_T} \propto p_T^{-n}$ then $\left.\dfrac{\gamma}{\pi^0}\right|_{\pi^0}(p_T) = 2/(n-1)$ x (1.19)=0.335

η/π^0=0.50

Since the the photons from $\pi^0 \to \gamma+\gamma$, $\eta \to \gamma+\gamma$ and similar decays are the principal background to direct photon production, the importance of a precise estimate of this background can not be overstated.

ISR direct photon production + correlations











No evidence for bremss. contribution to direct γ--same side correlation is zero--see CMOR NPB**327**, 541 (1989) for full list of references.

J/Psi and direct e± at the CERN-ISR

First



FIG. 2

Fig. 2. Invariant mass distribution for the observed e^+e^- pairs. The curves represent the shapes of the acceptance, as a function of the e^+e^- invariant mass value, for the Arm 1 and Arm 2 triggers, respectively.

Best

A.G. Clark et al. / Electron pair production at the ISR



Not cause of direct e±

F.W. Büsser et al. / Electrons at the ISR



CCRS PLB**56**(1975)482
2nd J/Ψ in Europe

CSZ NPB**142**(1978)29
$\langle p_T \rangle$=1.10±0.05 GeV/c

CCRS NPB**113**(1976)189
direct e± not due to J/Ψ

Status of ISR single particle measurements 1978

♡ Hard-scattering was visible both at ISR and FNAL (Fixed Target) energies by single particle inclusive at large $p_T \geq$ 2-3 GeV/c.

♡ Scaling and dimensional arguments for plotting data revealed the systematics and underlying physics.

♡ The theorists had the basic underlying physics correct; but many (inconvenient) details remained to be worked out, several by experiment.

♡ k_T, the transverse momentum imbalance of outgoing partons (due to initial state radiation), was discovered by experiment.

k_T is what made $n=4^{++} \rightarrow n=8$

k_T is not a parameter, it can be measured

- In leading order QCD or the Quark-Parton model, the net transverse momentum $\langle p_T \rangle_{\rm pair} = \sqrt{2} \times \langle k_T \rangle$, of a hard-scattering jet-pair, or a Drell-Yan pair, or a pair of high p_T photons, or the $\gamma+$ Jet pair for direct photon production is zero. All the above pairs should be coplanar with the incident beam axis.
- However, early Drell-Yan and inclusive high p_T particle studies showed that k_T was measurable and non-zero.

♡ The history of k_T is worth reviewing as k_T was predicted to be zero by theorists, but was discovered to be non-zero by experimentalists. The CCHK experiment [M. Della Negra, et al., Nucl. Phys. **B127**, 1 (1977)] discovered that back-to-back jets had considerable out of plane transverse momentum $p_{\rm out}$, and proposed that this was due to transverse momentum of partons inside a proton.

Feynman Field & Fox to the rescue

♡ This was elaborated by Feynman, Field and Fox, [Nucl. Phys. **B128**, 1, (1997), Phys Rev. **D18**, 3320 (1978)] who introduced the k_T phenomenology of a parton in a proton, which they discussed in terms of 'intrinsic transverse momentum' from confinement which would be constant as a function of x and Q^2, and NLO effects due to hard gluon emission which would vary with x and Q^2, but they used an constant 'effective' k_T to 'explain' the available measurements.

♡ A subsequent ISR experiment, CCOR, showed that k_T for jet-pairs was roughly the same as for Drell-Yan and increased similarly with $\sqrt{s}$ (and p_T) i.e. was not constant.

FFF and Owens QCD calculations inclusive π^0





Feynman,Field,Fox, PRD**18**(1978)3320

Owens,Reya, Gluck PRD**18**(1978)1501

Note FFF agrees much better at lower p_T due to k_T smearing

p.s. Fermilab experiment (1980) kills CIM

H. J. Frisch, et al., PRL **44**, 511 (1980) $\pi^- + p \rightarrow \pi^\pm + X$

If quark-meson scattering by exchange of a quark dominates then π^- should dominate π^+ at large p_T



Statement in PLB**637**, 58 (2006):"We find that high-p_T hadrons are produced by different mechanisms at fixed-target and collider energies. For pions, higher-twist subprocesses where the pion is produced directly dominate at fixed target energy," is contradicted by this measurement

Status of QCD Theory in 1978

- The first modern QCD calculation and prediction for high p_T single particle inclusive cross sections including non-scaling and initial state radiation was done in 1978 by J. F. Owens, E. Reya, M.Gluck, PRD **18**, 1501 (1978), "*Detailed quantum-chromodynamic predictions for high-p_T processes*," and J.F. Owens, J. D. Kimel, PRD **18**, 3313 (1978), "*Parton-transverse-momentum effects and the quantum-chromodynamic description of high-p_T processes*".

- This work was closely followed and corroborated by Feynman, Field, Fox PRD **18**, 3320 (1978), "*Quantum-chromodynamic approach for the large-transverse-momentum production of particles and jets*."

- Unfortunately jets in 4π Calorimeters at ISR energies or lower are invisible below $\sqrt{\hat{s}} \approx E_T \leq 25$ GeV, which led to considerable confusion in the period 1980-1982.

QCD and Jets are now a cornerstone of the standard model

- Incredibly at the famous Snowmass conference in July 1982, many if not most people in the U.S. were skeptical

e.g. MJT Seminar in 1982


WHY I BELIEVE IN JETS

IN SPITE OF CALORIMETER EXPERIMENTS

M.J. TANNENBAUM 3/22/82

FOR QCD TESTS MUST MINIMIZE THE EFFECT OF JETS

- The International HEP conference in Paris, three weeks later, July 26--31, 1982 changed everything.

THE UA2 Jet-Paris 1982

From 1980--1982 most high energy physicists doubted jets existed because of the famous NA5 E_T spectrum which showed NO JETS. This one event from UA2 in 1982 changed everybody's opinion.





Why I believed in Jets: At the CERN ISR from 1975-1982 two-particle correlations showed unambiguously that high p_T particles come from jets

How everything you want to know about JETS was measured with 2-particle correlations



CCOR, A.L.S.Angelis, et al Phys.Lett. **97B**, 163 (1980) PhysicaScripta **19**, 116 (1979)

$p_{Tt} > 7$ GeV/c vs p_T



Away side $p_{out} \sim p_T \Delta\phi$ is not constant i.e $\Delta\phi \neq 1/p_T$, indicating jets not collinear in azimuth $\Rightarrow k_T$

How everything you want to know about JETS was measured with 2-particle correlations



CCOR, A.L.S.Angelis, et al Phys.Lett. **97B**, 163 (1980)   PhysicaScripta **19**, 116 (1979)

p_{Tt} > 7 GeV/c vs p_T





Away side p_{out}~$p_T\Delta\phi$ is not constant i.e $\Delta\phi \neq 1/p_T$, indicating jets not collinear in azimuth⇒ k_T

How everything you want to know about JETS was measured with 2-particle correlations



CCOR, A.L.S.Angelis, et al Phys.Lett. **97B**, 163 (1980) PhysicaScripta **19**, 116 (1979)

$p_{Tt} > 7$ GeV/c vs p_T





Away side $p_{out} \sim p_T \Delta\phi$ is not constant i.e $\Delta\phi \neq 1/p_T$, indicating jets not collinear in azimuth $\Rightarrow k_T$

How everything you want to know about JETS was measured with 2-particle correlations



CCOR, A.L.S.Angelis, et al Phys.Lett. **97B**, 163 (1980) PhysicaScripta **19**, 116 (1979)

$p_{Tt} > 7$ GeV/c vs p_T





Away side $p_{out} \sim p_T \Delta\phi$ is not constant i.e $\Delta\phi \neq 1/p_T$, indicating jets not collinear in azimuth $\Rightarrow k_T$

How everything you want to know about JETS was measured with 2-particle correlations



CCOR, A.L.S.Angelis, et al Phys.Lett. **97B**, 163 (1980)   PhysicaScripta **19**, 116 (1979)

$p_{Tt} > 7$ GeV/c vs p_T





Away side $p_{out} \sim p_T\Delta\phi$ is not constant i.e $\Delta\phi \neq 1/p_T$, indicating jets not collinear in azimuth$\Rightarrow k_T$

CCOR $\langle|p_{out}|\rangle^2$ vs x_E^2



$$\langle|p_{out}|\rangle^2 = x_E^2[2\langle|k_{Ty}|\rangle^2 + \langle|j_{Ty}|\rangle^2] + \langle|j_{Ty}|\rangle^2$$

CCOR PLB**97**(1980)163-168

j_T is constant-independent of p_{Tt} and $\sqrt{s}$ Characteristic of jet fragmentation



- it took the $e^+ e^-$ people several more years to get this correct--- because they didn't understand the seagull effect: ($j_T < p_T$)

k_T varies with p_{Tt} and $\sqrt{s}$--not intrinsic



x_E distribution measures fragmentation fn.



$$x_E \sim p_{Ta}/p_{Tt} \sim z/\langle z_{trig}\rangle$$

$\langle z_{trig}\rangle$=0.85 measured

$$\Rightarrow D^q_\pi(z) \sim e^{-6z}\ *$$

- independent of p_{Tt}

See M. Jacob's talk Proc. EPS 1979 Geneva (CERN). p512

* but we did learn something new on this issue in PHENIX at RHIC

As shown at the ISR by Darriulat, etc, and believed by most High Energy Physicists

P. Darriulat, et al, Nucl.Phys. **B107** (1976) 429-456



Figure 21 Jet fragmentation functions measured in different processes: ν-p interactions (*open triangles*, Van der Welde 1979); e^+e^- annihilations (*solid line*, Hanson et al 1975); and pp collisions (*full circles* CS, $p_T < 6$ GeV/c, *open circles* CS, $p_T > 6$ GeV/c, *full squares* CCOR, $p_T > 5$ GeV/c, *open squares* CCOR, $p_T > 7$ GeV/c).



Figure 19 The slopes *b* obtained from exponential fits to the jet fragmentation function in the interval $0.2 < z < 0.8$ in e^+e^- annihilation (*full circles*) and LPTH data of the BS Collaboration (*open circles*).

Figures from P. Darriulat, ARNPS **30** (1980) 159-210 showing that Jet fragmentation functions in νp, e^+e^- and pp (CCOR) are the same with the same dependence of *b* (exponential slope) on "$\hat{s}$"

Where did I (and everybody in HEP) get this idea?---from Feynman, Field and Fox

38 *R.P Feynman et al. / Large transverse momenta*

FFF Nucl.Phys. **B128**(1977) 1-65



Fig. 23. Comparison of the π^0 and jet trigger away-side distribution of charged hadrons in pp collisions at $W = 19.4$ GeV, $\theta_1 = 90°$, and $p_\perp$ (trigger) = 4.0 GeV/c from the quark-quark scattering model. The upper figure shows the single-particle (π^0) trigger results plotted *versus* $z_p = -p_x(h^\pm)/p_\perp(\pi^0)$ and the jet trigger plotted *versus* $z_J = -p_x(h^\pm)/p_\perp(\text{jet})$ (see table 1). In the lower figure, we plot *both versus* z_J, where for the jet trigger $z_J = z_J$ but for the single-particle trigger $z_J = \langle z_c \rangle z_p$. The away hadrons are integrated over all rapidity Y and $|180° - \phi| \leqslant 45°$ and the theory is calculated using $\langle k_\perp \rangle_{h\to q} = 500$ MeV. • $h_1 = \pi^0$, × h_1 = jet.

"There is a simple relationship between experiments done with single-particle triggers and those performed with jet triggers. The only difference in the opposite side correlation is due to the fact that the 'quark', from which a single-particle trigger came, always has a higher $p_\perp$ than the trigger (by factor $1/z_{trig}$). The away-side correlations for a single-particle trigger at $p_\perp$ should be roughly the same as the away side correlations for a jet trigger at $p_\perp$ (jet)= $p_\perp$ (single particle)/ $<z_{trig}>$".

This is the only thing we didn't understand correctly at the ISR. Maybe we could be forgiven because Feynman said it.

* At RHIC we learned that the x_E distribution from a trigger fragment does not measure the fragmentation function.

For more info, see: M. J. Tannenbaum "Review of hard scattering and jet analysis", PoS (CFRNC2006) cited by Kronfeld and Quigg in "Resource Letter: QCD" arXiv:1002.5032v2

Why nobody (in the U.S.) believed in jets

- In 1972-73, soon after hard-scattering was discovered in p-p collisions, Bjorken PRD**8** (1973) 4098 and Willis (ISABELLE Physics Prospects-BNL-17522) proposed 4π hadron calorimeters to search for jets from fragmentation of scattered partons with large p_T realizing that a substantial increase in rate would be expected in measuring the entire jet at a given p_T rather than just the leading fragment. (Bjorken's parent-child effect)
- It took until 1980 to get a full azimuth $\Delta\eta\sim\pm 0.88$ ($\Delta\Theta\sim\pm 45^o$) calorimeter but meanwhile experiments were done with smaller back-to-back calorimeters each with aperture $\Delta\Phi\sim\pm 45^o$ $\Delta\eta\sim\pm 0.55$ and many new trigger biases were discovered, for instance, jets wider than the calorimeter aperture would deposit less energy than narrow jets of the same p_T and be suppressed by the steeply falling spectrum$\Rightarrow$jet structure is dominated by the calorimeter geometry [e.g. see M. Dris NIM **158** (1979) 89]

(In)famous FNAL E260 found "Jets" (1977)



- In each of 2 back to back calorimeters with $\Delta\Phi\sim\pm45^{o}$ $\Delta\eta\sim\pm0.36$ (same as PHENIX) the invariant cross section of several particles with a vector sum p_T is much larger than a single particle of the same p_T. The authors took this as evidence for the exactly back-to-back in azimuth jets of constituent scattering⇒Never let an interested theorist collaborate on an experiment.

C.Bromberg et al E260, PRL 38 (1977)1447, NPB134 (1978) 189

But, experiments with different apertures got different results

- The first 4π experiment was a bubble chamber(!) 110 GeV/c K^- on p [M. Deutschmann, et al, ABCCLVW collab, NPB**155** (1979)307]





- multiparticle cross section for p_T> 1.5 GeV/c >> single particle
- Data extrapolate nicely to those of E260 [8] in slope and magnitude.
- But ``principal axis" analysis of the data shows "the vast majority of events with large p_T multiparticle systems DO NOT exhibit jet-like structure."

NA5-the coup-de-grâce to jets (1980)

- Full azimuth calorimeter -0.88<η*<0.67 (→ NA35, NA49)



- plus triggered in two smaller apertures corresponding to E260.
- No jets in full azimuth data
- All data way above QCD predictions--------
- The large E_T observed is the result of "a large number of particles with a rather small transverse momentum"--the first E_T measurement in the present terminology.

K. Pretzl, Proc 20th ICHEP (1980)
C. DeMarzo et al NA5, PLB**112**(1982)173

For more on E_T see MJT IJMPA **4** (1989)3377

Back to-THE UA2 Jet-Paris 1982

From 1980--1982 most high energy physicists doubted jets existed because of the famous NA5 E_T spectrum which showed NO JETS. This one event from UA2 in 1982 changed everybody's opinion.



UA1-Carlo himself explained E_T (no jet) dist. before seeing UA2 plot. Explanation is correct





UA1 (1982) Paris-withdrawn (C.Rubbia) $\sqrt{s}$=540 GeV. No Jets because E_T is like multiplicity (n), composed of many soft particles near $<p_T>$! CERN-EP-82/122.

OOPS UA2 discovers jets ~5-6 orders of magnitude down in E_T distribution!

LO-QCD in 1 slide

Cross Section in p-p collisions c.m. energy $\sqrt{s}$

The overall p-p reaction cross section
is the sum over constituent reactions

$$a + b \to c + d$$

$f_a^A(x_1)$, $f_b^B(x_2)$, are structure functions, the differential probabilities
for constituents a and b to carry momentum fractions x_1 and x_2
of their respective protons, e.g. $u(x_1)$,

$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{dx_1 dx_2 d\cos\theta^*} = \frac{1}{s}\sum_{ab} f_a^A(x_1) f_b^B(x_2) \frac{\pi\alpha_s^2(Q^2)}{2x_1x_2} \Sigma^{ab}(\cos\theta^*)$$

$\Sigma^{ab}(\cos\theta^*)$, the characteristic subprocess angular distributions
and $\alpha_s(Q^2) = \frac{12\pi}{25\ln(Q^2/\Lambda^2)}$ are predicted by QCD

LO-QCD in 1 slide

Cros ... $\sqrt{s}$



$f_a^A(x_1)$, f_b^B ... robabilities
for const ... $_1$ and x_2

$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{dx_1 dx_2 d\cos\theta^*} = \frac{1}{s}\sum_{ab} f_a^A(x_1) f_b^B(x_2) \frac{\pi\alpha_s^2(Q^2)}{2x_1x_2}\Sigma^{ab}(\cos\theta^*)$$

$\Sigma^{ab}(\cos\theta^*)$, the characteristic subprocess angular distributions
and $\alpha_s(Q^2) = \frac{12\pi}{25\ln(Q^2/\Lambda^2)}$ are predicted by QCD

Constituent Kinematics

p-p c.m. energy √s



In p-p c.m. system,
parton-parton c.m. energy
$$\hat{s} = x_1 x_2 s$$



In parton-parton c.m. system
scattering angle is θ*

$$Q^2 = -\hat{t} = \hat{s}\,\frac{(1-\cos\theta^*)}{2}$$

$$-\hat{u} = \hat{s}\,\frac{(1+\cos\theta^*)}{2}$$

Σ^{ab} (cosθ*) in LO-QCD

a) $qq' \to qq'$, $\bar{q}q' \to \bar{q}q'$ $\quad \frac{4}{9}\frac{\hat{s}^2+\hat{u}^2}{\hat{t}^2}$

b) $qq \to qq$ $\quad \frac{4}{9}\left(\frac{\hat{s}^2+\hat{u}^2}{\hat{t}^2}+\frac{\hat{s}^2+\hat{t}^2}{\hat{u}^2}\right)-\frac{8}{27}\frac{\hat{s}^2}{\hat{u}\hat{t}}$

c) $\bar{q}q \to \bar{q}'q'$ $\quad \frac{4}{9}\frac{\hat{t}^2+\hat{u}^2}{\hat{s}^2}$

d) $\bar{q}q \to \bar{q}q$ $\quad \frac{4}{9}\left(\frac{\hat{s}^2+\hat{u}^2}{\hat{t}^2}+\frac{\hat{t}^2+\hat{u}^2}{\hat{s}^2}\right)-\frac{8}{27}\frac{\hat{u}^2}{\hat{s}\hat{t}}$

e) $\bar{q}q \to gg$ $\quad \frac{32}{27}\frac{\hat{u}^2+\hat{t}^2}{\hat{u}\hat{t}}-\frac{8}{3}\frac{\hat{u}^2+\hat{t}^2}{\hat{s}^2}$

f) $gg \to \bar{q}q$ $\quad \frac{1}{6}\frac{\hat{u}^2+\hat{t}^2}{\hat{u}\hat{t}}-\frac{3}{8}\frac{\hat{u}^2+\hat{t}^2}{\hat{s}^2}$

g) $qg \to qg$ $\quad -\frac{4}{9}\frac{\hat{u}^2+\hat{s}^2}{\hat{u}\hat{s}}+\frac{\hat{u}^2+\hat{s}^2}{\hat{t}^2}$

h) $gg \to gg$ $\quad \frac{9}{2}\left(3-\frac{\hat{u}\hat{t}}{\hat{s}^2}-\frac{\hat{u}\hat{s}}{\hat{t}^2}-\frac{\hat{s}\hat{t}}{\hat{u}^2}\right)$



Also Paris1982-first measurement of QCD subprocess angular distribution using π^0-π^0 correlations

DATA: CCOR NPB 209, 284 (1982)



QCD



$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{dx_1 dx_2 d\cos\theta^*} = \frac{1}{s}\sum_{ab} f_a^A(x_1) f_b^B(x_2) \frac{\pi\alpha_s^2(Q^2)}{2x_1x_2}\Sigma^{ab}(\cos\theta^*)$$

$\Sigma^{ab}(\cos\theta^*)$, the characteristic subprocess angular distributions and $\alpha_s(Q^2) = \frac{12\pi}{25\ln(Q^2/\Lambda^2)}$ are predicted by QCD

Also Paris1982-first measurement of QCD subprocess angular distribution using π^0-π^0 correlations

DATA: CCOR NPB 209, 284 (1982)



$$\frac{d^3\sigma}{dx_1 dx_2 d\cos\theta^*} = \frac{1}{s}\sum_{ab} f_a^A(x_1) f_b^B(x_2) \frac{\pi\alpha_s^2(Q^2)}{2x_1x_2} \Sigma^{ab}(\cos\theta^*)$$

$\Sigma^{ab}(\cos\theta^*)$, the characteristic subprocess angular distributions and $\alpha_s(Q^2) = \frac{12\pi}{25\ln(Q^2/\Lambda^2)}$ are predicted by QCD

Eventually this was measured with di-jets



Figure 10 (*a*) Distribution of cos θ^* for hard parton scattering as measured in the UA1 experiment (42). T normalization is defined by setting the value at cos $\theta^* = 0$ equal to 1. (*b*) Distribution of cos θ^* for ha parton scattering as measured in the UA2 experiment (43). All the different QCD processes (except for $\rightarrow q'\bar{q}'$), separately normalized to the data, lie in the area between the two dashed curves. The full line is t overall QCD prediction, normalized to the data.

see L. Di Lella ARNPS **35** (1985) 107--134

QCD really works CCOR pp follows qq, UA1 p-pbar follows q-qbar



plot I made in 1983

Jet measurements of QCD in pp collisions are now standard after a ~30 year learning curve





The measured crosssection is in agreement with NLO pQCD predictions after the necessary nonperturbative parton-to-hadron corrections are taken into account. i.e. Make sure to read the fine print!

A. Abulencia, et al, CDF PRL 96 (2006) 122001-k_T algorithm

At RHIC, inclusive single particles provide a precision pQCD probe, well calibrated in pp, dAu… collisions

PHENIX excellent in hard-scattering measurements via single-inclusive and two-particle correlations, STAR better with Jets

PHENIX PRL**91** (2003) 241803



π^0

PHENIX arXiv:1205.5533



direct-γ

PHENIX PRL**97** (2006) 252002



direct-single-e from
c and b quark decays

In p-p collisions, since 1978, NLO pQCD agrees very well with all measurements.

Of course LHC MUCH Better with Jets

STAR PRL**97** (2006) 252001



CMS PRL**107** (2011) 132001



Again agree very well with NLO pQCD in p-p collisions. But, I have known that QCD worked for hard scattering since 1978. What I learn from the CMS plot is that partons are pointlike up to $Q^2 \approx t \approx 2p_T^{\,2} = 2{,}000{,}000\ \mathrm{GeV}^2$ i.e. $r << 1.4 \times 10^{-4}$ fm!!

Direct γ p-p data and pQCD c. 2007

PHENIX direct-γ in p-p
PRL **98** (2007) 012002

PHENIX direct photon p-p data clarify longstanding data/theory puzzle

P. Aurenche et al Phys. Rev. D **73**, 094007 (2006)



Direct γ p-p data and pQCD c. 2007

PHENIX direct-γ in p-p
PRL **98** (2007) 012002

PHENIX direct photon p-p data clarify longstanding data/theory puzzle

P. Aurenche et al Phys. Rev. D **73**, 094007 (2006)

New PHENIX p-p results this year arXiv:1205.5533 are even better!



x_T scaling: a) Direct-γ b) Jets



Jets-Ratio of Scaled Cross Sections 630/1800



$$\frac{[p_T^4\,\sigma_{\rm inv}](x_T,\sqrt{s_1})}{[p_T^4\,\sigma_{\rm inv}](x_T,\sqrt{s_2})} = \sqrt{\frac{s_2}{s_1}}^{(n-4)}$$

Direct γ n≈5 2005

Jets n≈4.5

QCD in Action 2012



x_T scaling with n_{eff}=4 (parton model) QCD non-scaling is visible

Collection of World's direct-γ measurements (p+p/ p+pbar) including PHENIX low p_T msmt. to be described next.

QCD in Action 2012



x_T scaling with n_{eff}=4.5 works for direct-γ due to QCD non-scaling

Collection of World's direct-γ measurements (p+p/ p+pbar) including PHENIX low p_T msmt. to be described next.

QM2005-direct γ in AuAu via internal conversion

Kroll Wada PR**98**(1955) 1355

PHENIX NPA**774**(2006)403

$$\frac{1}{N_\gamma}\frac{dN_{ee}}{dm_{ee}} = \frac{2\alpha}{3\pi}\frac{1}{m_{ee}}\left(1-\frac{m_{ee}^2}{M^2}\right)^3 \mid F(m_{ee}^2)\mid^2 \sqrt{1-\frac{4m_e^2}{m_{ee}^2}}\left(1+\frac{2m_e^2}{m_{ee}^2}\right)$$







Eliminating the π^0 background by going to $0.2<m_{ee}<0.3$ GeV enables direct γ signal to be measured for $1<p_T<3$ GeV/c in Au+Au. It is exponential, does that mean it is thermal. We must see whether p-p direct γ turns over as $p_T \rightarrow 0$ as in Drell-Yan or exponential like for π^0

QM2008 direct γ in p-p via internal conversion

PRL104(2010)132301



Lowest p_T direct γ ever measured in p-p (and Au+Au). Curves are pQCD extrapolated (W.Vogelsang)



This is a major discovery, p-p result turns over as $p_T \to 0$, follows the same function $B(1+p_T^2/b)^{-n}$ used in Drell Yan [Ito, et al, PRD23, 604 (1981)] .
Fit to Au+Au is $[A\, e^{-p_T/T} + \langle T_{AA}\rangle\, B_{pp}(1+p_T^2/b_{pp})^{-n_{pp}}]$.
Significance of exponential (thermal?) is > 3 σ.
Temperature of medium is > fitted T(MeV)

centrality	$dN/dy(p_T > 1\text{GeV}/c)$	T(MeV)
0-20%	$1.10 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.30$	$221 \pm 23 \pm 18$
20-40%	$0.52 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.14$	$215 \pm 20 \pm 15$
MB	$0.33 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.09$	$224 \pm 16 \pm 19$

Recap of discoveries and techniques from the CERN ISR in 1972-1982

G. Giacomelli and M. Jacob, Phys. Rept. **55** (1979) 1-132
M. Jacob and K. Johnsen, CERN Yellow Report 84-13

- The rapidity plateau. (Not discussed in this talk.)
- Hard scattering in p-p collisions via particle production at large p_T which proved that the partons of DIS strongly interacted with each other. x_T scaling measurements to find the underlying physics.
- direct lepton ($e^{\pm}$) production from the decay of (unknown at that time-1974) particles composed of b and c quarks.
- first and only J/Psi cross section measurement for all pair $p_T \geq 0$ at a hadron collider, until PHENIX at RHIC [PRL **92** (2004) 051802] and CDF [PRD **71**(2005) 032001 (15 years after their first publication)]
- direct photon production
- Proof using same-side and away side two particle correlations that high p_T particles in p-p collisions are produced from states with two roughly back-to-back jets which are the result of scattering of constituents of the nucleons as described by QCD, which was developed during the course of these measurements.

The END