Hard to Soft Pomeron Transition in Small-x Deep Inelastic Scattering Data Using Optimal Renormalization

Martin Hentschinski, Agustín Sabio Vera, and Clara Salas

Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 041601 — Published 25 January 2013

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.041601

The hard to soft Pomeron transition in small x DIS data using optimal renormalization

Martin Hentschinski[1], Agustín Sabio Vera[2,3], Clara Salas[2,3]

[1] Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973, USA
[2] Instituto de Física Teórica UAM/CSIC and Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, E-28049 Madrid, Spain
[3] Physics Department, CERN, CH-1211 Genéve 23, Switzerland

December 18, 2012

Abstract

We show that it is possible to describe the effective Pomeron intercept, determined from the HERA Deep Inelastic Scattering data at small values of Bjorken x, using next-to-leading order BFKL evolution together with collinear improvements. To obtain a good description over the whole range of Q^2 we use a non-Abelian physical renormalization scheme with BLM optimal scale, combined with a parametrization of the running coupling in the infrared region.

1 Introduction & theoretical approach

The description of Deep Inelastic Scattering (DIS) data for structure functions in different regions of Bjorken x and virtuality of the photon Q^2 is a classical problem in QCD. The literature on the subject is large (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [1]). In this Letter we are interested in small x regions and revisit the approach to the problem using the next-to-leading order (NLO) [2] BFKL [3] equation together with collinear improvements. We find that, in order to get a good description over the full range of Q^2, we can use optimal renormalization schemes. Here we highlight the most important aspects which drive our results.

In DIS the cross section is written in terms of the structure functions F_2

and F_L in the form

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{dx\,dQ^2} = \frac{2\pi\alpha^2}{xQ^4}\left\{\left[1+(1-y)^2\right]F_2(x,Q^2) - y^2 F_L(x,Q^2)\right\}, \qquad (1)$$

where x and y are the Bjorken variables, Q^2 the photon's virtuality and α the electromagnetic constant. In terms of transverse and longitudinal polarizations of the photon, we have

$$F_2(x,Q^2) = \frac{Q^2}{4\pi^2\alpha}[\sigma_T(x,Q^2)+\sigma_L(x,Q^2)], \;\; F_L(x,Q^2) = \frac{Q^2}{4\pi^2\alpha}\sigma_L(x,Q^2), \qquad (2)$$

where $\sigma_{T,L}$ is the cross-section for the scattering of a transverse (longitudinal) polarized virtual photon on the proton. At large center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s}$, which corresponds to the small $x \simeq Q^2/s$ limit, high energy factorization makes it possible to write F_I, $I = 2, L$ in the form

$$F_I(x,Q^2) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4}\int\frac{d^2\mathbf{q}_\perp}{q^2}\int\frac{d^2\mathbf{p}_\perp}{p^2}\Phi_I\left(q,Q^2\right)\Phi_P\left(p,Q_0^2\right)\mathcal{F}\left(s,q,p\right), \qquad (3)$$

with two-dimensional integrations where $q = \sqrt{\mathbf{q}_\perp^2}$. The proton ($\Phi_P$) and photon ($\Phi_I$) impact factors are dominated by $\mathcal{O}(Q_0)$ and $\mathcal{O}(Q)$ transverse scales, respectively. Φ_I can be calculated in perturbation theory. This is not the case for Φ_P whose dependence on the non-perturbative scale $Q_0 \simeq \Lambda_{\rm QCD}$ can only be modeled.

If $Q^2 \simeq Q_0^2$ then the gluon Green's function $\mathcal{F}$, the solution of the BFKL equation, would be

$$\mathcal{F}(s,q,p) = \frac{1}{2\pi q\,p}\int\frac{d\omega}{2\pi i}\int\frac{d\gamma}{2\pi i}\left(\frac{q^2}{p^2}\right)^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}\left(\frac{s}{q\,p}\right)^{\omega}\frac{1}{\omega-\bar{\alpha}_s\chi_0\left(\gamma\right)}, \qquad (4)$$

with $\bar{\alpha}_s = \alpha_s N_c/\pi$ and $\chi_0(\gamma) = 2\psi(1) - \psi(\gamma) - \psi(1-\gamma)$ in a leading order (LO) approximation, which resums $\bar{\alpha}_s^n \log^n s$ terms. $\psi(\gamma)$ is the logarithmic derivative of the Euler Gamma function. In DIS, however, $Q^2 \gg Q_0^2$ and this expression should be written in a form consistent with the resummation of $\bar{\alpha}_s \log{(1/x)}$ contributions:

$$\mathcal{F}(s,q,p) = \frac{1}{2\pi q^2}\int\frac{d\omega}{2\pi i}\int\frac{d\gamma}{2\pi i}\left(\frac{q^2}{p^2}\right)^{\gamma}\left(\frac{s}{q^2}\right)^{\omega}\frac{1}{\omega-\bar{\alpha}_s\chi_0\left(\gamma-\frac{\omega}{2}\right)}. \qquad (5)$$

The zeros of the denominator in the integrand generate in the limits $\gamma \to 0, 1$ all-orders terms not compatible with DGLAP [4, 5]. The first of these pieces

($\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$) is removed when the NLO correction to the BFKL kernel is taken into account but not the higher order ones, which remain and are numerically important. A scheme to eliminate these spurious contributions [4], in a nutshell, consists of using a modified BFKL kernel in Eq. (4) where we essentially introduce the change $\chi_0(\gamma) \to \chi_0(\gamma + \omega/2)$.

Let us present now in a precise manner our procedure to include the NLO corrections and collinear improvements. The NLO expansion of the BFKL kernel in terms of poles at $\gamma = 0, 1$ reads

$$\begin{aligned}\omega &= \bar{\alpha}_s \chi_0(\gamma - \frac{\omega}{2}) + \bar{\alpha}_s^2 \chi_1(\gamma) \\ &= \bar{\alpha}_s \chi_0(\gamma) + \bar{\alpha}_s^2 \chi_1(\gamma) - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\alpha}_s^2 \chi_0{}'(\gamma)\chi_0(\gamma) + \mathcal{O}(\bar{\alpha}_s^3) \\ &\simeq \frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{\gamma} + \bar{\alpha}_s^2 \left(\frac{a}{\gamma} + \frac{b}{\gamma^2} - \frac{1}{2\gamma^3}\right) + \frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{1-\gamma} + \frac{\bar{\alpha}_s^2}{2\gamma^3} - \frac{\bar{\alpha}_s^2}{2(1-\gamma)^3} \\ &+ \bar{\alpha}_s^2 \left[\frac{a}{1-\gamma} + \frac{b}{(1-\gamma)^2} - \frac{1}{2(1-\gamma)^3}\right] + \mathcal{O}(\bar{\alpha}_s^3), \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\chi_0{}'(\gamma) = \psi'(1-\gamma) - \psi'(\gamma)$. Now, as we have explained before, we resum in the Regge region ($Q^2 \simeq Q_0^2$) collinear logarithms by introducing a shift of the general form [4, 5]

$$\omega = \bar{\alpha}_s(1 + A\bar{\alpha}_s)\left[2\psi(1) - \psi\left(\gamma + \frac{\omega}{2} + B\bar{\alpha}_s\right) - \psi\left(1 - \gamma + \frac{\omega}{2} + B\bar{\alpha}_s\right)\right]. \tag{7}$$

In the DIS limit ($Q^2 \gg Q_0^2$) this is replaced by

$$\begin{aligned}\omega &= \bar{\alpha}_s(1 + A\bar{\alpha}_s)\left[2\psi(1) - \psi\left(\gamma + B\bar{\alpha}_s\right) - \psi\left(1 - \gamma + \omega + B\bar{\alpha}_s\right)\right] \\ &= \bar{\alpha}_s(1 + A\bar{\alpha}_s)\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma + m + B\bar{\alpha}_s} + \frac{1}{1 - \gamma + m + \omega + B\bar{\alpha}_s} - \frac{2}{m+1}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

It is possible to get a very good approximation to the solution of this equation (certainly within the uncertainty of the resummation scheme) by breaking its transcendentality and solving it pole by pole and summing up the different solutions. This procedure was proposed in Ref. [5]. In terms of (anti-)collinear poles we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\left\{\bar{\alpha}_s(1+A\bar{\alpha}_s)\left(\frac{1}{\gamma+m+B\bar{\alpha}_s}-\frac{2}{m+1}\right)\right.\\
&+ \left.\frac{1}{2}\left(\gamma-1-m-B\bar{\alpha}_s+\sqrt{(\gamma-1-m-B\bar{\alpha}_s)^2+4\bar{\alpha}_s(1+A\bar{\alpha}_s)}\right)\right\}\\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\left\{\bar{\alpha}_s\left(\frac{1}{\gamma+m}+\frac{1}{1-\gamma+m}-\frac{2}{m+1}\right)\right.\\
&+ \bar{\alpha}_s^2\left(\frac{A}{\gamma+m}+\frac{A}{1-\gamma+m}-\frac{B}{(\gamma+m)^2}-\frac{B}{(1-\gamma+m)^2}\right.\\
&- \left.\left.\frac{1}{(1+m-\gamma)^3}-\frac{2A}{m+1}\right)\right\}+\mathcal{O}(\bar{\alpha}_s^3). \qquad (9)
\end{aligned}$$

In order to match the NLO poles in Eq. (6) we need to fix $A=a$ and $B=-b$. Keeping the LO and NLO kernels unmodified and introducing only higher orders corrections, our collinearly improved BFKL kernel then simply reads

$$\chi(\gamma) = \bar{\alpha}_s\chi_0(\gamma)+\bar{\alpha}_s^2\chi_1(\gamma)-\frac{1}{2}\bar{\alpha}_s^2{\chi_0}'(\gamma)\chi_0(\gamma)+\chi_{\rm RG}(\bar{\alpha}_s,\gamma,a,b), \qquad (10)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{\rm RG}(\bar{\alpha}_s,\gamma,a,b) &= \bar{\alpha}_s(1+a\bar{\alpha}_s)\left(\psi(\gamma)-\psi(\gamma-b\bar{\alpha}_s)\right)\\
&-\frac{\bar{\alpha}_s^2}{2}\psi''(1-\gamma)-b\bar{\alpha}_s^2\frac{\pi^2}{\sin^2(\pi\gamma)}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\left(\gamma-1-m+b\bar{\alpha}_s\right.\\
&\left.-\frac{2\bar{\alpha}_s(1+a\bar{\alpha}_s)}{1-\gamma+m}+\sqrt{(\gamma-1-m+b\bar{\alpha}_s)^2+4\bar{\alpha}_s(1+a\bar{\alpha}_s)}\right). \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

For the NLO kernel,

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_1(\gamma) &= \mathcal{S}\chi_0(\gamma)-\frac{\beta_0}{8N_c}\chi_0^2(\gamma)+\frac{\Psi''(\gamma)+\Psi''(1-\gamma)-\phi(\gamma)-\phi(1-\gamma)}{4}\\
&-\frac{\pi^2\cos(\pi\gamma)}{4\sin^2(\pi\gamma)(1-2\gamma)}\left[3+\left(1+\frac{n_f}{N_c^3}\right)\frac{2+3\gamma(1-\gamma)}{(3-2\gamma)(1+2\gamma)}\right]+\frac{3}{2}\zeta(3), \qquad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{S}=(4-\pi^2+5\beta_0/N_c)/12$, $\beta_0=\left(\frac{11}{3}N_c-\frac{2}{3}n_f\right)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(\gamma)+\phi(1-\gamma) &=\\
&\sum_{m=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{\gamma+m}+\frac{1}{1-\gamma+m}\right)\left[\Psi'\left(1+\frac{m}{2}\right)-\Psi'\left(\frac{1+m}{2}\right)\right], \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain for the coefficients

$$a = \frac{5}{12}\frac{\beta_0}{N_c} - \frac{13}{36}\frac{n_f}{N_c^3} - \frac{55}{36}, \qquad b = -\frac{1}{8}\frac{\beta_0}{N_c} - \frac{n_f}{6N_c^3} - \frac{11}{12}. \tag{14}$$

Our model for the non-perturbative proton impact factor reads

$$\Phi_P\left(p, Q_0^2\right) = \mathcal{C}\left(\frac{p^2}{Q_0^2}\right)^{\delta} e^{-\frac{p^2}{Q_0^2}}, \tag{15}$$

which introduces three independent free parameters and has a maximum at $p^2 = \delta\, Q_0^2$. Its representation in γ space reads

$$\int \frac{d^2p}{p^2}\Phi_P\left(p, Q_0^2\right)(p^2)^{-\gamma} = \pi\,\mathcal{C}\,\Gamma(\delta-\gamma)(Q_0^2)^{-\gamma}. \tag{16}$$

We choose to keep the impact factors as simple as possible in order to focus on the gluon Green's function. Having this philosophy in mind, we work with the LO photon impact factor which reads (directly in $\nu = i(1/2-\gamma)$ space)

$$\int \frac{d^2q}{q^2}\Phi_I\left(q, Q^2\right)\left(\frac{q^2}{Q^2}\right)^{\gamma-1} = \alpha\,\bar{\alpha}_s\,\pi^4\sum_{q=1}^{n_f} e_q^2\,\frac{\Omega_I(\nu)}{\nu+\nu^3}\,\mathrm{sech}(\pi\nu)\,\tanh\left(\pi\nu\right), \tag{17}$$

where $\Omega_2 = (11+12\nu^2)/8$ and $\Omega_L = \nu^2 + 1/4$.

So far we have not included those terms breaking scale invariance, directly linked to the running of the coupling. They appear as a differential operator in ν space which acts on the impact factors (for a similar analysis see Ref. [6]). Let us first only exponentiate the scale invariant LO and NLO terms in the kernel, *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} F_I(x, Q^2) &= \mathcal{D}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu\, x^{-\chi\left(\frac{1}{2}+i\nu\right)} c_I(\nu) c_P(\nu)\Bigg\{1 \\ &+ \bar{\alpha}_s^2 \log\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)\frac{\beta_0}{8N_c}\chi_0\left(\frac{1}{2}+i\nu\right)\left[\log\left(\mu^4\right) + i\frac{d}{d\nu}\log\left(\frac{c_I(\nu)}{c_P(\nu)}\right)\right]\Bigg\}, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where we have gathered different constants in $\mathcal{D}$ and μ denotes the renormalization scale. Since

$$c_I(\nu) = (Q^2)^{\frac{1}{2}+i\nu}\,\frac{\Omega_I(\nu)}{\nu+\nu^3}\,\mathrm{sech}(\pi\nu)\tanh\left(\pi\nu\right), \tag{19}$$

$$c_P(\nu) = \Gamma\left(\delta - \frac{1}{2} - i\nu\right)(Q_0^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}-i\nu}, \tag{20}$$

we can write

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_I(x,Q^2) &= \mathcal{D}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\nu\, x^{-\chi\left(\frac{1}{2}+i\nu\right)} c_I(\nu) c_P(\nu) \Bigg\{ 1 \\
&\quad +\bar{\alpha}_s^2 \log\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)\frac{\beta_0}{8N_c}\chi_0\left(\frac{1}{2}+i\nu\right)\Bigg[-\log\left(\frac{Q^2Q_0^2}{\mu^4}\right)-\psi\left(\delta-\frac{1}{2}-i\nu\right) \\
&\quad +i\Bigg(\pi\coth(\pi\nu)-2\pi\tanh(\pi\nu)-M_I(\nu)\Bigg)\Bigg]\Bigg\}, \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
M_2(\nu) = \frac{11+21\nu^2+12\nu^4}{\nu(1+\nu^2)(11+12\nu^2)}, \quad M_L(\nu) = \frac{1-\nu^2+4\nu^4}{\nu(1+5\nu^2+4\nu^4)}. \qquad (22)
$$

In this Letter we take a conservative approach and among all the possible ways to treat the running of the coupling we consider the simplest: to only exponentiate the logarithmic term in Eq. (21) carrying the dependence on the external scales (this is explained in Sec. 2). The scale dependence appears as a consequence of the symmetric action of the differential operator $\partial/\partial\gamma$ present in the BFKL kernel on both impact factors.

Although we have included all the ingredients needed to calculate F_L, we leave a comparison to experimental data for this observable to future work and focus in the following on F_2.

2 Running coupling & optimal renormalization

Although there is some freedom in the treatment of the running of the coupling, it is natural to remove the μ dependent logarithm in the second line of Eq. (21) making the replacement

$$
\bar{\alpha}_s - \bar{\alpha}_s^2\frac{\beta_0}{8N_c}\log\left(\frac{Q^2Q_0^2}{\mu^4}\right) \longrightarrow \bar{\alpha}_s\left(QQ_0\right), \qquad (23)
$$

and use this resummed coupling throughout our calculations. We are interested in the comparison of our approach with DIS data in the small x region. We focus on the description of the Q^2 dependence of the well-known effective intercept $\lambda(Q^2)$, which can be obtained from experimental DIS data in the region $x < 10^{-2}$ through a parametrization of the structure function of the form $F_2(x,Q^2) = c(Q^2)x^{-\lambda(Q^2)}$. The intercept $\lambda(Q^2)$ is $\mathcal{O}(0.3)$ at large values of Q^2 and $\mathcal{O}(0.1)$ at low values, closer to the confinement region. This can be qualitatively interpreted as a smooth transition from hard to soft Pomeron exchange. When trying to describe these data with our approach we have found that it is rather difficult to get good agreement over the full range of $1\,\mathrm{GeV}^2 < Q^2 < 300\,\mathrm{GeV}^2$. Somehow it is needed to introduce some new ideas related to the infrared region. A recent very interesting possibility is that proposed by Kowalski, Lipatov, Ross and Watt in Ref. [7]. Alternatively, we have found that moving from the $\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$ scheme to renormalization schemes inspired by the existence of a possible infrared fixed point significantly helps in generating a natural fit for $\lambda(Q^2)$, in the sense of having sensible values for the two free parameters in our calculation which affect this observable: δ and Q_0 in the proton impact factor. Here we are guided by having a proton impact factor which should be dominated by the infrared region.

The first evaluation of the BFKL Pomeron intercept in non-Abelian physical renormalization schemes using the Brodsky-Lepage-Mackenzie (BLM) optimal scale setting [8] was performed in Ref. [9] in the context of virtual photon-photon scattering. We will use the same procedure in our calculation. The pieces of the BFKL kernel at NLO proportional to β_0 are isolated and absorbed in a new definition of the running coupling in such a way that all vacuum polarization effects from the β_0 function are resummed, *i.e.*,

$$\tilde{\alpha}_s\left(QQ_0,\gamma\right) \;=\; \frac{4N_c}{\beta_0\left[\log\left(\frac{QQ_0}{\Lambda^2}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\chi_0(\gamma)-\frac{5}{3}+2\left(1+\frac{2}{3}Y\right)\right]}, \tag{24}$$

where we are using the momentum space (MOM) physical renormalization scheme based on a symmetric triple gluon vertex [10] with $Y \simeq 2.343907$ and gauge parameter $\xi = 3$ (our results are very weakly dependent on this choice). This scheme is more suited to the BFKL context since there are large non-Abelian contributions to the kernel. Let us clarify that the BLM procedure is scheme-independent and the dependence of our results on different schemes is very small. The main reason to introduce the BLM procedure in our context is to eliminate the divergent renormalon series of the form $\alpha_s^n \beta_0^n n!$, which has a big effect in the small Q^2 region (see Ref. [11] for a modern review on the subject). The replacements we need in our kernel in order to introduce this new scheme are $\bar{\alpha}_s\left(QQ_0\right) \to \tilde{\alpha}_s\left(QQ_0\right)$ in Eq.(23) and $\chi_1(\gamma) \to \tilde{\chi}_1(\gamma)$ in Eq. (12) together with the corresponding adjustments for the coefficients $a, b \to \tilde{a}, \tilde{b}$

which enter Eq. (11). They read

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\chi}_1(\gamma) &= \tilde{\mathcal{S}}\chi_0(\gamma) + \frac{3}{2}\zeta(3) + \frac{\Psi''(\gamma)+\Psi''(1-\gamma)-\phi(\gamma)-\phi(1-\gamma)}{4} \\
&- \frac{\pi^2\cos(\pi\gamma)}{4\sin^2(\pi\gamma)(1-2\gamma)}\left[3+\left(1+\frac{n_f}{N_c^3}\right)\frac{2+3\gamma(1-\gamma)}{(3-2\gamma)(1+2\gamma)}\right] \\
&+ \frac{1}{8}\left[\frac{3}{2}(Y-1)\xi + \left(1-\frac{Y}{3}\right)\xi^2 + \frac{17Y}{2} - \frac{\xi^3}{6}\right]\chi_0(\gamma), \qquad (25)\\
\tilde{a} &= -\frac{13}{36}\frac{n_f}{N_c^3} - \frac{55}{36} + \frac{3Y-3}{16}\xi + \frac{3-Y}{24}\xi^2 - \frac{1}{48}\xi^3 + \frac{17}{16}Y \qquad (26)\\
\tilde{b} &= -\frac{n_f}{6N_c^3} - \frac{11}{12}, \qquad (27)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = (4-\pi^2)/12$.

In order to access regions with $Q^2 \simeq 1\,\mathrm{GeV}^2$, we use a simple parametrization of the running coupling introduced by Webber in Ref. [12]:

$$
\alpha_s\left(\mu^2\right) = \frac{4\pi}{\beta_0 \ln\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}} + f\left(\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}\right), \quad f\left(\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}\right) = \frac{4\pi}{\beta_0}\frac{125\left(1+4\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}\right)}{\left(1-\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}\right)\left(4+\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda^2}\right)^4}. \qquad (28)
$$

At low scales it is consistent with global data of power corrections to perturbative observables. It is shown in Fig. 1.



Figure 1: Left: model for the running coupling with freezing in the infrared (solid line) and leading order running coupling with Landau pole (dashed line) for $n_f = 3$ and $\Lambda = 0.25$ GeV. Right: proton impact factor in momentum space with $\mathcal{C} = 1/\Gamma(1+\delta)$ and δ, Q_0 with the values used for the comparison to DIS data.

The final expression used in the numerical analysis is then given by

$$
\hat{\alpha}_s\left(QQ_0,\gamma\right) = \tilde{\alpha}_s\left(QQ_0,\gamma\right) + \frac{N_c}{\pi} f\left(\frac{QQ_0}{\Lambda^2}\right), \qquad (29)
$$

which replaces Eq. (24) in all expressions. In a future publication we will compare the scheme here presented to other physical renormalization schemes. For simplicity we have not introduced a complete treatment of quark thresholds in the results of this Letter, but we have checked that they have a very small effect.

3 Comparison to DIS data & scope

To obtain our theoretical results we have calculated the logarithmic derivative $\frac{d \log F_2}{d \log(1/x)}$ using Eq. (21) with the modifications described in Section 2. For the comparison with DIS data we chose the values $Q_0 = 0.28\,\mathrm{GeV}$ and $\delta = 8.4$ while the dependence on the overall normalization factor $\mathcal{C}$ cancels for our observable. The QCD running coupling constant is evaluated for $n_f = 4$ and $\Lambda = 0.21\,\mathrm{GeV}$, corresponding to a $\overline{\mathrm{MS}}$ coupling of $\alpha_s^{\overline{\mathrm{MS}}}(M_Z^2) = 0.12$. The result is shown in Fig. 2. The experimental input has been derived from the combined analysis performed by H1 and ZEUS in Ref. [13] with $x < 10^{-2}$. In the results indicated with “Real cuts” we have calculated the effective intercept for F_2 at a fixed Q^2, averaging its values in a sample of x space consistent with the actual experimental cuts in x. To generate the continuous line with label “Smooth cuts” we have used as boundaries in x space those shown in Fig. 3, which correspond to an interpolation of the real experimental boundaries. Note that the difference between both approaches is very small.

We would like to stress the accurate description of the combined HERA data in our approach, in particular at very low values of Q^2. It is noteworthy that the values of Q_0 and δ indicate that our proton impact factor (see the plot at the right in Fig. 1) safely lies within the non-perturbative region since it has its maximum at $\sim 0.81\,\mathrm{GeV}$. In the present Letter our intention is to emphasize that, in order to reach the low Q^2 region with a collinearly improved BFKL equation we needed to call for optimal renormalization and use some model with a frozen coupling in the infrared.

It is possible to improve the quality of our fit by introducing subleading contributions such as threshold effects in the running of the coupling, heavy quark masses and higher order corrections to the photon impact factor which became recently available [14]. We leave these, together with a comparison to data not averaged over x, for a more extensive study, which will include an investigation of F_L, to be presented elsewhere.



Figure 2: Comparison of our prediction with experimental data.



Figure 3: Smooth cuts in x used for the effective intercept of F_2.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge partial support from the European Comission under contract LHCPhenoNet (PITN-GA-2010-264564), the Comunidad de Madrid through Proyecto HEPHACOS ESP-1473, and MICINN (FPA2010-17747). M.H. also acknowledges support from the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), the U.S. Department of Energy under contract number DE-AC02-98CH10886 and a BNL "Laboratory Directed Research and Development" grant (LDRD 12-034).

References

[1] M. Dittmar *et al.*, hep-ph/0511119, S. Alekhin *et al.*, hep-ph/0601012. S. Alekhin *et al.*, hep-ph/0601013, Z. J. Ajaltouni *et al.*, arXiv:0903.3861 [hep-ph].

[2] V. S. Fadin, L. N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. B **429** (1998) 127, M. Ciafaloni, G. Camici, Phys. Lett. B **430** (1998) 349.

[3] L. N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **23** (1976) 338, E. A. Kuraev, L. N. Lipatov, V. S. Fadin, Phys. Lett. B **60** (1975) 50, Sov. Phys. JETP **44** (1976) 443, Sov. Phys. JETP **45** (1977) 199. I. I. Balitsky, L. N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **28** (1978) 822.

[4] G. P. Salam, JHEP **9807** (1998) 019 [hep-ph/9806482].

[5] A. Sabio Vera, Nucl. Phys. B **722** (2005) 65 [hep-ph/0505128].

[6] A. Sabio Vera, F. Schwennsen, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 014001 [arXiv:0708.0549 [hep-ph]], Nucl. Phys. B **776** (2007) 170 [hep-ph/0702158 [HEP-PH]], A. Sabio Vera, Nucl. Phys. B **746** (2006) 1 [hep-ph/0602250], F. Caporale, A. Papa, A. Sabio Vera, Eur. Phys. J. C **53** (2008) 525 [arXiv:0707.4100 [hep-ph]].

[7] H. Kowalski, L. N. Lipatov, D. A. Ross and G. Watt, Eur. Phys. J. C **70** (2010) 983 [arXiv:1005.0355 [hep-ph]], H. Kowalski, L. N. Lipatov and D. A. Ross, arXiv:1109.0432 [hep-ph], arXiv:1205.6713 [hep-ph].

[8] S. J. Brodsky, G. P. Lepage and P. B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D **28** (1983) 228.

[9] S. J. Brodsky, V. S. Fadin, V. T. Kim, L. N. Lipatov and G. B. Pivovarov, JETP Lett. **70** (1999) 155 [hep-ph/9901229], JETP Lett. **76** (2002) 249 [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **76** (2002) 306] [hep-ph/0207297].

[10] W. Celmaster and R. J. Gonsalves, Phys. Rev. D **20** (1979) 1420, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42** (1979) 1435, P. Pascual and R. Tarrach, Nucl. Phys. B **174** (1980) 123 [Erratum-ibid. B **181** (1981) 546].

[11] S. J. Brodsky and L. Di Giustino, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 085026 [arXiv:1107.0338 [hep-ph]].

[12] B. R. Webber, JHEP **9810** (1998) 012. [hep-ph/9805484].

[13] F. D. Aaron *et al.* [H1 and ZEUS Collaboration], JHEP **1001** (2010) 109 [arXiv:0911.0884 [hep-ex]].

[14] I. Balitsky and G. A. Chirilli, arXiv:1207.3844 [hep-ph].