UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Comparison of energy flows in deep inelastic scattering events with and without a large rapidity gap

Derrick(et al.), M.; Botje, M.A.J.; Chlebana, F.S.; Engelen, J.J.; de Kamps, M.; Kooijman, P.M.; Kruse, A.; Tiecke, H.G.J.M.; Verkerke, W.; Vreeswijk, M.; Wiggers, L.W.; de Wolf, E.; van Woudenberg, R.

DOI

[10.1016/0370-2693\(94\)90804-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(94)90804-4)

Publication date

1994

Published in

Physics Letters B

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Derrick(et al.), M., Botje, M. A. J., Chlebana, F. S., Engelen, J. J., de Kamps, M., Kooijman, P. M., Kruse, A., Tiecke, H. G. J. M., Verkerke, W., Vreeswijk, M., Wiggers, L. W., de Wolf, E., & van Woudenberg, R. (1994). Comparison of energy flows in deep inelastic scattering events with and without a large rapidity gap. *Physics Letters B*, 338, 483-496.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693\(94\)90804-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-2693(94)90804-4)

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)

ELSEVIER

3 November 1994

PHYSICS LETTERS B

Physics Letters B 338 (1994) 483–496

Comparison of energy flows in deep inelastic scattering events with and without a large rapidity gap

ZEUS Collaboration

M. Derrick^a, D. Krakauer^a, S. Magill^a, B. Musgrave^a, J. Repond^a, J. Schlereth^a, R. Stanek^a, R.L. Talaga^a, J. Thron^a, F. Arzarello^b, R. Ayad^{b,1}, G. Bari^b, M. Basile^b, L. Bellagamba^b, D. Boscherini^b, A. Bruni^b, G. Bruni^b, P. Bruni^b, G. Cara Romeo^b, G. Castellini^{b,2}, M. Chiarini^b, L. Cifarelli^{b,3}, F. Cindolo^b, F. Ciralli^b, A. Contin^b, S. D'Auria^b, C. Del Papa^b, F. Frasconi^b, P. Giusti^b, G. Iacobucci^b, G. Laurenti^b, G. Levi^b, G. Maccarrone^b, A. Margotti^b, T. Massam^b, R. Nania^b, C. Nemoz^b, F. Palmonari^b, A. Polini^b, G. Sartorelli^b, R. Timellini^b, Y. Zamora Garcia^{b,1}, A. Zichichi^b, A. Bargende^c, J. Crittenden^c, K. Desch^c, B. Diekmann^c, T. Doeker^c, L. Feld^c, A. Frey^c, M. Geerts^c, G. Geitz^c, M. Grothe^c, H. Hartmann^c, D. Haun^c, K. Heinloth^c, E. Hilger^c, H.-P. Jakob^c, U.F. Katz^c, S.M. Mari^c, A. Mass^c, S. Mengel^c, J. Mollen^c, E. Paul^c, Ch. Rembser^c, R. Schattevoy^{c,4}, J.-L. Schneider^{c,4}, D. Schramm^c, J. Stamm^c, R. Wedemeyer^c, S. Campbell-Robson^d, A. Cassidy^d, N. Dyce^d, B. Foster^d, S. George^d, R. Gilmore^d, G.P. Heath^d, H.F. Heath^d, T.J. Llewellyn^d, C.J.S. Morgado^d, D.J.P. Norman^d, J.A. O'Mara^d, R.J. Tapper^d, S.S. Wilson^d, R. Yoshida^d, R.R. Rau^e, M. Arneodo^f, L. Iannotti^f, M. Schioppa^f, G. Susinno^f, A. Bernstein^g, A. Caldwell^g, I. Gialas^g, J.A. Parsons^g, S. Ritz^g, F. Sciulli^g, P.B. Straub^g, L. Wai^g, S. Yang^g, P. Borzemiński^h, J. Chwastowski^h, A. Eskreys^h, K. Piotrkowski^h, M. Zachara^h, L. Zawiejski^h, L. Adamczykⁱ, B. Bednarekⁱ, K. Eskreysⁱ, K. Jeleńⁱ, D. Kisiełowskaⁱ, T. Kowalskiⁱ, E. Rulikowska-Zarębskaⁱ, L. Suszyckiⁱ, J. Zającⁱ, T. Kędzierski^j, A. Kotański^j, M. Przybycień^j, L.A.T. Bauerdick^k, U. Behrens^k, J.K. Bienlein^k, S. Böttcher^k, C. Coldewey^k, G. Drews^k, M. Flasiński^{k,5}, D.J. Gilkinson^k, P. Göttlicher^k, B. Gutjahr^k, T. Haas^k, L. Hagge^k, W. Hain^k, D. Hasell^k, H. Heßling^k, H. Hultschig^k, Y. Iga^k, P. Joos^k, M. Kasemann^k, R. Klanner^k, W. Koch^k, L. Köpke^k, U. Kötz^k, H. Kowalski^k, W. Kröger^k, J. Krüger^{k,4}, J. Labs^k, A. Ladage^k, B. Löhr^k, M. Löwe^k, D. Lüke^k, J. Mainusch^k, O. Mańczak^k, J.S.T. Ng^k, S. Nickel^k, D. Notz^k, K. Ohrenberg^k, M. Roco^k, M. Rohde^k, J. Roldán^{k,6}, U. Schneekloth^k, J. Schroeder^k, W. Schulz^k, F. Selonke^k, E. Stiliaris^{k,6}, T. Voß^k, D. Westphal^k, G. Wolf^k, C. Youngman^k, H.J. Grabosch^l, A. Leich^l, A. Meyer^l, C. Rethfeldt^l, S. Schlenstedt^l, G. Barbagli^m, P. Pelfer^m, G. Anzivinoⁿ, S. De Pasqualeⁿ, S. Qianⁿ, L. Votanoⁿ, A. Bamberger^o, A. Freidhof^o, T. Poser^{o,7}, S. Söldner-Rembold^o,

G. Theisen^o, T. Trefzger^o, N.H. Brook^p, P.J. Bussey^p, A.T. Doyle^p, I. Fleck^p, J.R. Forbes^p, V.A. Jamieson^p, C. Raine^p, D.H. Saxon^p, M. Stavrianakou^p, A.S. Wilson^p, A. Dannemann^q, U. Holm^q, D. Horstmann^q, H. Kammerlocher^{q,7}, B. Krebs^{q,8}, T. Neumann^q, R. Sinkus^q, K. Wick^q, E. Badura^r, B.D. Burow^r, A. Fürtjes^{r,9}, E. Lohrmann^r, J. Milewski^r, M. Nakahata^{r,10}, N. Pavel^r, G. Poelz^r, W. Schott^r, J. Terron^{r,6}, F. Zetsche^r, T.C. Bacon^s, R. Beuselinck^s, I. Butterworth^s, E. Gallo^s, V.L. Harris^s, B.H. Hung^s, K.R. Long^s, D.B. Miller^s, P.P.O. Morawitz^s, A. Prinias^s, J.K. Sedgbeer^s, A.F. Whitfield^s, U. Mallik^t, E. McCliment^t, M.Z. Wang^t, Y. Zhang^t, P. Cloth^u, D. Filges^u, S.H. An^v, S.M. Hong^v, C.O. Kim^v, T.Y. Kim^v, S.W. Nam^v, S.K. Park^v, M.H. Suh^v, S.H. Yon^v, R. Imlay^w, S. Kartik^w, H.-J. Kim^w, R.R. McNeil^w, W. Metcalf^w, V.K. Nadendla^w, F. Barreiro^{x,11}, G. Cases^x, R. Graciani^x, J.M. Hernández^x, L. Hervás^{x,12}, L. Labarga^{x,12}, J. del Peso^x, J. Puga^x, J.F. de Trocóniz^{x,13}, F. Ikraiam^y, J.K. Mayer^{y,14}, G.R. Smith^y, F. Corriveau^z, D.S. Hanna^z, J. Hartmann^z, L.W. Hung^z, J.N. Lim^z, C.G. Matthews^z, J.W. Mitchell^{z,15}, P.M. Patel^z, L.E. Sinclair^z, D.G. Stairs^z, M. St-Laurent^z, R. Ullmann^z, V. Bashkirov^{aa}, B.A. Dolgoshein^{aa}, A. Stifutkin^{aa}, G.L. Bashindzhagyan^{ab}, P.F. Ermolov^{ab}, L.K. Gladilin^{ab}, Y.A. Golubkov^{ab}, V.D. Kobrin^{ab}, V.A. Kuzmin^{ab}, A.S. Proskuryakov^{ab}, A.A. Savin^{ab}, L.M. Shcheglova^{ab}, A.N. Solomin^{ab}, N.P. Zotov^{ab}, S. Bentvelsen^{ac}, M. Botje^{ac}, F. Chlebana^{ac}, A. Dake^{ac}, J. Engelen^{ac}, P. de Jong^{ac,16}, M. de Kamps^{ac}, P. Kooijman^{ac}, A. Kruse^{ac}, V. O'Dell^{ac,17}, A. Tenner^{ac}, H. Tiecke^{ac}, W. Verkerke^{ac}, M. Vreeswijk^{ac}, L. Wiggers^{ac}, E. de Wolf^{ac}, R. van Woudenberg^{ac}, D. Acosta^{ad}, B. Bylsma^{ad}, L.S. Durkin^{ad}, K. Honscheid^{ad}, C. Li^{ad}, T.Y. Ling^{ad}, K.W. McLean^{ad}, W.N. Murray^{ad}, I.H. Park^{ad}, T.A. Romanowski^{ad,18}, R. Seidlein^{ad}, D.S. Bailey^{ae}, G.A. Blair^{ae,19}, A. Byrne^{ae}, R.J. Cashmore^{ae}, A.M. Cooper-Sarkar^{ae}, D. Daniels^{ae,20}, R.C.E. Devenish^{ae}, N. Harnew^{ae}, M. Lancaster^{ae}, P.E. Luffman^{ae,21}, J. McFall^{ae}, C. Nath^{ae}, A. Quadt^{ae}, H. Uijterwaal^{ae}, R. Walczak^{ae}, F.F. Wilson^{ae}, T. Yip^{ae}, G. Abbiendi^{af}, A. Bertolin^{af}, R. Brugnera^{af}, R. Carlin^{af}, F. Dal Corso^{af}, M. De Giorgi^{af}, U. Dosselli^{af}, F. Gasparini^{af}, S. Limentani^{af}, M. Morandin^{af}, M. Posocco^{af}, L. Stanco^{af}, R. Stroili^{af}, C. Voci^{af}, J. Bulmahn^{ag}, J.M. Butterworth^{ag}, R.G. Feild^{ag}, B.Y. Oh^{ag}, J.J. Whitmore^{ag,22}, G. D'Agostini^{ah}, M. Iori^{ah}, G. Marini^{ah}, M. Mattioli^{ah}, A. Nigro^{ah}, J.C. Hart^{ai}, N.A. McCubbin^{ai}, K. Prytz^{ai}, T.P. Shah^{ai}, T.L. Short^{ai}, E. Barberis^{aj}, N. Cartiglia^{aj}, T. Dubbs^{aj}, C. Heusch^{aj}, M. Van Hook^{aj}, B. Hubbard^{aj}, W. Lockman^{aj}, H.F.-W. Sadrozinski^{aj}, A. Seiden^{aj}, J. Biltzinger^{ak}, R.J. Seifert^{ak}, A.H. Walenta^{ak}, G. Zech^{ak}, H. Abramowicz^{al}, S. Dagan^{al,23}, A. Levy^{al,23}, T. Hasegawa^{am}, M. Hazumi^{am}, T. Ishii^{am}, M. Kuze^{am}, S. Mine^{am}, Y. Nagasawa^{am}, T. Nagira^{am}, M. Nakao^{am}, I. Suzuki^{am}, K. Tokushuku^{am}, S. Yamada^{am}, Y. Yamazaki^{am}, M. Chiba^{an}, R. Hamatsu^{an}, T. Hirose^{an}, K. Homma^{an}, S. Kitamura^{an}, S. Nagayama^{an}, Y. Nakamitsu^{an}, R. Cirio^{ao}, M. Costa^{ao}, M.I. Ferrero^{ao}, L. Lamberti^{ao}, S. Maselli^{ao}, C. Peroni^{ao}, R. Sacchi^{ao}, A. Solano^{ao}, A. Staiano^{ao}, M. Dardo^{ap}, D.C. Bailey^{aq}, D. Bandyopadhyay^{aq}, F. Benard^{aq}, M. Brkic^{aq}, M.B. Crombie^{aq}, D.M. Gingrich^{aq,24}, G.F. Hartner^{aq}, K.K. Joo^{aq}, G.M. Levman^{aq}, J.F. Martin^{aq}, R.S. Orr^{aq}, C.R. Sampson^{aq}, R.J. Teuscher^{aq}, C.D. Catterall^{ar}, T.W. Jones^{ar}, P.B. Kaziewicz^{ar}, J.B. Lane^{ar}, R.S. Saunders^{ar},

J. Shulman^{ar}, K. Blankenship^{as}, J. Kochocki^{as}, B. Lu^{as}, L.W. Mo^{as}, W. Bogusz^{at},
 K. Charchuła^{at}, J. Ciborowski^{at}, J. Gajewski^{at}, G. Grzelak^{at}, M. Kasprzak^{at},
 M. Krzyżanowski^{at}, K. Muchorowski^{at}, R.J. Nowak^{at}, J.M. Pawlak^{at}, T. Tymieniecka^{at},
 A.K. Wróblewski^{at}, J.A. Zakrzewski^{at}, A.F. Żarnecki^{at}, M. Adamus^{au}, Y. Eisenberg^{av,23},
 C. Glasman^{av}, U. Karshon^{av,23}, D. Revel^{av,23}, A. Shapira^{av}, I. Ali^{aw}, B. Behrens^{aw}, S. Dasu^{aw},
 C. Fordham^{aw}, C. Foudas^{aw}, A. Goussiou^{aw}, R.J. Loveless^{aw}, D.D. Reeder^{aw}, S. Silverstein^{aw},
 W.H. Smith^{aw}, T. Tsurugai^{ay}, S. Bhadra^{az,25}, W.R. Frisken^{az}, K.M. Furutani^{az}

^a Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL, USA⁴¹

^b University and INFN Bologna, Bologna, Italy³¹

^c Physikalisches Institut der Universität Bonn, Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany²⁸

^d H.H. Wills Physics Laboratory, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK⁴⁰

^e Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, LI, USA⁴¹

^f Calabria University, Physics Dept. and INFN, Cosenza, Italy³¹

^g Columbia University, Nevis Labs., Irvington on Hudson, NY, USA⁴²

^h Inst. of Nuclear Physics, Cracow, Poland³⁵

ⁱ Faculty of Physics and Nuclear Techniques, Academy of Mining and Metallurgy, Cracow, Poland³⁵

^j Jagellonian Univ., Dept. of Physics, Cracow, Poland³⁶

^k Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany

^l DESY-Zeuthen, Inst. für Hochenergiephysik, Zeuthen, Federal Republic of Germany

^m University and INFN, Florence, Italy³¹

ⁿ INFN, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy³¹

^o Fakultät für Physik der Universität Freiburg i.Br., Freiburg i.Br., Federal Republic of Germany²⁸

^p Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK⁴⁰

^q Hamburg University, I. Institute of Exp. Physics, Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany²⁸

^r Hamburg University, II. Institute of Exp. Physics, Hamburg, Federal Republic of Germany²⁸

^s Imperial College London, High Energy Nuclear Physics Group, London, UK⁴⁰

^t University of Iowa, Physics and Astronomy Dept., Iowa City, USA⁴¹

^u Forschungszentrum Jülich, Institut für Kernphysik, Jülich, Federal Republic of Germany

^v Korea University, Seoul, South Korea³³

^w Louisiana State University, Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Baton Rouge, LA, USA⁴¹

^x Univer. Autónoma Madrid, Depto de Física Teórica, Madrid, Spain³⁹

^y University of Manitoba, Dept. of Physics, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada²⁶

^z McGill University, Dept. of Physics, Montreal, Quebec, Canada^{26,27}

^{aa} Moscow Engineering Physics Institute, Moscow, Russia³⁷

^{ab} Moscow State University, Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow, Russia³⁸

^{ac} NIKHEF and University of Amsterdam, Netherlands³⁴

^{ad} Ohio State University, Physics Department, Columbus, Ohio, USA⁴¹

^{ae} Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK⁴⁰

^{af} Dipartimento di Fisica dell' Università and INFN, Padova, Italy³¹

^{ag} Pennsylvania State University, Dept. of Physics, University Park, PA, USA⁴²

^{ah} Dipartimento di Fisica, Univ. 'La Sapienza' and INFN, Rome, Italy³¹

^{ai} Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Chilton, Didcot, Oxon, UK⁴⁰

^{aj} University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, USA⁴¹

^{ak} Fachbereich Physik der Universität-Gesamthochschule Siegen, Federal Republic of Germany²⁸

^{al} School of Physics, Tel-Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel³⁰

^{am} Institute for Nuclear Study, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan³²

^{an} Tokyo Metropolitan University, Dept. of Physics, Tokyo, Japan³²

^{ao} Università di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica Sperimentale and INFN, Torino, Italy³¹

^{ap} II Faculty of Sciences, Torino University and INFN - Alessandria, Italy³¹

^{aq} University of Toronto, Dept. of Physics, Toronto, Ont., Canada²⁶

^{ar} University College London, Physics and Astronomy Dept., London, UK⁴⁰

^{as} Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State University, Physics Dept., Blacksburg, VA, USA⁴²

^{at} Warsaw University, Institute of Experimental Physics, Warsaw, Poland³⁵

^{au} *Institute for Nuclear Studies, Warsaw, Poland*³⁵^{av} *Weizmann Institute, Nuclear Physics Dept., Rehovot, Israel*²⁹^{aw} *University of Wisconsin, Dept. of Physics, Madison, WI, USA*⁴¹^{ay} *Meiji Gakuin University, Department of Physics, Yokohama, Japan*^{az} *York University, Dept. of Physics, North York, Ont., Canada*²⁶

Received 15 July 1994

Editor: K. Winter

Abstract

Energy flows in deep inelastic electron-proton scattering are investigated at a centre-of-mass energy of 296 GeV for the range $Q^2 \geq 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ using the ZEUS detector. A comparison is made between events with and without a large rapidity gap between the hadronic system and the proton direction. The energy flows, corrected for detector acceptance and resolution, are shown for these two classes of events in both the HERA laboratory frame and the Breit frame. From the differences in the shapes of these energy flows we conclude that QCD radiation is suppressed in the large-rapidity-gap events compared to the events without a large rapidity gap.

1. Introduction

In a previous publication [1] we reported the observation of events with a large rapidity gap in deep inelastic ep scattering (DIS) at HERA. We concluded that these events are not described by standard QCD-inspired fragmentation models [2,3]. Furthermore we presented indications that the mechanism is diffrac-

¹ supported by Worldlab, Lausanne, Switzerland² also at IROE Florence, Italy³ now at Univ. of Pisa, Italy⁴ now a self-employed consultant⁵ on leave from Jagellonian University, Cracow⁶ supported by the European Community⁷ now at DESY⁸ now with Herfurth GmbH, Hamburg⁹ now at CERN¹⁰ now at Institute for Cosmic Ray Research, University of Tokyo¹¹ on leave of absence at DESY, supported by DGICYT¹² partially supported by Comunidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain¹³ supported by Fundación Banco Exterior¹⁴ now at Univ. of Toronto¹⁵ now at Univ. of California, Davis, CA¹⁶ now at MIT, Cambridge, MA¹⁷ now at Fermilab., Batavia, IL¹⁸ now at Department of Energy, Washington¹⁹ now at RHBNC, Univ. of London, England²⁰ Fulbright Scholar 1993–1994²¹ now at Cambridge Consultants, Cambridge, UK²² on leave and supported by DESY 1993–94²³ supported by a MINERVA Fellowship²⁴ now at Centre for Subatomic Research, Univ. of Alberta, Canada and TRIUMF, Vancouver, Canada²⁵ now at DESY²⁶ supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada²⁷ supported by the FCAR of Quebec, Canada²⁸ supported by the German Federal Ministry for Research and Technology (BMFT)²⁹ supported by the MINERVA Gesellschaft für Forschung GmbH, and by the Israel Academy of Science³⁰ supported by the Israel Ministry of Energy, and by the German

Israeli Foundation

³¹ supported by the Italian National Institute for Nuclear Physics (INFN)³² supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (the Monbusho) and its grants for Scientific Research³³ supported by the Korean Ministry of Education and Korea Science and Engineering Foundation³⁴ supported by the Netherlands Foundation for Research on Matter (FOM)³⁵ supported by the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research (grant No. 204209101)³⁶ supported by the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research (grant No. PB 861/2/91 and No. 2 2372 9102, grant No. PB 2 2376 9102 and No. PB 2 0092 9101)³⁷ partially supported by the German Federal Ministry for Research and Technology (BMFT)³⁸ supported by the German Federal Ministry for Research and Technology (BMFT), the Volkswagen Foundation, and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft³⁹ supported by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science through funds provided by CICYT⁴⁰ supported by the Particle Physics and Astronomy Research Council⁴¹ supported by the US Department of Energy⁴² supported by the US National Science Foundation

tive, leading twist and consistent with the exchange of a colourless object, generically called the pomeron. Recently we have also reported on the observation of jet production in these events [4].

Energy flow measurements naturally complement jet studies; in particular, they are sensitive to QCD radiation, i.e. soft partonic emissions in addition to the hard scattering. Energy flows do not depend on a particular jet classification scheme, they are infrared-safe and, according to the idea of local parton-hadron duality (LPHD) [5], they are determined by the partonic structure of the events. Experimentally in the ZEUS detector at HERA, energy flows have the advantage that they can be measured with little bias in a large fraction of the events. In a previous publication [6] we have used energy flow measurements to discriminate between different QCD-inspired models for DIS. In this paper we study the hadronic energy flow in large-rapidity-gap events, both in the laboratory and in the Breit frames of reference. We also compare with the corresponding energy flows in non-rapidity-gap events.

2. Experimental setup

2.1. HERA machine conditions

The experiment was performed at the electron-proton collider HERA using the ZEUS detector. During 1993 HERA operated with bunches of electrons of energy $E_e = 26.7$ GeV colliding with bunches of protons of energy $E_p = 820$ GeV, with a time between bunch crossings of 96 ns. HERA is designed to run with 210 bunches in each of the electron and proton rings. For the 1993 data taking 84 paired bunches were filled for each beam and in addition 10 electron and 6 proton bunches were left unpaired for background studies. The electron and proton beam currents were typically 10 mA.

2.2. The ZEUS detector and trigger conditions

ZEUS is a multipurpose magnetic detector whose configuration for the 1992 running period has been described elsewhere [7,8]. For the present analysis we used the following components of ZEUS:

Charged particles are tracked by the vertex detector (VXD) and the central tracking detector (CTD) which operate inside a thin superconducting solenoid providing an axial magnetic field of 1.43 T. The solenoid is surrounded by a high-resolution uranium-scintillator calorimeter divided into three parts, forward (FCAL) covering the pseudorapidity⁴³ region $4.3 \geq \eta \geq 1.1$, barrel (BCAL) covering the central region $1.1 \geq \eta \geq -0.75$ and rear (RCAL) covering the backward region $-0.75 \geq \eta \geq -3.8$. The solid angle coverage is 99.7% of 4π . The calorimeter parts are subdivided longitudinally into electromagnetic (EMC) and hadronic (HAC) sections. The sections are subdivided into cells, each of which is viewed by two photomultiplier tubes. The calorimeter is described in detail in [9–11]. The C5 beam monitor, a small lead-scintillator counter arrangement, located at $Z = -3.2$ m close to the beam-pipe, was used to detect upstream proton beam interactions and to measure the timing and longitudinal structure of the proton and electron bunches from the arrival time of stray particles accompanying the particle bunches in HERA. The vetowall detector, consisting of two layers of scintillator on either side of an 87 cm thick iron wall centered at $Z = -7.3$ m was also used to tag off-beam background particles. For measuring the luminosity as well as for tagging very small Q^2 processes, we used two lead-scintillator calorimeters located at 35 m and 107 m upstream from the interaction point. These components are described in some more detail in [4].

Data were collected with a three-level trigger [7]. The First Level Trigger (FLT) is built as a deadtime-free pipeline. The FLT for DIS events required a logical OR of three conditions on sums of energy in the EMC calorimeter cells: either the BCAL EMC energy exceeded 3.4 GeV; or the RCAL EMC energy, excluding the towers immediately adjacent to the beam-pipe, exceeded 2.0 GeV; or the RCAL EMC energy, including the beam-pipe towers, exceeded 3.75 GeV. For events with the scattered electron detected in the calorimeter, the FLT was essentially independent of the DIS hadronic final state. The FLT acceptance was greater than 97% for $Q^2 > 10$ GeV². The Second Level Trigger (SLT) used information from a subset

⁴³ The pseudorapidity η is defined as $-\ln(\tan \theta/2)$, where the polar angle θ is taken with respect to the proton beam direction from the nominal interaction point.

of detector components to differentiate physics events from backgrounds. The SLT rejected proton beam-gas events according to the event times measured in the rear calorimeter thereby reducing the FLT DIS triggers by an order of magnitude, but without loss of DIS events. The Third Level Trigger (TLT) had available the full event information on which to apply physics-based filters. The TLT applied stricter cuts on the event times and also rejected beam-halo muons and cosmic muons.

3. Kinematics of deep inelastic scattering

The kinematic variables used to describe deep inelastic scattering events, $e(k) + p(P) \rightarrow e(k') + \text{anything}$, are the following: the negative of the squared four-momentum transfer carried by the virtual photon⁴⁴, γ^* , $Q^2 = -q^2 = -(k - k')^2$, where k and k' are the four-momenta of the initial and final-state electrons, respectively; the Bjorken variable $x = Q^2/(2q \cdot P) = Q^2/(ys)$, where P is the four-momentum of the incoming proton and s is the centre-of-mass energy squared of the ep system; the variable which describes the energy transfer to the hadronic final state $y = (q \cdot P)/(k \cdot P)$; and W , the centre-of-mass energy of the γ^*p system, $W^2 = (q + P)^2 = Q^2(1 - x)/x + M_p^2$ with M_p , the proton mass.

For the present analysis the *double-angle* method [12] has been used to determine the bin variables. Quantities determined in this way will be denoted by the subscript DA. Here, all event variables are derived from the scattering angle of the electron and the angle γ_H . It is determined from the measured energy depositions in the calorimeter cells in the following way: First the variables δ_H and y_{JB} ⁴⁵ are determined from $\delta_H = \sum_i (E_i - p_{iZ})$ and $y_{JB} = \delta_H/(2E_e)$. The sum runs over all calorimeter cells i , excluding those assigned to the scattered electron, p_{iZ} is the Z component of a momentum vector $p_i = (E_i, p_{iX}, p_{iY}, p_{iZ})$ assigned to each cell i of energy E_i such that $p_i^2 = 0$. The variable y_{JB} is a good estimator for y even

if a significant amount of energy escapes in the direction of the proton beam: Final state particles produced close to this direction give a negligible contribution to δ_H , and therefore to y_{JB} , since these particles have $(E - p_Z) \sim 0$. Next, we calculate the transverse momentum, p_T , of the hadronic system and γ_H from $\cos \gamma_H = (p_T^2 - \delta_H^2)/(p_T^2 + \delta_H^2)$ where $p_T^2 = (\sum_i p_{iX})^2 + (\sum_i p_{iY})^2$ [12].

The pseudorapidity corresponding to the γ_H direction, η_{γ_H} , can be expressed as $\eta_{\gamma_H} = \ln(p_T/\delta_H)$. Since p_T is related to Q and y through $p_T = Q \cdot \sqrt{1 - y}$, one sees from the above formulae that if y is sufficiently high (> 0.04), γ_H will point into the rear hemisphere at low Q^2 ($Q^2 \sim 5 \text{ GeV}^2$). As Q^2 grows the γ_H direction turns slowly to the forward hemisphere.

Energy flow distributions will also be presented in the Breit frame. The Breit frame is defined by the requirement that the vector $(q + 2xP)$ has no space-like components. As a consequence the virtual photon, γ^* , carries only a space-like component, conventionally assigned to the negative z direction: $q = (0, 0, 0, -Q)$. The z component of the momentum of the incoming quark is $Q/2$ before and $p_z^{\text{QPM}} = -Q/2$ after the interaction with the γ^* . The Breit frame is also referred to as the “brick wall” frame since in lowest order the incoming parton simply reverses its direction.

4. Data selection

The offline selection of DIS events was similar to that described in our earlier publications [1,14]. Scattered electron candidates were selected by using the pattern of energy deposition in the calorimeter. The electron energy was required to be more than 10 GeV. The electron identification algorithm was tuned for purity rather than efficiency. In studies with Monte Carlo DIS events and test beam samples the purity was estimated to be $\geq 96\%$. We demanded

- $Q_{\text{DA}}^2 \geq 10 \text{ GeV}^2$;
- $y_{JB} \geq 0.04$, to give sufficient accuracy for DA reconstruction;
- $\delta \geq 35 \text{ GeV}$, to control radiative corrections and photoproduction background (δ is calculated like the quantity δ_H described in the previous section but including the calorimeter cells assigned to the scattered electron);

⁴⁴ In the Q^2 range covered in this analysis, neutral-current ep interactions are described to sufficient accuracy by the exchange of a virtual photon.

⁴⁵ The abbreviation JB stands for Jacquet-Blondel [13].

Fig. 1. All distributions in this figure are uncorrected for detector acceptance and resolution. (a): The distribution of the variable $\eta_{\max}$, the rapidity of the most forward energy deposit above 400 MeV in the calorimeter. The solid circles are the ZEUS data points, the full histogram is the result of the CDMBGF Monte Carlo simulation and the dashed histogram is that of the POMPYT Monte Carlo. (b): The distribution in the (x_{DA}, Q_{DA}^2) plane of the large-rapidity-gap events. The two curves are lines of constant γ_H , $\gamma_H = 117.5^\circ$ and $\gamma_H = 170.6^\circ$, corresponding to values of $\eta_{\gamma_H} = -0.5$ and $\eta_{\gamma_H} = -2.5$. The horizontal lines delimit the five Q_{DA}^2 bins used in the analysis. The largest Q_{DA}^2 bin is not bounded from above. (c): The distribution in the (x_{DA}, Q_{DA}^2) plane of the non-rapidity-gap events. (d): The energy flow in the HERA frame as a function of the pseudorapidity difference $\Delta\eta = \eta_{\text{cell}} - \eta_{\gamma_H}$ with and without a cut on forward energy deposits in the calorimeter. The solid circles depict the energy flow including forward energy deposits while the histogram represents the same events after those energy deposits below 10° have been removed.

- $y_e \leq 0.95$, where y_e is the variable y defined in section (3) calculated from the electron variables, to reduce the photoproduction background.

Furthermore we required

- a vertex, determined from VXD and CTD tracks, in the range $-50 \leq Z_{\text{vtx}} \leq 40$ cm and a radial distance from the beamline $R = \sqrt{X_{\text{vtx}}^2 + Y_{\text{vtx}}^2} < 8.5$ cm;
- the position (X, Y) of the scattered electron in the RCAL to lie outside a square of 32×32 cm² centered on the beam axis;
- no more than 5 GeV of energy deposition in the photon calorimeter of the luminosity detector, to

exclude events with large initial-state radiation. Finally, we rejected Compton scattering events and cosmic and beam-related muons.

A total of 26210 events was selected in this way corresponding to an integrated luminosity of 550 nb^{-1} . Fig. 1a shows the distribution of the variable $\eta_{\max}$ for all events in the final selection where $\eta_{\max}$ is the pseudorapidity of the most forward calorimeter condensate with an energy above 400 MeV. A condensate is a contiguous energy deposit above 100 MeV for pure EMC and 200 MeV for HAC or mixed energy deposits. The distribution has not been corrected for

detector acceptance and resolution and, in particular, the dip near $\eta_{\max} \sim 1$ is a detector effect. Values of $\eta_{\max} \geq 4.3$, which are outside the calorimeter acceptance, occur when energy is deposited in many contiguous cells around the beam pipe in the proton direction. Also shown in Fig. 1a are the results from two Monte Carlo programs, namely CDMBGF (full histogram) which describes standard DIS processes and POMPYT (dashed histogram) which is a model for diffractive DIS processes. The Monte Carlo programs are described in the following section. The normalizations of the Monte Carlo distributions have been chosen such that their sum gives an optimal description of the data. As noted in [1,4,15], the data show a clear excess over the predictions of a standard DIS model at values of $\eta_{\max} < 1.5$. The event sample is split into two classes: those events which have $\eta_{\max} < 1.5$ are called large-rapidity-gap events. The rest of the events are called non-rapidity-gap events. In total, 1241 events are in the first class and 24969 events are in the second class. For the large-rapidity-gap events an upper limit of 2% (25 events) was estimated for non-DIS backgrounds such as photoproduction, cosmetics, beam-gas and beam-wall interactions.

We will compare energy flows with respect to the γ_H direction in large-rapidity-gap and in non-rapidity-gap events. For events selected by the $\eta_{\max}$ cut, the energy flow is necessarily small at pseudorapidities greater than $\eta_{\max}$. In order to obtain a range of at least two units in pseudorapidity between $\eta_{\max}$ and η_{γ_H} we require $\eta_{\gamma_H} < -0.5$. A lower cut on η_{γ_H} was chosen at -2.5 units in order to avoid the boundary of the calorimeter near the rear beam pipe. The centre of the γ_H bin, $\eta_{\gamma_H} = -1.5$, corresponds to $\gamma_H = 155^\circ$. In Fig. 1b the two curves delimit the range $-2.5 < \eta_{\gamma_H} < -0.5$. The horizontal lines delimit the Q_{DA}^2 bins used in the analysis. The highest Q_{DA}^2 bin has no upper limit. We see from this figure that the majority (79%) of the large-rapidity-gap events with $Q_{\text{DA}}^2 > 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ are contained in the selected intervals. Applying the same cuts to the non-rapidity-gap events we select 51% of the sample as shown in Fig. 1c.

5. The Monte Carlo simulation

The expected final states from DIS were modelled using two different sets of generators, the first one for

the description of the non-rapidity-gap events and the second one to model the large-rapidity-gap events.

Events from standard DIS processes were generated using two alternative Monte Carlo models, LEPTO 6.1 [16] with ARIADNE 4.0 [17,2] as implemented in [18] (CDMBGF) and with the matrix element plus parton showers (MEPS) option within LEPTO 6.1. In both models electroweak radiative corrections were implemented with the help of HERACLES [19] which was interfaced to LEPTO 6.1 via the program DJANGO 6.0 [20]. The proton parton densities were chosen to be the MRSD-' set [21] which gives an adequate description of the HERA structure function results [14,22]. Note that these Monte Carlo codes do not contain explicit contributions from diffractive γ^*p interactions.

In order to model the DIS hadronic final states from large-rapidity-gap events we have studied two Monte Carlo event samples, one of which was generated by POMPYT [23]. POMPYT is a Monte Carlo realisation of factorisable models for high energy diffractive processes, where within the PYTHIA [24] framework, the beam proton emits a pomeron, whose constituents take part in a hard scattering process with the virtual photon. The quark density in the pomeron is assumed to be hard:

$$P(\beta) = \text{constant} \cdot \beta(1 - \beta) \quad (1)$$

where β denotes the fraction of the pomeron momentum carried by the quark. Note that the shape of the hard quark density in POMPYT is the same as that proposed by Donnachie and Landshoff [25]. The second sample was generated following the Nikolaev-Zakharov (NZ) model [26] which was interfaced to the Lund fragmentation scheme [27]. The NZ model, which is not factorisable, assumes that the exchanged virtual photon fluctuates into a quark-antiquark pair which interacts with a colourless two-gluon system emitted by the incident proton. The resulting effective β distribution is somewhat softer than the one used for POMPYT. The diffractive Monte Carlo samples were generated with parameter settings as described in [4]. QED radiative processes were not simulated for these events. With the DIS selection cuts of Section 4, radiative corrections are below 10% [14]. Event samples generated by Monte Carlo methods were processed by the ZEUS detector simulation program which is

based on GEANT 3.13 [28] and which incorporates detector and trigger simulation. The events were then run through the standard ZEUS offline reconstruction program.

6. Correction procedure

In the HERA frame we measure the energy flow, $1/N \cdot dE/d(\Delta\eta)$, as a function of the pseudorapidity difference $\Delta\eta = \eta_{\text{cell}} - \eta_{\gamma_H}$. The energy flow is determined from all calorimeter cells with energies above 60 (110) MeV for EMC (HAC) cells. The pseudorapidity, η_{cell} , is calculated from the angle between the proton direction and a line connecting the measured vertex and the geometric centre of the cell. In the Breit frame, we measure $1/N \cdot dE/d(\eta^*)$ as a function of η^* , the pseudorapidity of a condensate in the Breit frame.

The measured distributions are distorted with respect to those of the true final state particles due to trigger biases, event selection cuts and the finite acceptance and the response of the detector. The detector and trigger simulation programs together with samples generated from different Monte Carlo programs have been used to estimate the distortions and to correct for them by multiplying the measured distributions by a correction function $c(\chi)$ in each bin of Q_{DA}^2 and γ_H . χ is either the pseudorapidity difference, $\Delta\eta$, or the pseudorapidity in the Breit frame, η^* , and $c(\chi)$ is calculated in the simulation as the bin-by-bin ratio

$$c(\chi) = \left(\frac{1}{N_{\text{gen}}} \frac{\Delta E(\chi)_{\text{gen}}}{\Delta\chi} \right) / \left(\frac{1}{N_{\text{obs}}} \frac{\Delta E(\chi)_{\text{obs}}}{\Delta\chi} \right). \quad (2)$$

In this expression variables with subscript (gen) and (obs) refer to the true quantities as generated in the Monte Carlo program at the hadron level and the simulated quantities observed at the detector level, respectively. N_{gen} and N_{obs} are the number of events generated and observed in the respective $(\gamma_H, Q_{\text{DA}}^2)$ bins, $\Delta E_{\text{gen}}(\Delta E_{\text{obs}})$ is the sum over the generated (observed) energies of hadrons (calorimeter cells) in the respective bins of χ , and $\Delta\chi$ is the width of the χ bin. Thus one accounts for energy losses, resolution, event selection cuts, event migrations and trigger biases. We correct the non-rapidity-gap event sample using the CDMBGF Monte Carlo program and the large-

rapidity-gap events using the POMPYT Monte Carlo program for diffractive γ^*p scattering.

To confirm that this correction method is justified we have checked that

- the chosen bins in $\Delta\eta$ and η^* are at least 30% larger than the resolution;
- the correction function $c(\chi)$ does not deviate from unity by more than 40% in the bins shown;
- $c(\chi)$ does not show a strong model-dependence in models that adequately describe the data. The differences between the Monte Carlo models are treated as part of the systematic error.

However, no correction is made to the large-rapidity-gap data for the η_{max} cut which is used to define this sample. The acceptance due to the η_{max} cut for events generated using the diffractive Monte Carlo programs is about 35%. Therefore in this sample a cut equivalent to the η_{max} cut is applied at the generator level by excluding events with hadrons above 400 MeV in the range $1.5 \leq \eta \leq 5$. The value of $\eta = 5$ was chosen to approximate the edge of the forward beam pipe aperture in the calorimeter.

We estimate the systematic errors by:

- using different Monte Carlo models;
- choosing a different electron identification algorithm;
- varying the η_{max} cut between 1.5 and 1.8;
- varying the cut on δ between 35 and 40 GeV;
- varying the energy scale of the calorimeter by $\pm 5\%$;
- moving the Z vertex position by ± 1 cm.

The chosen variations are consistent with our present knowledge of the detector performance. The contributions of the above effects to the systematic error have been added in quadrature. The dominant source of systematic error is the model dependence at about 20%.

7. Results

The energy flow $1/N \cdot dE/d(\Delta\eta)$, corrected as described above, is shown in Fig. 2 as a function of $\Delta\eta = \eta_{\text{cell}} - \eta_{\gamma_H}$. The average Q_{DA}^2 varies from 14 GeV² in Fig. 2a to 380 GeV² in Fig. 2e. In all of the comparisons cells in the very forward region with $\eta_{\text{cell}} > 2.5$ (corresponding to $\theta < 10^\circ$) were removed to reduce model and measurement uncertainties. The effect of this cut on the uncorrected energy flow for $10 < Q^2 < 20$ GeV² is shown in Fig. 1d. The solid circles depict

Fig. 2. The energy flow distribution, $1/N \cdot dE/d(\Delta\eta)$, as a function of the pseudorapidity difference $\Delta\eta$ in five bins of Q_{DA}^2 . The open circles are the non-rapidity-gap events ($\eta_{\max} > 1.5$), the solid circles are the large-rapidity-gap-events, the full histogram is the expectation from the Colour Dipole Model (CDMBGF) and the dotted histogram from the POMPYT Monte Carlo. (In the highest Q_{DA}^2 bin the large-rapidity-gap events are too few to be shown.) Statistical errors are shown as the thick error bars and the systematic errors are shown as the thin error bars. The large-rapidity-gap events have not been corrected for the $\eta_{\max}$ cut used to select these events.

the energy flow as a function of $\Delta\eta$ for all calorimeter cells, while in the histogram cells with $\eta_{\text{cell}} > 2.5$ have been removed. As can be seen the cut influences the energy flow only in the region $\Delta\eta \geq 3$. The energy flows of the selected large-rapidity-gap events are not influenced by this cut.

7.1. Energy flows in the laboratory frame

We first discuss the energy flow of the non-rapidity-gap events (open circles in Fig. 2). At high Q_{DA}^2 the QPM peak appears near $\Delta\eta \sim 0$. Furthermore, the energy flow rises towards the proton direction and there is substantial energy flow in between the struck quark and proton directions. With decreasing Q_{DA}^2 , the QPM peak becomes less pronounced. At low Q_{DA}^2 it is clearly seen that the QPM peak is rather broad, and is shifted towards positive values of $\Delta\eta$ by about 0.4 units and that the energy is emitted predominantly at positive values of $\Delta\eta$ [6]. The resolution in $\Delta\eta$ is approximately constant at 0.16 units over the entire range shown, determined predominantly by the resolution in η_{cell} .

The energy flow distributions of the large-rapidity-gap events (solid circles in Fig. 2) exhibit striking differences to the ones in the non-rapidity-gap events. In particular, the large-rapidity-gap-events show a much simpler structure:

- the peak of the energy flow is nearly centered at $\Delta\eta = 0$;
- the energy is well collimated within ± 1 unit of pseudorapidity around the γ_H direction;
- the collimation changes little with Q_{DA}^2 ;
- there is only little energy flow in the region between the γ_H and the proton directions.

We explain the differences of the two energy flow distributions by the suppression of QCD radiation in the large-rapidity-gap events. In the naive QPM the photon strikes a quark, with momentum fraction xP in the proton, and produces a massless jet. In contrast, in the leading order QCD correction to this process, the γ^* interacts with a parton from the proton and produces a quark-antiquark or quark-gluon pair. At the same value of x the incoming parton now carries a fraction ξ of the proton momentum $p = \xi P$ where ξ is larger than x to allow for the emission of a parton pair with, in general, a non-zero invariant mass⁴⁶. This leads to a net shift of the resultant direction of the parton pair towards the proton direction.

To estimate the size of the effect, we have computed the contribution to the energy flow from just the first order QCD processes. We have used the exact first order matrix element (ME) calculation for QCD

⁴⁶ Note that $(q + xP)^2 \equiv 0$ whereas $(q + \xi P)^2 > 0$.

Fig. 3. The distribution of the energy flow, $1/N \cdot dE/d(\Delta\eta)$, of partons as a function of the pseudorapidity difference $\Delta\eta$ in two bins of Q^2 . This energy flow was produced from the first order QCD processes only, QCD Compton (QCDC) and Boson-Gluon Fusion (BGF), with the LEPTO Monte Carlo program without fragmentation. The cutoff, y_{cut} , that regulates the singularities of the matrix element was chosen at 0.0025.

Compton (QCDC) and Boson-Gluon Fusion (BGF) as implemented in the LEPTO 6.1 Monte Carlo program [16]. The contributions of the two final-state partons to the energy flow are shown in Fig. 3 for two (x, Q^2) intervals. The computation at the parton level, with the standard ME cutoff parameter setting, confirms the qualitative argument developed above: the radiation is emitted strongly in the direction of the proton with a flat distribution in between the proton remnant and the QPM peak. The peak is also shifted at low Q^2 towards the proton direction. The characteristics of the first order processes are preserved in higher order since the emission of three, four and more partons can be approximated by a Markov chain of emissions where each individual emission has the same structure as in the two parton case [29].

The CDMBGF Monte Carlo calculation which includes higher order partonic emissions (full histogram in Fig. 2) is in good quantitative agreement with the non-rapidity-gap data (open circles in Fig. 2). Hence, we can conclude that QCD radiation is responsible for shifting the QPM peak and for filling in the region between the struck quark and proton directions. Reversing the argument we can also conclude that QCD radiation must be suppressed in the large-rapidity-gap events, otherwise we would observe both a shift of the QPM peak towards the proton direction and substan-

tially more energy emitted between the direction γ_H and the proton. A very small fraction of the events generated using the CDMBGF Monte Carlo program satisfy the η_{max} cut as can be seen in Fig. 1a. The energy flows of these events (not shown here) are qualitatively similar to those of the large-rapidity-gap events indicating that by the η_{max} cut we select events with little QCD radiation also in the CDMBGF Monte Carlo sample. These events are the result of rare fluctuations in the parton showering process. Since we cannot reproduce the rate of large-rapidity-gap events observed in the data with standard DIS Monte Carlo models we compare the events to models for diffractive ep scattering. One of these models, namely POMPYT, is shown as the dashed histogram in Fig. 2. It is in good quantitative agreement with the data.

In our previous publications [1,4] we have noted that in large-rapidity-gap events the mass M_X of the hadronic system observed in the detector is small compared to the typical masses observed in non-rapidity-gap events. The prominent features of the energy flow of the large-rapidity-gap events, namely the absence of a QPM peak shift and the narrow collimation, can be interpreted as a direct consequence of the fact that M_X is small in these events. Indeed, QCD radiation produces large masses, so that the observation of predominantly small masses M_X would lead to the same basic conclusion, namely that QCD radiation is suppressed.

7.2. Energy flows in the Breit frame

The structure of the energy flows in the HERA frame is dominated by the large transverse boost with respect to the virtual photon direction. In photon-aligned frames this kinematic effect is removed and the QCD dynamics become more apparent. In Fig. 4 we show the energy flow for the two classes of events as a function of the pseudorapidity, η^* , in the Breit frame (see Section 3). This frame is a photon-aligned frame and, as shall be shown later, it is a reasonable approximation to the centre-of-mass system of the diffractively produced hadrons in the large-rapidity-gap events.

These distributions were calculated in the following way: the transformation from the HERA frame to the Breit frame consists of a boost, followed by a rotation such that after the transformation the virtual

Fig. 4. The energy flow distributions, $1/N \cdot dE/d\eta^*$, as a function of the pseudorapidity in the Breit frame η^* in four bins of Q_{DA}^2 . The open circles are the non-rapidity-gap events, the solid circles are the large-rapidity-gap events and the full histogram is the CDMBGF which should be compared to the non-rapidity-gap data. The dashed histogram is the POMPYT Monte Carlo with the hard structure function (Eq. (12)) and the dotted histogram is the NZ model. The latter two models should be compared to the large-rapidity-gap data. The shaded histogram is the contribution from the target hemisphere of the centre-of-mass system of the diffractively produced hadrons as calculated in the POMPYT Monte Carlo model. Statistical errors are shown as the thick error bars and the systematic errors are shown as the thin error bars. The large-rapidity-gap events have not been corrected for the $\eta_{\max}$ cut used to select these events.

photon direction is defined to be the z axis. The boost and rotation are computed from the momenta of the virtual photon and the incoming proton. The momentum of the virtual photon is determined by measuring the scattering angle of the electron in the calorimeter and determining its energy from the double-angle variables. This method minimizes the systematic error introduced by the transformation. A calorimeter condensate is treated as a particle with a pion mass. (The results obtained are not sensitive to the precise choice of this mass.) Its momentum is transformed into the Breit frame and the energy flow is plotted as a func-

tion of the pseudorapidity, η^* . The distributions are corrected for the effects of detector acceptance and resolution. The corrections are smaller than 40% in the range $-2 < \eta^* < 2$ and the resolution in η^* varies from 0.1 units in the central region to 0.3 units at ± 2 units of pseudorapidity.

In the Breit frame one can separate the target and the current fragmentation regions. In Fig. 4 the current fragmentation region is on the left (negative values of η^*) and the target fragmentation region is on the right (positive values of η^*). In the non-rapidity-gap events the energy flow is steeply rising from the current region to the target region while in the large-rapidity-gap events it is flat at a value of the order of 1 GeV per unit of pseudorapidity. Hence in the target region the energy flow for large-rapidity-gap events is much smaller than for non-rapidity-gap events. In the current region, however, the energy flow for large-rapidity-gap events is larger than for non-rapidity-gap events.

This difference in the current fragmentation region is another sign of QCD radiation in the non-rapidity-gap events as can be seen from the following argument. In the QPM in the Breit frame the incoming quark carries momentum $Q/2$ and is emitted with momentum $p_z^{\text{QPM}} = -Q/2$ along the z direction. In the leading order QCD correction to the QPM the parton comes in with momentum $Q/2$, but the outgoing parton pair has a z component p_z^{rad} given by

$$p_z^{\text{rad}} = \frac{Q}{2} \left(\frac{\hat{s} - Q^2}{Q^2} \right) \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{s}$ is the square of the invariant mass of the emitted quark-antiquark or quark-gluon pair. When $Q^2 \gg \hat{s}$ the radiation is emitted in the QPM direction, $p_z^{\text{rad}} \sim p_z^{\text{QPM}}$. However, at low Q^2 , $\hat{s}$ is likely to be bigger than Q^2 and the radiation will be emitted in the direction opposite to the QPM direction. Typically, the minimum $\hat{s}$ is around 20 GeV² in our kinematic region, therefore at Q^2 around 10 GeV² the emitted radiation has $p_z^{\text{rad}} = Q/2$ or more, whereas $p_z^{\text{QPM}} = -Q/2$. QCD radiation pulls energy from the Breit frame current region into the target region. These features are well described by the CDMBGF Monte Carlo (solid histogram in Fig. 4).

The energy flows of the large-rapidity-gap events in the Breit frame are well described by the POMPYT Monte Carlo program with a hard structure function

(dashed histogram in Fig. 4) and by the model of Nikolaev and Zakharov (dotted histogram in Fig. 4). The shaded histogram in Fig. 4 shows the contribution from the target hemisphere of the centre-of-mass system of the diffractively produced hadrons as calculated in the POMPYT Monte Carlo model. Within the framework of the POMPYT model this contribution can be interpreted as the remnant of the pomeron dissociation.

8. Conclusions

We have compared energy flows in ep DIS events with and without a large rapidity gap at a centre-of-mass energy of 296 GeV as a function of Q^2 for values of Q^2 above 10 GeV². The distributions are corrected for effects of detector acceptance and resolution. We find that the energy flows are strikingly different in the two classes of events.

In the HERA frame a clear peak in the QPM struck quark direction is observed in the non-rapidity-gap events at high values of Q^2 ($< Q^2 > = 380$ GeV²). As Q^2 decreases this peak becomes less pronounced with most of the energy emitted at positive values of $\Delta\eta$. Substantial energy flow between the struck quark and the proton directions is observed forming an intermediate plateau the level of which depends only weakly on Q^2 . In addition, the QPM peak is shifted from its direction in the naive QPM by up to 0.4 units of pseudorapidity towards the proton direction in the lowest Q^2 bin. These features are understood as the result of QCD radiation. In the large-rapidity-gap events the energy is collimated within ± 1 unit of pseudorapidity around the QPM direction in the HERA frame. This collimation changes slowly with Q^2 . Only a small shift of the QPM peak is observed even in the lowest Q^2 bin. Furthermore, there is little energy flow between the QPM struck quark and the proton directions. This strongly suggests that QCD radiation is suppressed in these events. In events selected by requiring no energy at pseudorapidities $\eta > 1.5$ we observe little energy already at pseudorapidities $\eta > -0.5$.

In the Breit frame for non-rapidity-gap events the energy flow is rising rapidly from the current towards the target region. This behaviour is well described by the CDMBGF Monte Carlo model. For the large-rapidity-gap events the energy flow is approximately

constant at about 1 GeV per unit of pseudorapidity in the current and the target regions. Comparing the large-rapidity-gap events to two different models of diffractive dissociation, namely the POMPYT Monte Carlo with a hard quark density and the model by Nikolaev and Zakharov, we find that both give an adequate description of the data.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated that QCD radiation is strongly suppressed in deep inelastic scattering events with a large rapidity gap. In conjunction with our previous observation that these large rapidity gap events are consistent with a leading twist behaviour, the suppression of QCD radiation indicates the presence of a colourless object in the proton.

Acknowledgements

We thank Professors T. Walsh and E. Levin for valuable discussions. The strong support and encouragement by the DESY Directorate Prof. B.H. Wiik, Drs. H. Krech, J. May, Profs. P. Söding, V. Soergel, G.A. Voss and A. Wagner have been invaluable, as well as the support by Dr. G. Söhngen.

The experiment was made possible by the inventiveness and diligent efforts of the HERA machine group who continued to run HERA most efficiently during 1993.

The design, construction, and installation of the ZEUS detector have been made possible by the ingenuity and dedicated efforts of many people from inside DESY and from the home institutes who are not listed here. Their contributions are acknowledged with great appreciation.

We also gratefully acknowledge the support of the DESY computing and network services.

References

- [1] ZEUS Collab., M. Derrick et al., *Phys. Lett. B* 315 (1993) 481.
- [2] B. Andersson et al., *Phys. Rep.* 97 (1983) 31.
- [3] B. Andersson, G. Gustafson and T. Sjöstrand, *Phys. Lett. B* 94 (1980) 211;
B.R. Webber, *Nucl. Phys. B* 238 (1984) 492;
Ya.I. Azimov, Yu.L. Dokshitzer, V.A. Khoze and S.I. Troyan, *Phys. Lett. B* 165 (1985) 147.
- [4] ZEUS Collab., M. Derrick et al., DESY 94-063, accepted for publication in *Phys. Lett. B* (1994).

- [5] Ya.I. Azimov, Yu.L. Dokshitzer, V.A. Khoze and S.I. Troyan, *Zeit. Phys. C* 27 (1985) 65.
- [6] ZEUS Collab., M. Derrick et al., *Z. Phys. C* 59 (1993) 231.
- [7] The ZEUS Detector, Status Report 1993, DESY 1993.
- [8] ZEUS Collab., M. Derrick et al., *Phys. Lett. B* 293 (1992) 465.
- [9] A. Andresen et al., *Nucl. Inst. and Meth. A* 309 (1991) 101.
- [10] A. Bernstein et al., *Nucl. Inst. and Meth. A* 336 (1993) 23.
- [11] A. Caldwell et al., *Nucl. Inst. and Meth. A* 321 (1992) 356.
- [12] S. Bentvelsen, J. Engelen, and P. Kooijman, *Proc. of the Workshop on Physics at HERA, Vol. 1, DESY (1991)* 23, eds. W. Buchmüller and G. Ingelman.
- [13] F. Jacquet and A. Blondel, in *Proceedings of the study for an ep facility in Europe 79/48 (1979)* 391, ed. U. Amaldi.
- [14] ZEUS Collab., M. Derrick et al., *Phys. Lett. B* 316 (1993) 412.
- [15] H1 Collab.: A. De Roeck, invited talk at the Europhysics Conf. on HEP, Marseille 1993, DESY 94-005; J.B. Dainton, invited talk at the XVI International Symposium on Lepton-Photon Interactions, Cornell 1993, RAL-94-012.
- [16] G. Ingelman, *Proc. of the Workshop on Physics at HERA, Vol. 3 (1991)* 1366, eds. W. Buchmüller and G. Ingelman; M. Bengtsson, G. Ingelman and T. Sjöstrand, *Nucl. Phys. B* 301 (1988) 554.
- [17] L. Lönnblad, Lund preprint, LU TP-89-10; *Comp. Phys. Comm.* 71 (1992) 15.
- [18] T. Sjöstrand, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* 39 (1986) 347; T. Sjöstrand and M. Bengtsson, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* 43 (1987) 367.
- [19] A. Kwiatkowski, H. Spiesberger and H.-J. Möhring, *Proc. of the Workshop on Physics at HERA, Vol. 3, DESY (1991)* 1294, eds. W. Buchmüller and G. Ingelman.
- [20] K. Charchula, G. Schuler and H. Spiesberger, *CERN-TH.7133/94*.
- [21] A.D. Martin, W.J. Stirling and R.G. Roberts, *Phys. Lett. B* 306 (1993) 145.
- [22] H1 Collab., I. Abt et al., *Nucl. Phys. B* 407 (1993) 515.
- [23] P. Bruni and G. Ingelman, DESY 93-187, to be published in *Proc. of the Europhysics Conf., Marseille (1993)*.
- [24] H.-U. Bengtsson and T. Sjöstrand, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* 46 (1987) 43; T. Sjöstrand, *CERN-TH.6488/92*.
- [25] A. Donnachie and P.V. Landshoff, *Phys. Lett. B* 191 (1987) 309.
- [26] N.N. Nikolaev and B.G. Zakharov, *Z. Phys. C* 53 (1992) 331.
- [27] A. Solano, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Torino 1993, unpublished.
- [28] R. Brun et al., GEANT3, CERN DD/EE/84-1 (1987).
- [29] G. Marchesini and B.R. Webber, *Nucl. Phys. B* 310 (1988) 461.