

Predictions of ultrahigh-energy proton-air production cross sections from accelerator data

M. M. Block

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208, USA

(Received 21 May 2007; published 14 December 2007)

We make new predictions of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, the proton-air inelastic production cross section, at pp center-of-mass energies $0.1 \lesssim \sqrt{s} \lesssim 100$ TeV, using high-energy predictions from a saturated Froissart bound parametrization of accelerator data on forward $\bar{p}p$ and pp scattering amplitudes, together with Glauber theory. The parametrization of the $\bar{p}p$ and pp cross sections incorporates analyticity constraints and unitarity, allowing accurate extrapolations to ultrahigh energies. Our predictions are in excellent agreement with available cosmic-ray extensive air shower measurements, both in magnitude and in energy dependence.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.76.111503

PACS numbers: 13.85.Tp, 12.38.Qk, 13.85.Hd, 96.50.sd

Introduction. There are now available published [1–4] and preliminary [5,6] p -air inelastic production cross sections ($\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$) that span the enormous pp cms (center-of-mass system) energy range $0.1 \lesssim \sqrt{s} \lesssim 100$ TeV, reaching energies well above the Large Hadron Collider (LHC). Further, we expect high statistics results from the Pierre Auger Collaboration [7] in the near future in this ultrahigh-energy region. Most important, we now have available very accurate predictions at cosmic-ray energies for the total pp cross section, σ_{pp} , from fits [8] to accelerator data that used adaptive data sifting algorithms [9] and analyticity constraints [10] that were not available in the earlier work of Block, Halzen, and Stanev [11]. The purpose of this Letter is to take advantage of these new pp cross section predictions in order to make *accurate* predictions of the cosmic-ray p -air total cross sections, to be compared with past and future experiments.

Extracting proton-proton cross sections from published cosmic-ray observations of extensive air showers, and vice versa, is far from straightforward [12]. By a variety of experimental techniques, cosmic-ray experiments map the atmospheric depth at which extensive air showers develop and measure the distribution of X_{max} , the shower maximum, which is sensitive to the inelastic p -air cross section $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$. From the measured X_{max} distribution, the experimenters deduce $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$. We will compare published [1–3] and recently announced preliminary values of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ with predictions made from σ_{pp} , using a Glauber model to obtain $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ from σ_{pp} .

$\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ from the X_{max} distribution: *Method I.* The measured shower attenuation length (Λ_m) is not only sensitive to the interaction length of the protons in the atmosphere ($\lambda_{p\text{-air}}$) [13], with

$$\Lambda_m = k\lambda_{p\text{-air}} = k \frac{14.4m_p}{\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}} = k \frac{24\,100}{\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}}, \quad (1)$$

(with Λ_m and $\lambda_{p\text{-air}}$ in g cm^{−2}, the proton mass m in g, and the inelastic production cross section $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ in mb), but

also depends on the rate at which the energy of the primary proton is dissipated into electromagnetic shower energy observed in the experiment. The latter effect is parametrized in Eq. (1) by the parameter k . The value of k depends critically on the inclusive particle production cross section and its energy dependence in nucleon and meson interactions on the light nuclear target of the atmosphere (see Ref. [12]). We emphasize that the goal of the cosmic-ray experiments is $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ (or correspondingly, $\lambda_{p\text{-air}}$), whereas in Method I, the *measured* quantity is Λ_m . Thus, a significant drawback of Method I is that one needs a model of proton-air interactions to complete the loop between the measured attenuation length Λ_m and the cross section $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, i.e., one needs the value of k in Eq. (1) to compute $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$. Shown in Table I are the widely varying values of k used in the different experiments. Clearly the large range of k -values, from 1.15 for EASTOP [5] to 1.6 for Fly’s Eye [1] differ significantly, thus making the *published* values of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ unreliable. It is interesting to note the monotonic decrease over time in the k ’s used in the different experiments, from 1.6 used in Fly’s Eye in 1984 to the 1.15 value used in EASTOP in 2007, showing the time evolution of

TABLE I. A table of k -values, used in experiments and from Monte Carlo model simulation.

Experiment	k
Fly’s Eye	1.6
AGASA	1.5
Yakutsk	1.4
EASTOP	1.15
Monte Carlo Results: C.L. Pryke	
Model	k
CORSIKA-SIBYLL	1.15 ± 0.05
MOCCA-SIBYLL	1.16 ± 0.03
CORSIKA-QGSjet	1.30 ± 0.04
MOCCA-Internal	1.32 ± 0.03

M. M. BLOCK

Monte Carlo models of energy dissipation in showers. For comparison, Monte Carlo simulations made by Pryke [14] in 2001 of several more modern shower models are also shown in Table I. We see that even among modern shower models, the spread is still significant. One of our goals is to minimize the impact of model dependence on the determination of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$.

$\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ from the X_{max} distribution: *Method II.* The HiRes group [4] has developed a quasi-model-free method of measuring $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ directly. They fold into their shower development program a randomly generated exponential distribution of shower first interaction points, and then fit the entire distribution, and not just the trailing edge, as is done in the experiments of Refs. [1–3,5]. They obtain $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}} = 460 \pm 14(\text{stat}) + 39(\text{syst}) - 11(\text{syst})$ mb at $\sqrt{s} = 77$ TeV, a result which they claim is effectively model-independent and hence is an absolute determination [4].

Extraction of σ_{pp} from $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$. The total pp cross section is extracted from $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ in two distinct steps. First, one calculates the p -air total cross section, $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}$, from the measured inelastic production cross section using

$$\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}} = \sigma_{p\text{-air}} - \sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{el}} - \sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{q\text{-el}}. \quad (2)$$

Next, the Glauber method [15] is used to transform the measured value of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ into a proton-proton total cross section σ_{pp} ; all the necessary steps are calculable in the theory. In Eq. (2) the measured cross section for particle production is supplemented with $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{el}}$ and $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{q\text{-el}}$, the elastic and quasielastic cross section, respectively, as calculated by the Glauber theory, to obtain the total cross section $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}$. The subsequent relation between $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ and σ_{pp} critically involves the nuclear slope parameter B , the logarithmic slope of forward elastic pp scattering, $d\sigma_{pp}^{\text{el}}/dt$, i.e., $B \equiv [\frac{d}{dt}(\ln \frac{d\sigma_{pp}^{\text{el}}}{dt})]_{t=0}$. A plot of B against σ_{pp} , 5 curves of different values of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, is shown in Fig. 1, taking into account inelastic screening [16]. The reduction procedure from $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ to σ_{pp} is summarized in Ref. [12]. The solid curve in Fig. 1 is a plot of B vs σ_{pp} , which we will discuss in detail later.

Determination of $\sigma_{pp}(s)$. Block and Halzen [17] have made an analytic amplitude fit that saturates the Froissart bound [18], to both the available high-energy total cross section and ρ -value data, where ρ is defined as the ratio of the real to the imaginary portion of the forward scattering amplitude, for both $\bar{p}p$ and pp interactions. For their high-energy expressions they used the analytic amplitude form

PHYSICAL REVIEW D 76, 111503(R) (2007)




FIG. 1 (color online). B dependence on the pp total cross section σ_{pp} . The five curves are lines of constant $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, of 414, 435, 456, 499, and 542 mb—the central value is the published Fly's Eye value, and the others are $\pm 1\sigma$ and $\pm 2\sigma$. The solid curve is a plot of a QCD-inspired fit of B against σ_{pp} , obtained from a $\ln^s$ fit—see text for details. The large dot is the prediction for $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ at $\sqrt{s} = 77$ TeV, the HiRes energy.

$$\sigma^\pm(\nu) = c_0 + c_1 \ln\left(\frac{\nu}{m}\right) + c_2 \ln^2\left(\frac{\nu}{m}\right) + \beta \mathcal{P}'\left(\frac{\nu}{m}\right)^{\mu-1} \pm \delta \left(\frac{\nu}{m}\right)^{\alpha-1}, \quad (3)$$

$$\rho^\pm(\nu) = \frac{1}{\sigma^\pm(\nu)} \left\{ \frac{\pi}{2} c_1 + c_2 \pi \ln\left(\frac{\nu}{m}\right) - \beta \mathcal{P}' \cot\left(\frac{\pi\mu}{2}\right) \times \left(\frac{\nu}{m}\right)^{\mu-1} + \frac{4\pi}{\nu} f_+(0) \pm \delta \tan\left(\frac{\pi\alpha}{2}\right) \left(\frac{\nu}{m}\right)^{\alpha-1} \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where the upper sign is for pp and the lower sign is for $\bar{p}p$ scattering, with $\mu = 0.5$, ν is the laboratory energy, $f_+(0)$ is a dispersion relation subtraction constant, and m the proton mass. The 7 real constants $c_0, c_1, c_2, \beta \mathcal{P}', \delta, \alpha$ and $f_+(0)$ are parameters of the fit. Since at high energies, s , the square of the cms energy, is given by $2m\nu$, we see that their cross section approaches $\ln^2 s$ at high energies, thus saturating the Froissart bound [18].

Using all of the cross sections, σ_{pp} and $\sigma_{\bar{p}p}$, along with all of the ρ -values, $\rho_{\bar{p}p}$ and ρ_{pp} , in the Particle Data Group [19] archive that were in the laboratory energy interval $18.3 \leq \nu \leq 1.73 \times 10^6$ GeV, i.e., $6 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 1800$ GeV, Block and Halzen [17] formed a sieved data set using the sieve algorithm of Ref. [9] to eliminate outliers, which markedly improved their fit [17]. Using 4 analyticity constraints [10], i.e., by fixing both the cross sections $\sigma_{\bar{p}p}$ and σ_{pp} and their laboratory energy derivatives, at $\sqrt{s} = 4$ GeV, they reduced the number of parameters to be fit from 7 to 4 and obtained an excellent fit, which, in turn,

constrained pp cross sections at cosmic-ray energies to have a relative accuracy $\sim 1 - 2\%$. Their fits to σ and ρ are shown in Fig. 2(a) and 2(b), respectively.

Determination of $B(s)$. A QCD-inspired parametrization [20] of forward $\bar{p}p$ and pp scattering amplitudes which is analytic, unitary, and fits all data of σ_{tot} , B , and ρ for both $\bar{p}p$ and pp interactions has been made, using 2 analyticity constraints which fix $\sigma_{\bar{p}p}$ and σ_{pp} at $\sqrt{s} = 4$ GeV; see Fig. 2(c) for $B(s)$.

The solid curve in Fig. 1 is a plot of B vs σ_{pp} , with B taken from the QCD-inspired fit of Ref. [20] and σ_{pp} taken from the Froissart bound fit of Ref. [17]. The large dot corresponds to the value of σ_{pp} and B at $\sqrt{s} = 77$ TeV, the HiRes energy, thus fixing the predicted value of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ at the HiRes energy.

Obtaining σ_{pp} from $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$. In Fig. 3, we have plotted the values of σ_{pp} vs $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ that are deduced from the intersections of the B - σ_{pp} curve with the $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ curves

in Fig. 1. Figure 3 furnishes cosmic-ray experimenters with an easy method to convert their measured $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ to σ_{pp} , and vice versa. The percentage error in $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ is $\approx 0.4\%$ near $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}} = 450$ mb, due to the error in σ_{pp} from model parameter uncertainties.

Determining the k value. It is important at this point to recall Eq. (1), $\Lambda_m = k\lambda_{p\text{-air}}$, thus reminding us of the fact that in Method I, the extraction of $\lambda_{p\text{-air}}$ (or $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$) from the measurement of Λ_m requires knowing the parameter k . The measured depth X_{max} at which a shower reaches maximum development in the atmosphere, which is the basis of the cross section measurement in Ref. [1], is a combined measure of the depth of the first interaction, which is determined by the inelastic cross section, and of the subsequent shower development, which has to be corrected for. The model dependent rate of shower development and its fluctuations are the origin of the deviation of k from unity in Eq. (1). As seen in Table I, its values range




FIG. 2 (color online). The saturated Froissart bound fit [17] of total cross section σ_{pp} , ρ vs $\sqrt{s}$, in GeV, for pp (squares) and $\bar{p}p$ (circles) accelerator data: (a) σ_{pp} , in mb; (b) ρ ; (c) the nuclear slope B , in GeV^{-2} vs $\sqrt{s}$, in GeV, from a QCD-inspired fit [20].




FIG. 3 (color online). A plot of the predicted total pp cross section σ_{pp} , in mb vs the predicted production p -air cross section, $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, in mb.

from 1.6 for a very old model where the inclusive cross section exhibited Feynman scaling to 1.15 for modern models with large scaling violations.

Adopting the same strategy that earlier had been used by Block, Halzen, and Stanev [11], we decided to match the data to our prediction of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}(s)$ in order to extract a *common* value for k . This neglects the possibility of a weak energy dependence of k over the range measured, found to be very small in the simulations of Ref. [14]. By combining the results of Figs. 2(a) and 3, we obtain our prediction of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ vs $\sqrt{s}$, which is shown in Fig. 4. To determine k , we leave it as a free parameter and make a χ^2 fit to *rescaled* $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}(s)$ values of Fly's Eye [1], AGASA [2], EASTOP [5], and Yakutsk [3], which are the experiments that need a common k -value.

Figure 4 is a plot of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ vs $\sqrt{s}$, the cms energy in GeV, for the two different types of experimental extraction, using Methods I and II described earlier. Plotted as *published* is the HiRes value at $\sqrt{s} = 77$ TeV, since it is an absolute measurement. We have rescaled in Fig. 4 the published values of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ for Fly's Eye [1], AGASA [2], Yakutsk [3], and EASTOP [5], against our prediction of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, using the *common* value of $k = 1.264 \pm 0.033 \pm 0.013$ obtained from a χ^2 fit, and it is the rescaled values that are plotted in Fig. 4, along with the rescaled values of ARGO-YBJ [6], which were not used in the fit. The error in k of 0.033 is the statistical error of the χ^2 fit, whereas the error of 0.013 is the systematic error due to the error in the prediction of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$. Clearly, we have an excellent fit, with complete agreement for all experimental points. Our analysis gave $\chi^2 = 3.19$ for 11 degrees of freedom (the low χ^2 is likely due to overestimates of experimental errors). We note that our k -value, $k = 1.264 \pm 0.033 \pm 0.013$,




FIG. 4 (color online). An χ^2 fit of the *renormalized* AGASA [2], EASTOP [5], Fly's Eye [1], and Yakutsk [3] data for $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, in mb, as a function of the energy, $\sqrt{s}$, in GeV. The result of the fit for the parameter k in Eq. (1) is $k = 1.263 \pm 0.033$. The HiRes point [4] (solid diamond), at $\sqrt{s} = 77$ GeV, is model-independent and has *not* been renormalized. The renormalized ARGO-YBJ [6] data were not used in the fit.

although somewhat too small for the very low energy ARGO-YBJ data, is about halfway between the values of CORSIKA-SIBYLL and CORSIKA-QSGSjet found in the Pryke simulations [14], as seen in Table I for model predictions.

We next compare our measured k parameter with a very recent direct measurement of k by the HiRes group [21]. They measured the exponential slope of the tail of their X_m distribution, Λ_m , and compared it to the p -air interaction length $\lambda_{p\text{-air}}$ that they found. Using Eq. (1), they found a preliminary value, $k = 1.21 + 0.14 - 0.09$, in agreement with our value.

Taken together with the goodness-of-fit of our fitted k value and the fact that our value, $k = 1.264 \pm 0.033 \pm 0.013$, is compatible with the range of k values from theoretical models shown in Table I, the preliminary HiRes value [21] of $k = 1.21 + 0.14 - 0.09$ is additional experimental confirmation of our overall method for determining k , i.e., our assumptions that the k value is essentially energy-independent, as well as being independent of the very different experimental techniques for measuring air showers.

Conclusions. Our measured k value, $k = 1.264 \pm 0.033 \pm 0.013$, agrees very well with the preliminary k -value measured by the HiRes group, at the several percent level; in turn, they both agree with Monte Carlo model simulations at the 5–10 percent level.

It should be noted that the preliminary EASTOP measurement [5]—at the cms energy $\sqrt{s} = 2$ TeV—is at an energy essentially identical to the top energy of the Tevatron collider, where there is an *experimental* determination of $\sigma_{\bar{p}p}$ [22], and consequently, no necessity for an

extrapolation of collider cross sections. Since their value of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ is in excellent agreement with the predicted value of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, this anchors our fit at its low-energy end. Correspondingly, at the high end of the cosmic-ray spectrum, the absolute value of the HiRes experimental value of $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ at 77 TeV—which requires *no knowledge* of the k parameter—is also in good agreement with our prediction, anchoring the fit at the high end. Thus, our $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$ predictions, which span the enormous energy range, $0.1 \lesssim \sqrt{s} \lesssim$

100 TeV, are consistent with cosmic-ray data, for both magnitude and energy dependence.

In the future, we look forward to the possibility of confirming our predictions with the high statistics of the Pierre Auger Collaboration [7], as well as confirming the prediction of 107.3 ± 1.2 mb for the total pp cross section [17] at the LHC energy of 14 TeV.

M.M.B. would like to thank the Aspen Center for Physics for its hospitality during the writing of this manuscript.

-
- [1] R.M. Baltrusaitis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 1380 (1984).
 - [2] M. Honda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 525 (1993).
 - [3] S.P. Knurenko *et al.*, Proceedings of the 27th ICRC (Salt Lake City), Vol. 1 (2001), p. 372.
 - [4] K. Belov (Hires Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. **151**, 197 (2006).
 - [5] M. Aglietta *et al.*, Proceedings of the 25th ICRC (Durban), Vol. 6 (1997), p. 37; G. Trinchero (EASTOP Collaboration), 12th International Conference on Elastic and Diffractive Scattering—Forward Physics and QCD, Desy, Hamburg (2007); , Aspen Workshop on Cosmic Ray Physics (2007), <http://cosmic-ray.physics.rutgers.edu/files>; Phys. Lett. B (to be published).
 - [6] A. Surdo (ARGO-YBJ Collaboration), Proceedings, European Cosmic Ray Symposium (2006); <http://www.lip.pt/events/2006/ecrs/proc/ecrs06-s4-31.pdf>.
 - [7] The Pierre Auger Project Design Report, Fermilab Report No. FERMILAB-PUB-96-024, 1997; Paul Mantsch (Pierre Auger Collaboration), arXiv:astro-ph/0604114v1.
 - [8] M.M. Block and F. Halzen, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 036006 (2005).
 - [9] M.M. Block, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **556**, 308 (2006).
 - [10] M.M. Block, Eur. Phys. J. C **47**, 697 (2006).
 - [11] M.M. Block, F. Halzen, and T. Stanev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4926 (1999); Phys. Rev. D **62**, 077501 (2000).
 - [12] R. Engel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 014019 (1998).
 - [13] We will define “standard atmosphere” as the numerical relation given by Eq. (1), in order to have the density of nucleons needed to find the pp cross section from a nuclear model of “air.” It would be useful for the experimenter to reduce his/her measurement to “standard atmosphere” so that it can be compared with other experiments, as well as with theory.
 - [14] C.L. Pryke, Astropart. Phys. **14**, 319 (2001).
 - [15] T.K. Gaisser *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 1350 (1987).
 - [16] R. Engel, Karlsruhe (private communication).
 - [17] M.M. Block and F. Halzen, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 036006 (2005).
 - [18] M. Froissart, Phys. Rev. **123**, 1053 (1961).
 - [19] K. Hagiwara and S. Eidelman *et al.* (Particle Data Group) Phys. Lett. B **592**, 1 (2004).
 - [20] M.M. Block, Phys. Rep. **436**, 71 (2006).
 - [21] K. Belov (HiRes Collaboration), Aspen Workshop on Cosmic Ray Physics (2007), <http://cosmic-ray.physics.rutgers.edu/files/Belov-sigmapair.ppt>.
 - [22] At $\sqrt{s} = 2$ TeV, the total cross sections $\sigma_{\bar{p}p}$ and σ_{pp} are expected to differ by ~ 0.01 mb, and thus, for the purpose of predicting $\sigma_{p\text{-air}}^{\text{prod}}$, are the same—see Ref. [20].