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Abstract

A measurement of the cross sections for single and double prompt photon production in $p\bar{p}$ interactions at $\sqrt{s} = 630$ GeV is presented. The data sample corresponds to an integrated luminosity of 13.2 pb$^{-1}$. The results are in good agreement with the predictions of perturbative QCD. The signal from double prompt photon production has a statistical significance of 4.3 standard deviations.
1 Introduction

The study of the production of large transverse momentum ($p_T$) photons in hadron-hadron collisions is a convenient way to extract information about the constituents of hadronic matter and their interactions. A measurement of the direct photon cross-section provides a test of QCD with the advantage that the photon transverse momentum is not affected by fragmentation effects, resulting in experimental uncertainties which are considerably smaller than those obtained, for instance, in the measurement of a jet cross-section. Next-to-leading order calculations both for single and double prompt photon production are available [1]–[3] and can be directly compared to the experimental results.

The main source of background to the photon signal is the production of high transverse momentum hadron jets since they often contain one or more $\pi^0$ (or $\eta$) mesons which decay into photon pairs that cannot be resolved at high energy. For both single and double prompt photon production, this background is overwhelming, due to the low production cross-section of prompt photon processes with respect to jet production. Prompt photon production, however, results in isolated electromagnetic clusters, whereas the background from hadron jets is accompanied by jet fragments, so that an “isolation requirement” is very effective in reducing the background in the signal sample.

An additional difficulty for the study of double prompt photon production is the very low cross-section, of the order of a few picobarns for the $p_T$ range explored by collider experiments, requiring a high statistics sample for the extraction of a meaningful signal.

Using the integrated luminosity of 13.2 pb$^{-1}$ accumulated during the 1988–90 UA2 runs, a measurement of the single prompt photon production cross-section was performed with higher statistics than previous measurements [4, 5]. Furthermore a signal from double prompt photon production was observed with a statistical significance of 4.3 standard deviations.

2 The UA2 Apparatus

The upgraded UA2 detector [6] provides full azimuthal coverage around the interaction region in the pseudorapidity range $-3 < \eta < 3$ and consists of a central tracking detector surrounded by electromagnetic and hadronic calorimeters [7].

The calorimeter is divided into a central part (CC) with $|\eta| < 1$ and two end cap regions (EC) reaching $|\eta| = 3$. All calorimeters use the sampling technique, with a tower structure and wavelength shifter readout. The granularity is $\Delta\theta \cdot \Delta \phi = 10^\circ \cdot 15^\circ$ in the CC and $\Delta\eta \cdot \Delta \phi = 0.2 \cdot 15^\circ$ in the EC, except for the two cells closest to the beam axis where $\Delta\eta = 0.3$ and 0.5 respectively. The electromagnetic compartments are multi-layer lead-scintillator sandwiches with a total thickness of 17 radiation lengths (r.l.) in the CC and varying between 17.1 and 24.4 r.l. in the EC, depending on the polar angle $\theta$. The hadronic compartments are multi-layer iron-scintillator sandwiches, 4 absorption lengths (a.l.) deep in the CC and 6.5 a.l. deep in the EC.

The central detector, used to determine the position of the event vertex and to reconstruct charged particle tracks, consists of two silicon pad counter arrays [8] around
the beam at radii of 2.9 cm and 14.8 cm. A cylindrical drift chamber [9] is located between the two silicon detectors. Beyond the outer silicon layer there is a transition radiation detector [10], consisting of two sets of radiation and proportional chambers, followed by a scintillating fibre detector SFD [11] which provides track segments in the first six stereo triplets of fibres and localizes the beginning of electromagnetic showers in front of the CC in the last two stereo triplets, located after a 1.5 r.l. thick lead converter.

In the forward regions, $|\eta| > 1$, tracking and preshower measurements are provided by three stereo triplets of proportional tubes [12] placed in front of the end cap calorimeters. The first two triplets are used as a tracking device, while the last triplet, placed after a 2 r.l. thick iron and lead converter, acts as a preshower detector. Two sets of time-of-flight hodoscopes are located at small angles with respect to the beam. Their function is to define a minimum bias trigger and to provide an independent vertex measurement. Finally, two planes of large area scintillation counters cover the back sides of the end cap calorimeters. Events caused by beam halo particles are rejected in the analysis by detecting charged particles giving an early signal in these counters with respect to the beam crossing time.

3 Photon selection and background subtraction

The events are selected by requiring a reconstructed vertex within a distance along the beam line smaller than 250 mm from the detector centre, and the presence of one or two electromagnetic clusters. Clustering is performed in the calorimeter by joining all cells with an energy greater than 400 MeV sharing a common edge. Clusters with a small lateral size and a small energy leakage into the hadronic compartments are marked as electromagnetic. A photon candidate is defined as an electromagnetic cluster satisfying the following criteria:

- Lateral and longitudinal profiles of the cluster consistent with that expected for a single isolated electron or photon.

- The absence of charged tracks in front of the calorimeter cluster, ensured by pulse height cuts on any silicon pads present in either silicon counter within a window of $|\Delta\eta| < 0.2$ and $|\Delta\phi| < 15^\circ$ about the cluster axis (defined by the line joining the interaction vertex to the cluster centroid).

- At most, one preshower signal in a cone $\sqrt{\Delta\phi^2 + \Delta\eta^2} < 0.265$ about the cluster axis.

The applied isolation criteria reject a large fraction of $\pi^0$'s and $\eta$'s at the same time maintaining a high efficiency for direct photons. The residual background contamination is measured and subtracted on a statistical basis, by considering the fraction $\alpha$ of photons in the sample that initiate showers in the converter of the preshower detector. A converted photon candidate is defined by the observation of a signal above a threshold of 3 minimum ionizing particle (MIP) equivalents in the preshower detector, otherwise the photon candidate is referred to as unconverted. In order to compute $\alpha$, all the selection
efficiencies which have a different value for converted and unconverted photon candidates have been taken into account, as discussed in Ref. [5], to determine the true numbers of converted ($N_{c}^{true}$) and of unconverted ($N_{u}^{true}$) photons from the number of observed photon candidates. The conversion probability $\alpha$ in the sample is then computed as:

$$\alpha = \frac{N_{c}^{true}}{N_{c}^{true} + N_{u}^{true}}$$

The conversion probability $\varepsilon_{\gamma}$ of an incident single photon is evaluated as a function of the photon energy using the EGS shower simulation programme [13]. The simulation has been tuned to describe correctly the preshower detector response to test beam electrons of 10 and 40 GeV and to electrons from $W$ decays. The total systematic error on $\varepsilon_{\gamma}$ is estimated to decrease with energy from 2.4% to 2.0% in the energy range between 17 and 90 GeV corresponding to the data sample. The multiphoton conversion probability $\varepsilon_{\pi}$ for photon pairs produced by single $\pi^{0}$ and $\eta$ decays is calculated using $\varepsilon_{\gamma}$ for each photon and assuming that the ratio between the number of $\eta$ and $\pi^{0}$ is 0.6 and $p_{T}$ independent [14]. The component of multi-$\pi^{0}$ states in the background has been estimated [5] by comparing the conversion probability measured for a background data sample with the value of $\varepsilon_{\pi}$ calculated from single $\pi^{0}$'s and $\eta$'s. This component has turned out to be highly suppressed by the preshower isolation requirement. The systematic error on $\varepsilon_{\pi}$ is mainly due to the uncertainty in the two-photon angular resolving power and ranges from 2.7% to 1.5% with increasing $\pi^{0}$ energy, for energy values between 17 and 90 GeV. The calculated values of $\varepsilon_{\pi}$ and $\varepsilon_{\gamma}$ are compared in Fig. 1a with the measured conversion probability $\alpha$ as a function of the cluster energy $E_{\gamma}$. The measured values lie between the two theoretical curves and tend towards $\varepsilon_{\gamma}$ as $E_{\gamma}$ increases.

The fraction of multiphoton events in the sample,

$$b(p_{T}) = \frac{\alpha - \varepsilon_{\gamma}}{\varepsilon_{\pi} - \varepsilon_{\gamma}}$$

computed in each $p_{T}$-bin is shown in Fig. 1b to decrease with increasing $p_{T}$, as expected from Fig. 1a.

4 Single photon inclusive cross-section

The present analysis is based on events selected during the 1988–90 collider runs. The data from the 1988 and 1989 runs were selected using the single electron trigger [15], requiring the presence of an electromagnetic cluster with $p_{T} > 12$ GeV. This trigger is found to be fully efficient above the offline $p_{T}$ threshold of 15 GeV. In 1990, in order to cope with the increased peak luminosity, the online $p_{T}$ threshold, set to 18 GeV, was combined to a requirement of small lateral cluster profile. This trigger is found to be fully efficient for $p_{T} > 21$ GeV. For this reason the final cross-section has been computed using the 1988–89 data only in the case of photon candidates with $p_{T}$ between 15 and 21 GeV, and using the full sample for candidates with $p_{T} > 21$ GeV. Only events with a single reconstructed $p\bar{p}$ interaction vertex and having an electromagnetic cluster well
contained in the fiducial region of the central calorimeter (|\eta| < 0.76) are considered. In addition, the events must contain at least one cluster with the characteristics expected for an isolated single photon. A total of 21117 photon candidates with 15 < \pt \leq 21 \text{ GeV} from the 1988–89 sample and 9017 candidates with \pt > 21 \text{ GeV} from the full 1988–90 data sample is found.

The invariant inclusive cross-section for direct photon production is evaluated from

\[ E \frac{d\sigma}{d^3p} = \frac{N_\gamma(p_T) \cdot [1 - b(p_T)]}{2\pi p_T \Delta p_T \mathcal{L} \epsilon_c A(p_T)} \]

where \( N_\gamma(p_T) \) is the number of photon candidates in a \( p_T \)-bin of width \( \Delta p_T \), \( b(p_T) \) is the background fraction in that bin, \( \mathcal{L} = 13.2 \pm 0.7 \text{ pb}^{-1} \) is the integrated luminosity corresponding to the data sample, \( \epsilon_c \) is the direct photon detection efficiency and \( A(p_T) \) is the geometrical acceptance. The global detection efficiency \( \epsilon_c = 0.454 \pm 0.011 \) does not include the effects associated with photon conversions in the preshower detector, which have been taken into account in the calculation of the conversion probability as discussed in section 3.

Table 1: Inclusive direct photon cross-section at |\eta| = 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( &lt; p_T &gt; ) (GeV)</th>
<th>( \frac{\frac{d\sigma}{d^3p}}{pb \text{ GeV}^{-2}} )</th>
<th>Uncertainty (pb GeV(^{-2}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stat.</td>
<td>syst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining background caused by beam halo particles has been estimated to be less than 1% of the photon candidate sample at all \( p_T \) and has been neglected. The contribution from \( W \to e\nu \) decays where no electron track was reconstructed is estimated
to be [5] 0.2% of the photon candidates in the $p_T$ region between 20 and 45 GeV and is also neglected.

The results are compared to next-to-leading order QCD calculations [1] performed using different sets of structure functions [16]. The isolation cut used in the selection of the data suppresses the bremsstrahlung contribution from final state quarks. Such an effect has been taken into account in the QCD calculation [1] by excluding photon–quark configurations with a small angular separation (see Ref. [1] for a description of the exact procedure). The $p_T$ distribution of the data together with the QCD expectations is shown in Fig. 2. The error bars indicate the statistical and $p_T$ dependent systematic uncertainties added in quadrature. The latter arise from the uncertainties in the preshower isolation efficiency and in the Monte Carlo evaluation of $\varepsilon_\gamma$ and $\varepsilon_\pi$, and from the difference in the energy reconstruction for converted and unconverted photons [5]. The cross-section values are listed in Table 1, where the statistical and the systematic uncertainties are also shown. Not included in Fig. 2 and Table 1 is the overall $p_T$ independent systematic error of 9%, due to the 1% uncertainty on the energy scale (resulting in a 6.4% error on the cross-section), a 5.3% uncertainty on the luminosity measurement, a 2.5% error on the global detection efficiency and a 1% error on the geometrical acceptance. Within these uncertainties and the overall scale error, the data are in fair agreement with the QCD predictions. However, in the low $p_T$ region ($p_T < 30$ GeV) the measured $p_T$ dependence is significantly steeper than the QCD prediction. Such an effect has also been recently observed by the CDF collaboration at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV [17]. It could result from the contribution of quark bremsstrahlung which is expected to be important at low $p_T$. A more accurate theoretical estimate of this contribution is needed for a better quantitative comparison.

5 Double Prompt Photon Production

5.1 Data reduction

The data for this analysis were collected with an electron pair trigger, requiring two electromagnetic clusters in the calorimeter with an azimuthal separation of at least 60°. The data reduction aims at restricting the analysis to a kinematical region where the trigger efficiency is uniform over the full data taking period, and where the results on single photon identification efficiencies described above can be applied. The events must contain two electromagnetic clusters ($\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$) satisfying the following requirements:

- $p_T(\gamma_1) > 10$ GeV and $p_T(\gamma_2) > 9$ GeV;
- $|\eta(\gamma_1)| < 0.76$ and $|\eta(\gamma_2)| < 0.76$;
- $Z > 0.7$ where $Z$ is defined as

$$Z = -\frac{\overrightarrow{p_T}(\gamma_1) \cdot \overrightarrow{p_T}(\gamma_2)}{|p_T(\gamma_1)|^2}$$
This last cut rejects the events with a large imbalance between the \( p_T \) of the two clusters. In this way the contribution from quark bremsstrahlung processes is reduced, as well as the background from jets in which part of the jet energy fails outside the reconstructed cluster.

Photon identification cuts are then applied to each of the two electromagnetic clusters in order to select the final two-photon candidate sample. These criteria are based on the same principles as the ones applied in the single photon analysis; the requirements on track isolation and on the cluster profile are however less strict than in the single photon case, in order to retain a high efficiency for double photon events. The cumulative selection efficiency is measured to be \( \epsilon = 0.725 \pm 0.008 \) for each photon. This value does not include the efficiency of the cuts applied to flag a calorimeter cluster as electromagnetic and of the preshower isolation criteria.

The number of candidate events after this selection is 142.

### 5.2 Rejection of jet background

In order to estimate the background from \( \gamma \)-jet or two-jet events, the rejection against jets resulting from the photon identification criteria must be known. Such a rejection, \( \rho \), is defined as the probability for a cluster not associated with a direct photon, but recognized as electromagnetic at trigger level, to fulfill the photon identification requirements described in the previous section. It can be evaluated from a sample of electromagnetic clusters using the following set of equations:

\[
N_1 = N_j + N_\gamma \quad [5.1]
\]
\[
N_2 = \rho N_j + \varepsilon N_\gamma \quad [5.2]
\]
\[
\varepsilon N_\gamma = (1 - b)N_2 \quad [5.3]
\]

where \( N_1 \) is the number of electromagnetic clusters, \( N_2 \) is the number of clusters passing the photon identification criteria, and \( \varepsilon \) is the efficiency of the photon selection defined above. The unknowns are \( \rho \), \( N_j \) and \( N_\gamma \), representing respectively the numbers of jets and direct photons in the initial sample. The variable \( b \), appearing in eq. [5.3] is the background fraction used in the prompt photon analysis (see section 3).

Due to uncertainties in modelling the effect of the SFD angular resolution for two-shower separation in the preshower detector, \( \varepsilon_\pi \) and \( \varepsilon_\gamma \) are considered fully reliable only for \( p_T > 15 \) GeV. Therefore \( \rho \) was measured directly from equations [5.1]–[5.3] only for \( p_T > 16 \) GeV, using the high statistics event sample of the single prompt photon analysis. For the lower \( p_T \) region (\( 9 < p_T < 16 \) GeV), \( \rho \) was evaluated using a sample of single photon candidates extracted from the two-electron trigger, which is fully efficient for \( p_T > 9 \) GeV. The number of real photons in this sample was evaluated by a Monte Carlo simulation [18] of single prompt photon production, normalized to the measured single prompt photon cross-section in the high \( p_T \) bins.

The dependence of \( \rho \) as a function of the cluster \( p_T \) is shown in Fig. 3, together with the estimated error, which is dominated by the uncertainties on \( \varepsilon_\pi \) and \( \varepsilon_\gamma \).
5.3 Background evaluation

In order to evaluate the background content of the double photon candidate sample, the efficiencies and rejection factors can be factorized for the two clusters in the event; one can thus write four equations:

\[ N_1 = N_{jj} + N_{\gamma\gamma} \]
\[ N_2 = \rho_1(1 - \rho_2)N_{jj} + \epsilon(1 - \rho_1)N_{\gamma\gamma} + \rho_1(1 - \epsilon)N_{\gamma\gamma} + \epsilon(1 - \epsilon)N_{\gamma\gamma} \]
\[ N_3 = \rho_2(1 - \rho_1)N_{jj} + (1 - \epsilon)\rho_2N_{\gamma\gamma} + \epsilon(1 - \rho_1)N_{\gamma\gamma} + \epsilon(1 - \epsilon)N_{\gamma\gamma} \]
\[ N_4 = \rho_1\rho_2N_{jj} + \epsilon\rho_2N_{\gamma\gamma} + \epsilon\rho_1N_{\gamma\gamma} + \epsilon^2N_{\gamma\gamma} \]

In these equations, \( N_1 \) is the original sample where the only requirement on the two clusters is that they satisfy the criteria defining an electromagnetic cluster at trigger level, \( N_2 \) is the sample having only the higher \( p_T \) cluster identified as a photon, \( N_3 \) the sample for which only the lower \( p_T \) cluster passes the photon cuts, and \( N_4 \) is the double photon candidate sample. The subscripts 1 and 2 on efficiencies and rejections refer to the cluster of higher and lower \( p_T \) respectively, while \( N_{jj} \), \( N_{\gamma\gamma} \), \( N_{\gamma\gamma} \) and \( N_{\gamma\gamma} \) are the numbers of jet-jet, single photon and double photon events in the initial sample. Using the known values of \( \epsilon \) and \( \rho \), these values can be obtained by solving the system of four linear equations. The calculation is performed dividing the sample in bins of \( p_T \) of the higher \( p_T \) cluster; for each bin \( \rho \) is evaluated at the average \( p_T \) value of the first(second) cluster for \( \rho_1 \) (\( \rho_2 \)) respectively.

The numbers \( N_{1-4} \) together with \( N_{\gamma\gamma} \) and its error are shown in Table 2 for four \( p_T \) bins.

Table 2: Numbers of events used for background evaluation (\( N_1 \) to \( N_4 \)) and number of real double photon events (\( \epsilon^2N_{\gamma\gamma} \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \Delta p_T ) (GeV)</th>
<th>( N_1 )</th>
<th>( N_2 )</th>
<th>( N_3 )</th>
<th>( N_4 )</th>
<th>( \epsilon^2N_{\gamma\gamma} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29.7 ± 8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 18</td>
<td>3548</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.0 ± 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 24</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.1 ± 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 31</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4 ± 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The values of the unknowns, summed over all \( p_T \) bins are: \( N_{jj} = 6020.9 \), \( (N_{\gamma\gamma} + N_{\gamma\gamma}) = 959.4 \) and \( N_{\gamma\gamma} = 110.7 \). The dominant error on \( N_{\gamma\gamma} \) is the statistical error on the number of candidates. From the number \( N_{\gamma\gamma} \) in each bin and the corresponding errors, calculated including all the relevant \( p_T \) dependent contributions, the \( \gamma\gamma \) signal turns out to be \( 58.2 ± 13.4 \) events, with a statistical significance of 4.3 standard deviations.
5.4 Cross-section calculation and comparison with QCD

Values of the cross-section for double prompt photon production, $d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}/dp_T$, are obtained from the number of photons falling inside a given $p_T$ bin when the event contains a second photon. With this definition, each event is counted twice: once for each $p_T$ bin to which the two photons belong. The formula for the cross-section is:

$$\frac{d\sigma_{\gamma\gamma}}{dp_T} = \frac{N^*_{\gamma\gamma}}{\varepsilon_C A(p_T) \Delta p_T L}$$

where $N^*_{\gamma\gamma}$ is the number of photons in each bin, $\varepsilon_C$ is the efficiency of the cuts defining an electromagnetic cluster, $A(p_T)$ is the geometrical acceptance, $\Delta p_T$ is the bin size and $L$ is the integrated luminosity.

The geometrical acceptance $A(p_T)$ is obtained by means of a Monte Carlo simulation which used a generator of double prompt photon events to lowest order [18], and takes into account the effect of the spread of the interaction vertex as well as the rapidity boundary $|\eta| < 0.76$ applied to both photon candidates in the data.

Table 3: Double prompt photon differential cross section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\Delta p_T$ (GeV)</th>
<th>$p_T$ (GeV)</th>
<th>$d\sigma/dp_T$ (pb/GeV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 – 12</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.31 ± 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 18</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>0.922 ± 0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>0.346 ± 0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 31</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>0.116 ± 0.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross-section values so obtained are given in Table 3 and shown in Fig. 4. The quoted errors include the statistical and all $p_T$-dependent systematic uncertainties. In addition, there is a normalization uncertainty of 6.8% which is obtained by adding in quadrature the following errors:

- the 5.3% error on the luminosity;
- a 3.5% error resulting from a 1% uncertainty on the photon energy scale;
- a 2.4% error resulting from the 1.1% uncertainty which affects the determination of $\varepsilon_C$.

Fig. 4 also shows the results of two independent QCD predictions to next-to-leading order (NLO). The calculation of Ref. [2] is performed analytically, whereas a Monte Carlo method is used for Ref. [3]. In the two cases the same parameters are used, namely: a NLO definition of $\alpha_s$, the HMRSB structure functions [19]; $Q^2 = p_T^2$; and no isolation criteria on the photon. However, while the calculation of Ref. [3] is performed by requiring $|\eta| < 0.76$ for both photons, as in the data, in the analytical calculation of Ref. [2] this requirement is applied to only one photon, resulting in a cross-section which
is larger by approximately a factor of 2.5. The result of this calculation was therefore corrected for the reduced acceptance of the data using the Monte Carlo simulation described above. For both predictions the agreement is good apart from the first bin in \( p_T \) where the data lie significantly above the theoretical prediction. This discrepancy could be due to the theoretical uncertainties in the calculation of the diagrams where the final state photons are radiated from quarks (bremsstrahlung diagrams), which contribute mostly to the lowest \( p_T \) bin. The earlier measurement [20] of the two photon cross-section, performed in \( \pi^- p \) interactions at \( \sqrt{s} = 23 \text{ GeV} \), is in good agreement with QCD predictions. However, that analysis covers a different region in \( x_T = 2p_T/\sqrt{s} \), where double prompt photon production is dominated by the annihilation diagram \( q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma \).
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Figure captions

Fig. 1a  Conversion fraction for photon candidates as a function of the cluster energy. The curves labeled $\varepsilon_1$ and $\varepsilon_\tau$ are the conversion probabilities for single photons and multiphoton background, respectively.

Fig. 1b  The fractional multiphoton background contamination in the sample of photon candidate events as a function of the reconstructed photon $p_T$.

Fig. 2  The invariant differential cross-section for direct photon production is compared with the next-to-leading order QCD calculation of Ref. [1] with two different sets of structure functions [16]: Duke–Owens set 1 (DO1); and Aurelche et al. (ABFOW) with an optimized $Q^2$ scale (OPT) and $Q^2 = p_T^2$. The errors shown include statistical and $p_T$ dependent systematic errors added in quadrature.

Fig. 3  Probability $\rho$ for electromagnetic clusters not generated by a direct photon to pass the photon identification cuts, as a function of the cluster $p_T$.

Fig. 4  Differential double prompt photon cross-section. The error bars include the statistical error and the $p_T$-dependent systematics. The superimposed curves are the NLO QCD calculations of Ref. [2] (dashed line) and of Ref. [3] (full line).
Figure 1a
Figure 4