#### **Modern Hadron Spectroscopy : Challenges and Opportunities**

Adam Szczepaniak, Indiana University/Jefferson Lab

Lecture 1: Hadrons as laboratory for QCD:

- Introduction to QCD
- Bare vs effective effective quarks and gluons
- Phenomenology of Hadrons

Lecture 2: Phenomenology of hadron reactions

- Kinematics and observables
- Space time picture of Parton interactions and Regge phenomena
- Properties of reaction amplitudes

Lecture 3: Complex analysis

Lecture 4: How to extract resonance information from the data

- Partial waves and resonance properties
- Amplitude analysis methods (spin complications)



# **Probing QCD resonances (using physical states)**

- When (color neutral) mesons and baryons a smashed, their quarks overlap, "stick together" to form resonances (quasi QCD eigenstates). They are short lived and decay to lowest energy, asymptotic states (pions, K's, proton,...)
- Resonances are fundamental to our understanding of QCD dynamics since they appear beyond perturbation theory.
- (QCD) Resonances challenge QFT practitioners to develop all orders calculations (still ways to go).
- (QCD) Resonance lead to extremely rich phenomenology (e.g. XYZ states).
- In practice, one requires tools that relate asymptotic states before collision to asymptotic states after collision that include flexible parametrization of microscopic dynamics. This is often referred to as amplitude analysis. The rest of these lectures will focus on this topic.

### Bound states/Resonances/Asymptotic states



Bound states: compact wave function contains interaction to all orders.

3

Resonances: particles interact to all orders (like bound states) but eventually decay (connect with asymptotically free states). Their effect appears in the S-matrix

Born approximation : lowest order

perturbation on free motion

#### Amplitude analyticity: it is much about complex functions 4



Scattering amplitude describes evolution between asymptotic states. The information related to formation about resonances is "hidden" in unphysical domains (sheets) of the kinematical variables.

This "bump" is an indication of a "hidden" phenomenon. To uncover it one needs to analytically continue outset the physical sheet





## **Introduction to Scattering**

$$H = H_{kin} + V \to H_0 + V(t) \qquad V \to V(t) = Ve^{-\epsilon|t|}$$

Interaction is switched on adiabatically at t=0

• Time evolution pictures: Schrodinger, Heisenberg, Interaction

$$O_{I}(t) = e^{iH_{0}}O(0)e^{-iH_{0}t} \longrightarrow \begin{aligned} H_{0,I}(t) &= H_{0} \\ V_{I}(t) &= e^{iH_{0}}Ve^{-iH_{0}t}e^{-\epsilon|t|} \\ |t\rangle_{I} &= e^{iH_{0}t}|t\rangle_{S} \longrightarrow i\frac{d}{dt}|t\rangle_{I} = V_{I}(t)|t\rangle_{I} \end{aligned}$$

- As t → ± ∞ interaction picture states evolve to eigenstates of H<sub>kin</sub>, i.e. to free particles
- At t=0 interactions picture states are solution of the full Hamiltonian

## **S-matrix and T-matrix**

$$i\frac{d}{dt}|t\rangle_I = V_I(t)|t\rangle_I \longrightarrow |t\rangle_I = U(t, -\infty)|initial\rangle$$

• S-matrix

$$S_{fi} = \langle f(t = +\infty) | i(t = -\infty) \rangle = \langle f, (out) | i, (in) \rangle$$
$$= \langle f | U(+\infty, -\infty) | i \rangle$$

$$U(+\infty, -\infty) = \mathcal{P} \exp\left(-i \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt V_I(t)\right) = I - 2\pi i \delta(E_f - E_i)T$$

**Evolution operator** 

• T-matrix

$$T = V + VG_0V + \cdots \quad G_0 = \frac{1}{E - H_0}$$
$$E = E_i = E_f$$



## **T** matrix : Example

$$T = V + VG_0V + \cdots$$

Example

Nonrelativistic particle scarring in external potential

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2\mu} + V$$

 $\dim \lambda = -1$ 

$$V = \frac{\lambda}{2\mu a^2} \delta(r-a)$$



Method 1: In coordinate space Method 2: Lippmann-Schwinger (see above)

Phenety is related to ∞ number of poles when calculated to all

## **Solution**

#### From method 1

$$f(k) = \frac{\left[-\lambda \frac{\sin^2(ka)}{(ka)^2}\right]}{\left[1 + \frac{\lambda}{a} \frac{\sin(ka)\cos(ka)}{ka}\right] - ik\left[-\lambda \frac{\sin^2(ka)}{(ka)^2}\right]}$$
$$f(k) = \frac{K(E)}{1 - iK(E)k} = \frac{1}{K^{-1}(E) - ik} = \frac{1}{K^{-1}(E) - ik}$$

 $= \frac{P(k)}{Q(k)} \mathop{\scriptstyle{\scriptstyle{\scriptstyle{\scriptstyle{}}}}}\limits_{\scriptstyle{\scriptstyle{\scriptstyle{\scriptstyle{\scriptstyle{}}}}} {\rm of \ zeros} \, \rightarrow \, {\rm Poles}}}$ 

# **Solution**

From method 2

$$f(k) = \frac{-\lambda \frac{\sin^2(ka)}{(ka)^2}}{1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\infty dE' k' \frac{-\lambda \frac{\sin^2(k'a)}{(k'a)^2}}{E' - E(k)}}$$

$$k' = k(E') = \sqrt{2\mu E'}$$

$$K(E) = \frac{-\lambda \frac{\sin^2(ka)}{(ka)^2}}{1 - \frac{1}{\pi} \Re \int \cdots}$$



$$K(k = k_R + ik_I) \to const. + O(e^{-2k_I a}) = \frac{1}{ik} + O(e^{-2k_I a})$$

$$f(k) = \frac{K(E)}{1 - iK(E)k} = O(e^{+2ik_I a})$$

Essential singularity at infinity in the physical sheet !

"Conspiracy" between zeros and poles !!!

E.g.  $\infty$  number of zeros of K(s) are "fixed" by geometry of the sphere ("dynamics") and this specific "physics" fixes all the poles.

In more general case (no fixed scattering radius) correlation between zeroes and poles persist", an infinite number poles requires infinite number of zeroes (and vice versa)



Simple model for low extend patilos (e.g s's) con access "quil movel" states LpE= 22  $V(v) = \frac{1}{2\mu} \delta(v-a) - \frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{1}{2\mu} (v-a) - \frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{1}{2\mu} (v-a) - \frac{1}{2\mu} \frac{1}{2\mu} (v-a) + \frac{1$ N= n M: A sinkat Brosha x a free wire. at a: A suka+BcoshA= sulza ale Acosta -able sontra = a' costa + > sin Va - 4++4.+V=D My= 4.+V  $\supset f = \dots$  boud states = ...





bess3

8/21/17







bess3

27/39





(h'14)= (2213 531 4-4)= (2113 22516:4)57(1) 41 - $= (14)^2 \frac{1}{E^2} (\frac{dE}{dE})^2 S[e \cdot e | S^3(A \cdot o_2)] = E \cdot \frac{E^2}{L^2}$ = (11) ~ 1 S(E. E) 5? (2'. d) = /21/2 / S/E. E15 7/2/17/21 (i sit): m - (18) Site i Luink) (hITIV) - [ Ty Your Ken Lu Isle) = (201 Epsile El? You dux  $\begin{bmatrix}
1 & - (16)^{2} & (12) & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (12) & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (12) & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (12)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (12)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & (2)^{2} & (2) & (2) \\
- (16)^{2} & ($ Fi (How (2,4Tc)) Muik 7.= 22101x) = -341-2 2 h 1712) - 2Te7 1 m 1 m - 2 (12+1) Te72 (120) Te= 2 (dt Pelino) 47 46 17165 fe= -2 (200) State (21 24)

$$f_{e} = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{100} \right) \left( A_{e} P_{e}(a) \right) \left( A_{e} P_{e}(a) \right) \left( 2a^{2} P$$



# S-matrix properties (in relativistic theory)

• Related to transition probability

$$P_{fi} = |\langle f|S|i\rangle|^2 = \langle i|S^{\dagger}|f\rangle\langle f|S|i\rangle$$

• Conservation of Probability = Unitarity





• Lorentz symmetry: T is a product of Lorentz scalars and covariant factors representing wave functions of external states, e.g for  $\pi(k_1) + N(p_1, \lambda_1) \rightarrow \pi(k_2) + N(p_2, \lambda_2)$ 

 $\bar{u}(p_1,\lambda_1)[A(s,t) + (k_1 + k_2)_{\mu}\gamma^{\mu}B(s,t)]u(p_2,\lambda_2)$ 

• Crossing symmetry: the same scalar functions describe all process related by permutation of legs between initial and final states (only the wave function change)  $\pi(k_1) + \pi(-k_2) \rightarrow \overline{N}(-p_1, \mu_1) + N(p_2, \mu_2)$ 

$$\bar{v}(p_1,\mu_1)[A(s,t) + (k_1 + k_2)_{\mu}\gamma^{\mu}B(s,t)]u(p_2,\mu_2)$$

• Analyticity: The scalar functions are analytical functions of invariants

#### Lorentz symmetry

N-to-M scattering depends on 4(N+M)-4-10 = 3(N+M)-10 invariants e.g for 2-to-2: 2 invariants related to the c.m. energy and scattering angle



How many independent variables describe

- Decay proces  $A \rightarrow a + b + c$
- Three particle production A +B  $\rightarrow$  a + b + c



## **Helicity amplitudes**

We work in the c.m. frame

INDIANA UNIVERSITY Jefferson Lab

$$\frac{\vec{S} \cdot \vec{p}}{|\vec{p}|} |p, \lambda\rangle = \lambda |p, \lambda\rangle$$

$$\langle p_3, \lambda_3; p_4, \lambda_4 | A | p_1, \lambda_1; p_2, \lambda_2 \rangle = A_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4}(s, t, u)$$

Helicity states vs canonical spin states:  $S_z |p, m\rangle_z = m |p, m\rangle_z$  $|p, m\rangle_z = \Lambda(\vec{p} \leftarrow 0) |0, m\rangle_z$  $|p, \lambda\rangle = R(\hat{p})\Lambda(|\vec{p}|\hat{z} \leftarrow 0) |0, m\rangle_z$ Exercise show this:  $|p, \lambda\rangle_z = \sum_{m=-S}^{S} |p, m\rangle_z D^S_{m,\lambda}(\hat{p})$ 

 Even though this looks non relativistic it is relativistic. Notion of LS amplitudes, LS vs. helicity relations are relativistic

$$\text{Parity} \quad A_{\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4}(s,t,u) = \eta A_{-\lambda_1,-\lambda_2,-\lambda_3,-\lambda_4}(s,t,u) \\$$

How many independent scalar functions describe

$$J/\psi \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$$

 $\gamma p \rightarrow \pi^0 p$ 



## **Crossing symmetry**



• The is important. Function values at, e.g. s + is vs s - is are different !

## Crossing Symmetry : Decays $M_1 > m_2 + m_3 + m_4$ <sup>28</sup>





 $a(p_1) + b(p_2) \rightarrow c(p_3) + d(p_4)$ 

 $a(p_1) \rightarrow \overline{b(p_2)} + c(p_3) + d(p_4)$ 

$$A(s,t,u) \to A(M_1^2 + i\epsilon, s + i\epsilon, t + i\epsilon, u + i\epsilon)$$

- In decay kinematics, the decaying mass becomes a dynamical variable, (is important)
- Crossing from one kinematical region (e.g. s-channel) to another (e.g. t-channel) requires taking the corresponding variables off the real axis and to the complex plane : analytical continuation.



## Analyticity

#### Feynman diagrams

$$A(p_1, \dots) \propto \int [\Pi_j d^4 k_j] \frac{\text{polynomial in } \mathbf{k}_j}{(m_q^2 - (p_i - k_j)^2 - i\epsilon)((k_i - k_j)^2 - i\epsilon) \dots}$$
$$m^2 - p^2 = [m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2] - (p^0)^2 \qquad \qquad \sum p_1 \qquad \qquad p_1$$

$$m^2 - p^2 = 0 \to p^0 = \pm (m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2)^{1/2}$$

- Integrand becomes singular when intermediate states go on shell.
- Thresholds for producing physical intermediate are the only reason why amplitudes are singular.
- Production of intermediate states is related to unitarity. Thus we expect unitarity to determine singularities of the amplitudes.

Jefferson Lab

On the role of is

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

$$\operatorname{Im}\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2} \mp i\epsilon - p^0}\right] = \pm \pi \delta(p_0 - \sqrt{m^2 + \mathbf{p}^2})$$



# **Analyticity and Causality**



and extend definition to complex plane E  $\rightarrow$  z, then f(z) is holomorphic for Im E > 0

Causality: The outgoing wave cannot appear before the incoming one. Causality determines analytical properties of the scattering amplitude as function on energy/ momenta/scattering angle. The specific from of these conditions depend on the type of interactions and kinematics (e.g. relativistic vs non relativistic)



#### momentum vs energy planes



The function is analytical in the whole E-plane not only the upper half



## How unitarity constrains singularities

 Unitarity "operates" in the physical domain, i.e. s real and above threshold and |Cos(θ)|<1. This domain is the boundary of the complex plane where analytical amplitude are defined

$$A(s + i\epsilon) = A_{\text{physical}}(s = \text{real and above threshold})$$

I sheet

The difference (discontinuity) A(s + iε) - A(s - iε) ≠ 0 (cf. Feynman diagrams), comes from particle production this we expect it being determined by unitarity.

$$2ImT_{ft} = \sum_{n} 2\pi\delta(E_i - E_n)T_{fn}^*T_{ni}$$

• Cauchy theorem : singularities determine the amplitude !!!

sign fixed by "arrow of time V(t) = V exp(-t  $|\varepsilon|$ )

Causality: Determines domain of analyticity of reaction amplitudes as function of kinematical variables.

**Unitarity**: Determines singularities.

Crossing: Dynamical relation, aka reaction amplitudes in the exchange channel (forces) are analogous to amplitude in the direct channel (resonance)

These defined the Bootstrap program of the 60's. It is equivalent to nonrelativistic QM, but not to QFT, i.e. "bootstrap equations" do not have unique solutions. For example it failed to reproduce the QCD resonance spectrum, which needs "external parameters". (aka. K-matrix poles, CDD -poles, etc.)



#### How unitarity constrains singularities: simple example



At fixed s, this is a complicated, integral relation w.r.t momentum transfer, t It is simplified (diagonalized) by expanding A(s,t) in partial waves

Jefferson Lab

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

$$A(s,t) = 16\pi \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1)f_l(s)P_l(\cos\theta) \qquad Imf_l(s) = \rho(s)|f_l(s)|^2$$

34

#### How unitarity constrains singularities

Properties of the partial wave,  $f_i(s)$  (for fixed I as function of s):

- f<sub>l</sub>(s) is real for s below threshold
- Im f<sub>l</sub>(s) is finite above threshold.
- f<sub>l</sub>(s) is complex for diffidently negative s
- f<sub>l</sub>(s) is analytical (since A(s,t) is)

$$f_l(s) = \frac{1}{32\pi} \int_{-1}^{1} d\cos\theta P_l(\cos\theta) A(s, t(s, \cos\theta))$$

 $\rightarrow$  Reflection theorem (Calculus 101):  $f_i(s^*) = f_i(s^*)$ 



INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Jefferson Lab

- Even though f<sub>l</sub>(s) has physical meaning for s real and above threshold, there is a unique function in the complex plane which reduces to f<sub>l</sub>(s) on the real axis (+iε).
- Furthermore, unitarity which is a condition for physical s-values, becomes a restriction on the complex function, f<sub>l</sub>(s).

$$\frac{1}{2i}[f_l(s+i\epsilon) - f_l(s-i\epsilon)] = \rho(s)f_l(s+i\epsilon)f_l(s-i\epsilon)$$

#### **Second sheet**





## **Breit-Wigner Formula**





## **Kinematical vs Dynamical Singularities**



- Wigner d-functions lead to kinematical singularities
- Threshold (barrier factors) originate from kinematical factors in relation between t and cos(θ) (through dependence of A<sub>λ</sub> on t)
- Unequal masses give lead to "daughter poles"
- Dynamical singularities : from dynamical (unitary cuts) in A(s,t).



### **Phenomenology of hadron interaction**



## **Resonance Scattering**



more pronounced forward/backward peaks as energy increases



### **Resonance scattering**



- If QCD was confining resonance would appear at all energy and angular momenta (infinitely rising Regge trajectories).
- String/flux tube breaking leads to screening of color charge and resonance seem to appear with finite angular momentum.
- For  $I_{max} \sim 5$  and nteraction range  $r_0 \sim 0.5$  fm this gives  $p_{lab} < 10$ /fm  $\sim 2$ GeV, [or W ~  $(2 P_{lab} m_p)^{1/2} ~ 2GeV$ ]
- For resonance scattering

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

$$A(s,t) = \sum_{l} (2l+1)f_{l}(s)P_{l}(z_{s}(t)) \longrightarrow A(s,t) \sim \frac{P_{l_{R}}(z_{s}(t))}{s-s_{R}}$$

$$\texttt{U} \text{ indiana University Jefferson Lab}$$

## **Scattering at High energies**



• s-dependence:

•many intermediate particles can be produced, unitarity becomes complicated and less useful.

• t-dependence:

•high partial waves become important, several Legendre functions are needed.

 There is universality in both s and t-dependencies: smooth (constant or falling s-dependence), and forward/(backward) peaking in t. The universality hints into importance of t/(u) channel singularities.





#### From t-channel to s-channel (high energy forward scattering) 44



#### From u-channel to s-channel (high energy backward scattering) <sup>45</sup>



# Regge phenomena



\* ...looks like resonance in t-channel: hint explore unitarity in t-channel

$$A(s,t) = \sum_{l} (2l+1)f_{l}(t)P_{l}(z_{t}(s))$$

resonance poles in  $f_I(t)$  at t=t<sub>R</sub> can be considered as poles in I: t<sub>R</sub>=t(I) --> I= $\alpha(t_R)$  thus for large s  $A(s,t) \sim s^l = s^{\alpha(t)}$ 

to rigorously establish the large-s behavior one needs to make sense out of the divergent sum. (Gribov-Froissart projection + Somerfeld-Watson transformation)

### **Example of analytical continuation**

$$A(s,t) = \sum_{l} (2l+1)f_l(t)P_l(z_t) \qquad s = -\frac{t-4m^2}{2}(1-z_t)$$

The series converges for  $|z_t|<1$  (cosine of scattering angle in the t-channel), i.e. in the t-channel physical region. We want to know A(s,t) for in the s-channel physical region, in particular for large s, with corresponds to  $|z_t| >> 1$ .

For example, assume  $f_l(t) = \frac{1}{l - \alpha(t)}$  i.e. it has a pole (resonance) where  $\alpha(t)=1$ 

$$A(s,t) \sim J(z_t) = \sum_{l} \frac{z_t^l}{l - \alpha(t)} \quad \text{for } \alpha < 0 \text{ and } |z_t| < 1 \text{ use } \quad \frac{1}{l - \alpha} = \int_0^\infty dx e^{-x(l - \alpha)} dx e^{-x(l - \alpha)} dx = \int_0^\infty dx e^{-x(l - \alpha)} dx e^{-x(l - \alpha)} dx = \int_0^\infty dx = \int_0^\infty dx e^{-x(l - \alpha)} dx = \int_0^\infty dx e^{-x(l - \alpha)} dx = \int_0^\infty dx e^{-x(l - \alpha$$

to obtain 
$$J(z) = \int_0^\infty dx \left[ \frac{e^{x\alpha}}{1 + ze^{-x}} \right] = z^\alpha \int_0^z \frac{dy}{y^{\alpha+1}(1+y)} \qquad \qquad y = ze^{-x}$$

provides analytical continuation for  $\alpha > 0$  for large  $z = z(s) \sim s$ 

$$J(z) = -\frac{z^{\alpha}\pi}{\sin\pi\alpha} + z^{\alpha} \int_{z}^{\infty} \frac{dy}{y^{\alpha+1}(1+y)} \to -\frac{z^{\alpha}\pi}{\sin\pi\alpha} \qquad z \to \infty$$

In general use Sommefeld-Watson transformation to sum a series



### **Pomeron vs Reggeons**

s-channel: multi-particle production

ж

t-channel: collection of resonances: "Regge" exchanges



Rightmost singularity in I-plane dominates large-s limit of the amplitude and forward cross section (it has vacuum quantum numbers: Pomeron $\alpha(0) = 1 + \epsilon$ )

(exchange of non-vacuum q.n. falls with energy)



## **Comparing with Experiment**



# Growing Radius, partons, saturation,...

Where does to parton model come from

adding correlated partons is beneficial (expansion not in  $g^2$  but in  $g^2 \log s$ )

... and in space-time assuming Pomeron  $\alpha(0)=1$ 

$$\begin{split} A(s,r_{\perp}) \sim \int d^2k_{\perp} e^{ik_{\perp}r_{\perp}} e^{\alpha(-k_{\perp}^2)\log s} \sim \frac{1}{\log(s)} e^{-r_{\perp}^2/\log(s)} & \text{hadron swells} \\ \Delta E \sim \frac{\mu_{\perp}^2}{x(1-x)p_z} & \text{long lived fluctuations finite } \\ p_z \rightarrow \infty & (1-x)p_z & \langle x \rangle^{\langle n \rangle} = \frac{p_z}{\mu} & \langle n \rangle \sim \log(s) \\ & \text{random walk in transverse space} \\ & \star \langle r_{\perp} \rangle \sim \sqrt{\langle n \rangle \frac{1}{\mu_{\perp}}} \sim \log^{1/2}(s) \\ & \text{p} = 0 \\ \end{split}$$

INDIANA Styletstyk astronog time" to develop a low-x parton out of a fast one

S-matrix principles : Crossing symmetry, Analyticity, Unitarity provide important constraints/insights into reaction dynamics.

For example: low energy scaring is dominated by a few direct channel partial waves, resonance appear as poles on the II<sup>nd</sup> sheet with widths constrained by unitarity, large-s scattering is given by t/u channel exchanges, etc.

In QCD resonances are not predicted by exchange forces (Bootstrap idea), they have to be "inserted by hand".

