

Saturation momentum at fixed and running QCD coupling

D.D. Dietrich^a

Laboratoire de Physique Théorique, Université Paris XI, Orsay, France
and The Niels Bohr Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark

Received: 20 July 2005 / Revised version: 29 September 2005 /
Published online: 13 December 2005 – © Springer-Verlag / Società Italiana di Fisica 2005

Abstract. A relationship linking the saturation momentum in the case of fixed and running QCD coupling, respectively, is derived from the Balitsky–Kovchegov equation. It relies on the linear instability of the evolution equation in the dilute regime. The relationship can also be derived for the Balitsky–Kovchegov equation with a cutoff accounting for low-density effects.

1 Introduction and results

In deep-inelastic scattering the total cross-section σ for the scattering of a virtual photon with momentum q on a proton with momentum p is a function of the virtuality $Q^2 = -q^2$ and the rapidity $Y = \ln(1/x)$ with $x = Q^2/(2p \cdot q)$. At sufficiently small $x \approx 10^{-2}$ the cross-section σ becomes a function of the ratio of the virtuality Q^2 and a function $Q_s^2(Y)$ of rapidity Y called saturation momentum: $\sigma = \sigma[Q^2/Q_s^2(Y)]$ [1]. This phenomenon is known as geometric scaling. Translated to the dipole scattering amplitude N , it becomes a function of the difference between the logarithm L of the square of the momentum variable conjugate to the dipole size and the logarithm of the saturation momentum: $N = N[L - \ln Q_s^2(Y)]$.

In quantum chromodynamics (QCD) the scattering of dipoles is described by the Balitsky hierarchy [2]. In the factorising limit it reduces to the Balitsky–Kovchegov (BK) equation [3]. In the low-density regime it in turn simplifies to the Balitsky–Fadin–Kuraev–Lipatov (BFKL) equation [4].

In [5] scaling solutions for the BK equation are identified at fixed coupling and with the second-order (“diffusive”) approximation¹ for the BFKL kernel. That investigation is based on knowledge about the existence of travelling-wave solutions for the Fisher–Kolmogorov–Petrovsky–Piskunov (FKPP) equation [6].

This approach is not feasible for the running-coupling BK equation because it belongs to a different universality class. Different methods have to be used, like a rescaling of the rapidity Y [7], introduction of curved absorptive boundaries into the BFKL equation [8], or use of a travelling-wave

ansatz [9]². Note that, in general, the “time” and “space” variables need not be linear functions of the rapidity Y and the momentum variable L .

Here a mapping between the saturation momentum at fixed and at running coupling, respectively, is derived. The derivation is based on the observation that in the scaling regime the saturation momentum characterises an isoline of the amplitude N . It is derived by neglecting commutators of the BFKL kernel and the running-coupling function acting on the amplitude N . This procedure is justified by the fact that the BK equation is linearly unstable with respect to small perturbations around $N = 0$ (pulled front). At this level of accuracy it is shown to hold for the saturation momentum in both cases at large rapidities Y .

As said instability is already present for the BFKL equation the relationship also holds there. Actually the validity of the relation seems to be widely independent of the detailed form of the equation of motion and the form of the running-coupling function’s equivalent. It appears to hold for a larger class of differential equations. In this context, the linear instability appears to be a sufficient condition. For example, the relationship is satisfied by the BK equation with the next-to-leading order (NLO) BFKL kernel [17] as well.

Furthermore, the relationship between the isolines for fixed and running coupling can also be derived after a cutoff has been introduced into the growth term of the BK equation in order to accommodate effects beyond the mean-field approximation [10, 11, 13]. Even if, strictly speaking, the thus modified BK equation is no longer linearly unstable against arbitrarily small perturbations around $N = 0$, saturation momenta for large rapidities Y are again mapped onto each other. For the approximation made in the course of the relationship’s derivation to hold, it suffices that the BK equation with cutoff is unstable for sufficiently large perturbations.

^a e-mail: dietrich@nbi.dk

¹ The use of the approximate equation’s solution is reasonable everywhere outside the deeply saturated regime. In the latter it goes to a constant while the solution of the exact equation continues to grow logarithmically [3].

² All of these approaches work also in the fixed-coupling case.

The comparison of isoline plots [14] obtained by solving the BK equation numerically [15] for fixed and running coupling, respectively, according to the relations presented below, would also provide interesting insights and cross checks.

In Sect. 2 the mapping between the isolines for the BK equation for fixed and running coupling, respectively, is derived. In Sect. 3 the validity of the relationship is checked for the saturation momentum at large rapidities and the reason for the accuracy of the relation is discussed. It is explained how it can be generalised to a larger class of differential equations. Section 6 treats the mapping for the BK equation with a cutoff taking into account low-density effects. For convenience Appendix A exposes details of the connection between the fixed-coupling BK equation and the FKPP equation.

2 Relation

The BK equation for the dipole forward-scattering amplitude as a function of the rapidity Y and the momentum variable L is given by

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial Y} = \bar{\alpha} \left[\chi \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial L} \right) N - N^2 \right], \quad (1)$$

with the BFKL kernel

$$\chi(\gamma) = 2\psi(1) - \psi(\gamma) - \psi(1 - \gamma), \quad (2)$$

where $\psi(\gamma)$ is the digamma function – the logarithmic derivative of the gamma function – and where the BFKL eigenvalue-function with a differential operator in the argument is defined via its series expansion around $\gamma_0 \in]0; 1[$.

The phenomenon of scaling manifests itself by the isolines of the amplitude $N(Y, L)$ keeping their distance from each other in the direction of the variable L constant if the rapidity Y changes. In other words, the amplitude is only a function of the difference $L - \ln Q_s(Y)^2$. Consequently, in the scaling regime, the saturation momentum $Q_s = Q_s(Y)$ characterises the isoline with $N[Y, Q_s(Y)] = N_s^3$. There, the equations describing two isolines differ merely by an additive constant.

Independent of the phenomenon of scaling, any isoline $L_i = L_i(Y)$ of the amplitude $N(Y, L)$ satisfies the relation

$$\frac{dL_i}{dY} = -\frac{\partial N}{\partial Y} \left(\frac{\partial N}{\partial L_i} \right)^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

For fixed QCD coupling, $\partial N/\partial Y$ can be replaced by the right-hand side of (1):

$$\frac{dL_f}{dY} = -\bar{\alpha} \left[\chi \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial L_f} \right) N_f - N_f^2 \right] \left(\frac{\partial N_f}{\partial L_f} \right)^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

³ The last condition defines this isoline also outside the scaling regime, although, strictly speaking, there, Q_s does not deserve the name ‘‘saturation momentum’’.

The running-coupling case is obtained through the replacement $\bar{\alpha} \rightarrow (bL)^{-1}$:

$$\frac{dL_r}{dY} = -\frac{1}{bL_r} \left[\chi \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial L_r} \right) N_r - N_r^2 \right] \left(\frac{\partial N_r}{\partial L_r} \right)^{-1}. \quad (5)$$

The constant b is linked to the QCD- β -function and reads $b = (11n_c - 2n_f)/(12n_c)$. n_c stands for the number of colours and n_f for the number of (massless) flavours.

Hence, division of (4) by L_f , taking into account the common initial condition

$$N_f(Y_0, L) = N_0(L) = N_r(Y_0, L), \quad (6)$$

yields

$$\frac{1}{L_f} \frac{dL_f}{dY_0} = \frac{dL_r}{dY_0}. \quad (7)$$

The constants $\bar{\alpha}$ and b have been omitted for the sake of clarity. It suffices to keep in mind to exchange the two in a comparison.

Analogous relations for the higher derivatives can be derived by repetition of the above steps: After taking the derivatives of (4) and (5) with respect to the rapidity Y , replace the new occurrences of the derivative $\partial N/\partial Y$ on the right-hand side with the help of the BK equation (1). Subsequently, divide the expression obtained from (4) by L_f . This allows one to identify the respective right-hand sides at $Y = Y_0$ up to terms involving commutators of the BFKL kernel with the running-coupling function acting on the amplitude $[\chi(-\partial_L), L^{-1}]_- N$. They are going to be omitted in what follows. Why this is justified will be investigated in Sect. 3.

Together with the initial condition

$$L_f(Y_0) = L_0 = L_r(Y_0), \quad (8)$$

this hierarchy of equations can be summarised by

$$\left[\frac{1}{L_f(Y_0)} \frac{d}{dY_0} \right]^n L_f(Y_0) = \left[\frac{d}{dY_0} \right]^n L_r(Y_0). \quad (9)$$

for all $n \in \{0; 1; 2; \dots\}$. This defines all Taylor coefficients of $L_r(Y)$ at rapidity $Y = Y_0$ based on those of $L_f(Y)$.

Inversely, by multiplying with L_r each time instead of dividing by L_f one obtains all Taylor coefficients of $L_r(Y)$ from those of $L_f(Y)$:

$$\left[\frac{d}{dY_0} \right]^n L_f(Y_0) = \left[L_r(Y_0) \frac{d}{dY_0} \right]^n L_r(Y_0). \quad (10)$$

Equation (9) can be reexpressed as

$$L_r(Y_0 + \delta Y) = \exp \left\{ \delta Y \frac{1}{L_f(Y_0)} \frac{d}{dY_0} \right\} L_f(Y_0), \quad (11)$$

and (10) accordingly as

$$L_f(Y_0 + \delta Y) = \exp \left\{ \delta Y L_r(Y_0) \frac{d}{dY_0} \right\} L_r(Y_0) \quad (12)$$

for all δY . This can be verified by Taylor expansions around $\delta Y = 0$. The exponentials in (11) and (12) are operators for conformal mappings. In the following calculations the interpretation as translation operators is to be used. (Alternative computations could, for example, involve dilatation operators.) With the definitions

$$\frac{dZ_f}{dY} = L_f(Y) \quad (13)$$

and

$$\frac{dZ_r}{dY} = \frac{1}{L_r(Y)}, \quad (14)$$

respectively, these turn into

$$\begin{aligned} L_r(Y_0 + \delta Y) &= \exp \left\{ \delta Y \frac{d}{dZ_f} \right\} L_f[Y_f(Z_f)] \\ &= L_f\{Y_f[Z_f(Y_0) + \delta Y]\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} L_f(Y_0 + \delta Y) &= \exp \left\{ \delta Y \frac{d}{dZ_r} \right\} L_r[Y_r(Z_r)] \\ &= L_r\{Y_r[Z_r(Y_0) + \delta Y]\} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

for all δY . $Y_f(Z_f)$ and $Y_r(Z_r)$ are the inverse functions of $Z_f(Y)$ and $Z_r(Y)$, respectively, as defined in (13) and (14). Equations (15) and (16) provide a direct link between the isolines of the solutions for the equations of motion in the fixed- and the running-coupling case. They hold irrespective of whether the exact or an approximative expression, for example, the second-order expansion around $\gamma = \gamma_c$, is used for the BFKL kernel (2).

3 Comparison

For large rapidities Y , the expression for the (logarithm of the) saturation momentum – up to an arbitrary additive constant – in the case of fixed coupling reads [8, 9, 15, 16]

$$L_f(Y) = \bar{\alpha} \frac{\chi(\gamma_c)}{\gamma_c} Y. \quad (17)$$

The BFKL kernel (2) has been expanded around $\gamma_0 = \gamma_c$ which solves the equation $\gamma_c \chi'(\gamma_c) = \chi(\gamma_c)$ and has the numerical value $\gamma_c = 0.6275 \dots$ [9]. For the running-coupling case the saturation momentum is given by [8, 9]

$$L_r(Y) = \sqrt{\frac{2\chi(\gamma_c)}{b\gamma_c}} Y. \quad (18)$$

The rapidity variable Y in the last two equations can differ by an additive constant ΔY .

Starting out with (17) one finds from (13)

$$Z_f(Y) = \bar{\alpha} \frac{\chi(\gamma_c)}{2\gamma_c} Y^2. \quad (19)$$

Inversion yields

$$Y_f(Z_f) = \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma_c}{\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)}} Z_f. \quad (20)$$

Evaluation at $Z_f(Y_0) + \delta Y$ leads to

$$Y_f[Z_f(Y_0) + \delta Y] = \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma_c}{\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)}} [Z_f(Y_0) + \delta Y]. \quad (21)$$

Replacing the rapidity Y in (17) by the right-hand side of the previous expression and afterwards $\bar{\alpha}$ by b^{-1} yields

$$\sqrt{\frac{2\chi(\gamma_c)}{b\gamma_c}} (Y_0 + \delta Y + \Delta Y) = L_r(Y_0 + \delta Y), \quad (22)$$

where constants have been absorbed in ΔY . Thus (15) is satisfied by (17) and (18). With analogous calculations also (16) can be verified.

3.1 Subleading terms

In the literature further terms are known for the logarithm of the saturation momentum, which are universal – up to an additive constant – for large rapidities Y . For fixed coupling the entire expression reads [8, 9, 16]

$$\begin{aligned} L_f(Y) &= \bar{\alpha} \frac{\chi(\gamma_c)}{\gamma_c} Y - \frac{3}{2\gamma_c} \ln Y - \frac{3}{\gamma_c^2} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\bar{\alpha}\chi''(\gamma_c)}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{Y}}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The third term is only given in [16] and there the error is of the order $\mathcal{O}(Y^{-1})$. For the running-coupling case two leading terms are known [8, 9]:

$$L_r(Y) = \sqrt{\frac{2\chi(\gamma_c)}{b\gamma_c}} Y + \frac{3}{4} \left[\frac{\chi''(\gamma_c)}{\sqrt{2b\gamma_c\chi(\gamma_c)}} \right]^{\frac{1}{3}} \xi_1 Y^{\frac{1}{6}}. \quad (24)$$

With the first two terms in (17) one finds from (13)

$$Z_f(Y) = \bar{\alpha} \frac{\chi(\gamma_c)}{2\gamma_c} Y^2 + \frac{3}{2\gamma_c} (1 - \ln Y) Y, \quad (25)$$

the exact inverse of which cannot be given analytically. The factor $(1 - \ln Y)$ varies slowly as compared to powers of Y . Regarding it as fixed in every step, one can determine the inverse iteratively. Starting out with $\ln Y_f^{(0)}(Z_f) = 1$ leads to (20) for $Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)$. Replacing $\ln Y$ in the logarithm in (25) by the preliminary result of the iteration $\ln Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)$ [in general $\ln Y_f^{(n)}(Z_f)$], subsequent inversion, and selection

of the positive solution in every step finally leads to the recursion relation

$$Y_f^{(n+1)}(Z_f) = -\frac{3 \left[1 - \ln Y_f^{(n)}(Z_f) \right]}{2\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)} \quad (26)$$

$$+ \sqrt{\left\{ \frac{3 \left[1 - \ln Y_f^{(n)}(Z_f) \right]}{2\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)} \right\}^2 + [Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)]^2}.$$

It shows that the dominant behaviour for large Z_f – and hence large $Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)$ – can be obtained after a finite number of iterations. The dominant terms are given by

$$Y_f^{(n+1)}(Z_f) = Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f) + \frac{3}{2\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)} \ln Y_f^{(n)}(Z_f) \quad (27)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{3}{2\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)} \right]^2 \frac{[\ln Y_f^{(n)}(Z_f)]^2}{Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)} + \mathcal{O} \left[\frac{1}{Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)} \right],$$

where constant terms have been omitted. Replacing the rapidity Y in the first two terms of (17) by the right-hand side of the previous expression yields

$$\bar{L}_r = \bar{\alpha} \frac{\chi(\gamma_c)}{\gamma_c} Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f) - \frac{9}{8} \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)\gamma_c} \frac{[\ln Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)]^2}{Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)} \quad (28)$$

$$+ \mathcal{O} \left[\frac{\ln Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)}{Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f)} \right],$$

which can already be obtained from the second-order result, i.e., from (26) with $n = 1$. Evaluation at $Z_f(Y_0) + \delta Y$ leads to the replacement

$$Y_f^{(1)}(Z_f) \rightarrow Y_f^{(1)}[Z_f(Y_0) + \delta Y]$$

$$= \frac{\gamma_c}{\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)} \sqrt{\frac{2\chi(\gamma_c)}{b\gamma_c} (Y_0 + \delta Y + \Delta Y)}, \quad (29)$$

which coincides with (21). Finally, $\bar{\alpha}$ has to be replaced by b^{-1} .

Again, the leading term of (18) is reproduced. The first subleading terms in (18) and (28) together with (29) do not coincide exactly. However, they are similar qualitatively. Through their inclusion with the leading term, L_r and \bar{L}_r are both diminished. The relative error vanishes for large rapidities Y like $(\bar{L}_r - L_r)/(\bar{L}_r + L_r) \sim Y^{-1/3}$.

In principle, it is possible to base the above comparison on (16). While the integral required for solving (14) is still known analytically for $L_r(Y)$ given by (18), the inversion of the resulting expression is more cumbersome than for (25).

4 Commutator

As has just been demonstrated, neglecting the commutator $[\chi(-\partial_L), L^{-1}]_- N$ leads to a mapping satisfied by the expressions (17) and (18) for the saturation momentum at

fixed and running coupling, respectively. In what follows it shall be discussed why this is the case.

Omitting said commutator is equivalent to approximating the prefactors of the m th derivatives with respect to the momentum variable L occurring on the running-coupling side during the relationship's derivation by the term dominant for large L : $[L^{-1} + \mathcal{O}(L^{-2})]\partial_L^m N \approx L^{-1}\partial_L^m N$. Subsequently one would have to justify why L is effectively so large that the above steps are feasible. One is tempted to bring forward the fact that saturation physics is protected from the influence of the infrared, i.e. from small L . However, through the repetition of the identical steps the above relationship can also be derived for the BFKL equation and in the BFKL equation no saturation effects are encoded.

As this line of arguments is not conclusive let us investigate how shifting the BFKL kernel by an additive constant $\bar{\chi}(\gamma) = \chi(\gamma) + \delta$ does affect the expression for the saturation momentum. First for arbitrary values of the shift δ the modified critical value $\bar{\gamma}_c$ for the argument γ , defined through $\bar{\chi}(\bar{\gamma}_c) = \bar{\gamma}_c \bar{\chi}'(\bar{\gamma}_c)$ obeys $0 < \bar{\gamma}_c < 1$. Therefore the solution stays always in the supercritical regime of the FKPP equation $\bar{\gamma}_c^{-1} > 1^4$, i.e. it has always a universal travelling-wave solution [5, 9]. Hence one can explore the effect of the shift δ directly with the help of the expression for the saturation momentum in (17).

For $\delta > -4 \ln 2$, $\bar{\chi}(\gamma)$ remains positive definite and the same qualitative asymptotic behaviour is retained, although reaching the asymptotic regime might require extremely large rapidities Y if $\bar{\chi}(\bar{\gamma}_c) \ll 1$.

The picture changes for $\delta = -4 \ln 2$, where $\bar{\gamma}_c = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\bar{\chi}(\bar{\gamma}_c) = 0$, i.e. the minimum of the kernel becomes zero. The term proportional to the rapidity Y is absent. As explained above, by shifting the BFKL kernel one stays in the supercritical regime of the FKPP equation. However, the L and the x axes are not parallel to each other. In this particular situation $x \sim 2t$ is mapped exactly onto $L = \text{const.}$ (see Appendix A), whence the prefactor in (17) vanishes although the FKPP equation has a supercritical travelling-wave solution. In other words, for $\delta = -4 \ln 2$ the BK equation is not linearly unstable for small perturbations around $N = 0$ even if the FKPP equation is. In the expression for the running coupling (18) the prefactor of the square root of the rapidity Y vanished in unison with the one in the fixed-coupling case.

Proceeding to $\delta < -4 \ln 2$ leads to $\bar{\chi}(\gamma)$ also taking negative values and especially to a negative critical value $\bar{\chi}(\bar{\gamma}_c) < 0$. Thus the term in the fixed-coupling saturation momentum proportional to the rapidity Y reappears but with a negative sign. This means that for growing rapidities Y the amplitude decreases. With this kernel the BK equation is stable against perturbations around $N = 0$. In this range, according to (18), the saturation momentum in the running-coupling case would even be complex. This shows that the latter case would have to be investigated anew.

⁴ In order to clarify the necessary connections Appendix A displays the mapping that leads to the FKPP equation.

Summarising, the term of the differential equation important for the instability around $N = 0$, thereby for the commutator to be negligible, and hence for the mapping to work, is the one originating from the critical value of the kernel $\chi(\gamma_c)$. It is not decisive whether higher negative powers of L are suppressed because of an effectively large L . Preserving only the term $\chi(\gamma_c)$ and deriving the relationship between the isolines for the different couplings leads exactly to the previous results, because in this limit the crucial commutator vanishes exactly, $[\chi(\gamma_c), L^{-1}]N = 0$. Based on these observations one can understand why the subleading terms cannot be matched exactly: The dependence on $\chi''(\gamma_c)$ of the subleading term in the running-coupling case. The more general derivation in Sect. 2 resums additional terms which lead to the same overall behaviour. The presence of these derivative terms is important as, otherwise, a front would never be able to propagate into an area of values of L where $N = 0$ exactly at a given initial rapidity Y_0 .

5 NLO BK

Based on the discussions in the last two sections the present approach should work equally well for any pair of differential equations which can be written in the form

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial Y} = \alpha f \left(\left\{ \frac{\partial^n N}{\partial L^n} \right\} \right), \quad (30)$$

and which are linearly unstable around the dilute state, widely independent of the details of the remaining terms and the detailed structure of the equivalent of the running-coupling constant. The main step for adapting to another situation is replacing the right-hand sides of (14) or (13), respectively, by the new running-coupling function $\bar{\alpha}(L)$ or its reciprocal $[\bar{\alpha}(L)]^{-1}$, respectively.

Along these lines let us investigate the BK equation with the BFKL kernel at next-to-leading order (NLO) [17] in the approximation due to [18]

$$\chi_{\text{NLO}} \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial L}, \frac{\partial}{\partial Y} \right) \approx \left(1 - \frac{\partial}{\partial Y} \right) \chi \left(-\frac{\partial}{\partial L} \right). \quad (31)$$

As has been seen above, the crucial part of the kernel is its value at γ_c . For this reason, here only that term is retained and the NLO BK equation at fixed coupling can be expressed as

$$\frac{\partial N_f}{\partial Y} = \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{1 + \bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)} [\chi(\gamma_c)N - N^2], \quad (32)$$

with the usual replacement $\bar{\alpha} \rightarrow (bL)^{-1}$ in the running-coupling case. As a side remark, this equation shows that the BFKL growth is reduced by the NLO contributions. In the running-coupling case the LO BK equation is recovered at large values of L . Be this as it may, now the mapping can be evaluated for (32) at fixed and running coupling, respectively. In analogy with (17), for the initial condition $N(Y = Y_0, L) \sim e^{-\gamma_c L \theta(L)}$ the form of the fixed-coupling isoline in the linear regime is given by

$$L_f(Y) = \frac{\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)}{[1 + \bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)]\gamma_c} Y. \quad (33)$$

With

$$Z_f(Y) = \frac{\bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)}{2[1 + \bar{\alpha}\chi(\gamma_c)]\gamma_c} Y^2 \quad (34)$$

one finds by repeating the steps in Sect. 3

$$\sqrt{\frac{2\chi(\gamma_c)}{b\gamma_c}} (Y_0 + \delta Y + \Delta Y) = L_r(Y_0 + \delta Y), \quad (35)$$

which coincides with (22). This is in correspondence with the observation that in the running-coupling case the modified BK equation converges to the unmodified for large values of L .

Using the mapping in the opposite direction – that is from the running to fixed coupling – still yields the correct form for the NLO-modified fixed-coupling case (33) if the correct prefactor from (32) is used.

6 Low-density effects

The BK equation describes the mean-field limit of the Balitsky hierarchy. The mean-field approximation is best satisfied in the dense regime and least in the dilute. There fluctuations are important. As mentioned above, for the relevant boundary conditions, the BK equation describes the propagation into a linearly unstable state. This leads to a high sensitivity of the solution to modifications at the toe of the front. In [10, 13] it has been demonstrated that the principal correction to the front propagation speed can be simulated in a deterministic manner by cutting off the growth term for small values of the amplitude. For example in the diffusive approximation to the BK equation this leads to the following modified equation of motion:

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial Y} = \bar{\alpha} \left[\chi_2 \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial L^2} + \chi_1 \frac{\partial N}{\partial L} + (\chi_0 N - N^2) c(N) \right], \quad (36)$$

with the replacement $\bar{\alpha} \rightarrow (bL)^{-1}$ for the case of running coupling and where the coefficients χ_i , $i \in \{0; 1; 2\}$ are given in Appendix A and with the cutoff function

$$c(N) = \theta(N - \epsilon), \quad (37)$$

with $\epsilon \ll \chi_0$.

Carrying out the steps of the derivation beginning with (3) but this time for the modified BK equation (36) instead of its standard form (1) yields again (15) and (16). Looking at the modified expressions for the saturation momentum one sees that (15) and (16) are satisfied exactly: At fixed coupling the isoline equation for large rapidities Y reads [10, 11, 13]

$$L_f(Y) = \bar{\alpha} \left[\frac{\chi(\gamma_c)}{\gamma_c} - \frac{\pi^2}{2} \frac{\gamma_c \chi''(\gamma_c)}{\ln^2 \epsilon} \right] Y. \quad (38)$$

At running coupling one finds [11]

$$L_r(Y) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{b} \left[\frac{\chi(\gamma_c)}{\gamma_c} - \frac{\pi^2}{2} \frac{\gamma_c \chi''(\gamma_c)}{\ln^2 \epsilon} \right]} Y. \quad (39)$$

The introduction of the cutoff removes the linear instability of the BK equation with respect to perturbations smaller than the threshold ϵ . However, the instability for perturbations larger than ϵ is sufficient to ensure that the modified expressions for the saturation momentum are qualitatively similar to those of the unmodified version. Consequently the mapping still works.

In this last context the term ‘‘saturation momentum’’ is avoided on purpose because after the inclusion of stochastic effects the solutions of the BK equation do no longer provide the observable amplitude but the amplitude for the scattering on a given partonic realisation of the target [11,13]. The physical amplitude is obtained by means of an ensemble average [13] accounting for the non-vanishing variance of the front position [10]. Then the physical amplitude does no longer show geometric scaling for high rapidities Y [11,13].

7 Summary

A mapping between the asymptotic isolines of a pair of two-dimensional partial differential equations has been derived. The differential equations are of first order in one of the variables (time) and can be of arbitrary order in the other (space). The two equations differ by a prefactor in front of the first temporal derivative. The overall factor is a function of the spatial variable. The mapping works, if the differential equations are linearly unstable with respect to perturbations around a fixed point.

The investigation has been motivated by and was carried out for the BK equation at fixed and running coupling, respectively. The relationship can be verified for the leading terms of the saturation momentum at fixed and running coupling, respectively. Therefore, due to the linear instability of the pair of partial differential equations, the relation works to this accuracy. Subleading terms for the saturation momentum are not mapped onto each other exactly, although the qualitative correspondence is preserved. Thence the relative error between the actual saturation momentum at running coupling and the one predicted from the fixed-coupling case by applying the mapping decreases like $Y^{-1/3}$. The extension to an exact mapping of the subleading terms is under investigation. To the same accuracy the relationship has been verified for the isolines of the NLO BK equation and the BK equation with a cutoff accounting for fluctuations.

Acknowledgements. The author feels particularly indebted to Gregory Korchemsky for giving helpful and informative answers to his questions. The author would also like to thank Habib Aissaoui, Kazunori Itakura, Yuri Kovchegov, Yacine Mehtar-Tani, Joachim Reinhardt, and Dominique Schiff for lively discussions. This work has been supported financially by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD).

Appendix A: Mapping: FKPP \leftrightarrow BK

The fixed-coupling BK equation for $N = N(Y, L)$ in the second-order (‘‘diffusive’’) approximation:

$$\frac{\partial N}{\partial Y} = \bar{\alpha} \left[\chi_2 \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial L^2} + \chi_1 \frac{\partial N}{\partial L} + \chi_0 N - N^2 \right], \quad (A.1)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_0 &= \gamma_c^2 \chi''(\gamma_c)/2, \\ \chi_1 &= \gamma_c \chi''(\gamma_c) + \chi(\gamma_c)/\gamma_c, \\ \chi_2 &= \chi''(\gamma_c)/2, \end{aligned} \quad (A.2)$$

is mapped onto the FKPP equation for $u = u(t, x)$:

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} + u - u^2, \quad (A.3)$$

by the relation

$$N(Y, L) = [\gamma_c^2 \chi''(\gamma_c)/2] \times u[t(Y), x(Y, L)], \quad (A.4)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \bar{\alpha} Y \times [\gamma_c^2 \chi''(\gamma_c)/2], \\ x &= \bar{\alpha} Y \times [\gamma_c^2 \chi''(\gamma_c) + \chi(\gamma_c)] + L \times \gamma_c. \end{aligned} \quad (A.5)$$

References

1. A.M. Stařto, K. Golec-Biernat, J. Kwieciński, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 596 (2001) [hep-ph/0007192]
2. I.I. Balitsky, Nucl. Phys. B **463**, 99 (1996) [hep-ph/9509348]
3. Y.V. Kovchegov, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 034008 (1999) [hep-ph/9901281]
4. L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **23**, 338 (1976); E.A. Kuraev, L.N. Lipatov, V.S. Fadin, Sov. Phys. JETP **45**, 199 (1977); I.I. Balitsky, L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **28**, 822 (1978)
5. S. Munier, R. Peschanski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 232001 (2003) [hep-ph/0309177]
6. R.A. Fisher, Ann. Eugenics **7**, 355 (1937); A. Kolmogorov, I. Petrovsky, N. Piscounov, Moscou Univ. Bull. Math. A **1**, 1 (1937)
7. E. Iancu, K. Itakura, L. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. A **708**, 327 (2002) [hep-ph/0203137]
8. A.H. Mueller, D.N. Triantafyllopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B **640**, 331 (2002) [hep-ph/0205167]
9. S. Munier, R. Peschanski, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 034008 (2004) [hep-ph/0310357]
10. E. Brunet, B. Derrida, Phys. Rev. E **56**, 2597 (1997); Comp. Phys. Comm. **121–122**, 376 (1999); J. Stat. Phys. **103**, 269 (2001)
11. A.H. Mueller, A. Shoshi, Nucl. Phys. B **692**, 175 (2004) [hep-ph/0402193]
12. D. Panja, W. v. Saarloos, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 057202 (2002)
13. E. Iancu, A.H. Mueller, S. Munier, Phys. Lett. B **606**, 342 (2005) [hep-ph/0410018]

14. K. Golec-Biernat, L. Motyka, A.M. Staśto, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 074037 (2002) [hep-ph/0110325]
15. J.L. Albacete, N. Armesto, J.G. Milhano, C.A. Salgado, U.A. Wiedemann, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 014003 (2005) [hep-ph/0408216]; M.A. Braun, Phys. Lett. B **576**, 115 (2003) [hep-ph/0308320]; K. Rummukainen, H. Weigert, Nucl. Phys. A **739**, 183 (2004) [hep-ph/0309306]
16. S. Munier, R. Peschanski, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 077503 (2004) [hep-ph/0401215]
17. V.S. Fadin, L.N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B **429**, 127 (1998) [hep-ph/9802290]
18. E. Gotsman, E. Levin, U. Maor, E. Naftali, Nucl. Phys. A **750**, 391 (2005) [hep-ph/0411242]