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Abstract

Leading charm hadrons produced in hadron–nucleus interactions cannot be adequately described within the parton fusion model. Recent results on charm baryon production in Σ−A interactions at 330 GeV with the WA89 detector disagree with fusion predictions. Intrinsic heavy quark pairs in the Σ−(dds) wavefunction provide a simple mechanism for producing fast charm hadrons. We calculate leading charm baryon production from Σ−, π− and p projectiles in a two component model combining parton fusion with intrinsic charm. Final state D−, Λc+, Ξc+, and Λc0 distributions and D−/D+, D±/D± and Λc+/Λc− asymmetries are compared to WA89 data. Predictions are made for 650 GeV Σ−A and π−A interactions in the SELEX detector at Fermilab and for 800 GeV pA interactions.
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1. Introduction

One of the most striking features of charm hadroproduction is the leading particle effect: the strong correlation between the quantum numbers of the projectile and the final-state charm hadron. For example, more D− than D+ are produced at large xF in π−A → D±X interactions [1–5]. Such correlations are remarkable because they explicitly contradict the perturbative QCD factorization theorem [6] which predicts that...
heavy quarks hadronize through jet fragmentation functions independent of the initial state.

While leading charm effects are well established for $D$ mesons, observations of charm baryons are more rare [7]. Two experiments with $\Sigma^- (dds)$ beams promise to clarify the situation in the baryon sector. The hyperon beam, with a strange valence quark, presents a unique opportunity to study the flavor dependence of leading charm hadroproduction since both charm and charm-strange baryons can be leading. The first, WA89, which directs a 330 GeV hyperon beam on carbon and copper targets, has reported the $x_F$ distributions of $D^- (d\bar{c})$, $\Sigma_c^0 (ddc)$, $\Xi_c^+ (usc)$, and $\Lambda_c^+ (udc)$ [8] as well as the $D^- / D^+$, $D_s^- / D_s^+$ and $\Lambda_c / \Lambda_c$ production asymmetries [9]. The second, SELEX [10], has a large acceptance for forward charm production, enhancing the charm baryon yield. Their 650 GeV beam, approximately half $\pi^- (\bar{u}d)$ and $\Sigma^-$, promises to improve current samples from both beams by up to an order of magnitude. They also plan to study the $A$ dependence of leading charm.

In previous work [11,12], a QCD mechanism which produces leading charm at large $x_F$ was introduced. An important feature of the model is coalescence, the process through which a charm quark hadronizes by combining with quarks of similar rapidities, such as projectile spectator valence quarks. In a gauge theory the strongest attraction is expected to occur when the spectators and the produced quarks have equal velocities [13]. Thus the coalescence probability should be largest at small relative rapidity and rather low transverse momentum where the invariant mass of the $Qq$ system is minimized, enhancing the binding amplitude.

This coalescence occurs in the initial state where the projectile wavefunctions of e.g. the $\pi^-, p$ and $\Sigma^-$ can fluctuate into Fock configurations containing a $c\bar{c}$ pair such as $|\bar{u}dc\bar{c}\rangle$, $|uuucc\bar{c}\rangle$ or $|ddsc\bar{c}\rangle$ respectively. In these states, two or more gluons are attached to the charm quarks, reducing the amplitude by $O(a_s^2)$ relative to parton fusion [11]. The longest-lived fluctuations in states with invariant mass $M$ have a lifetime of $O(2P_{lab}/M^2)$ in the target rest frame where $P_{lab}$ is the projectile momentum. Since the comoving charm and valence quarks have the same rapidity in these states, the heavy quarks carry a large fraction of the projectile momentum and can thus readily combine to produce charm hadrons with large longitudinal momentum. Such a mechanism can then dominate the hadroproduction rate at large $x_F$. This is the underlying assumption of the intrinsic charm model [14] in which the wavefunction fluctuations are initially far off-shell. However, they materialize as charm hadrons when light spectator quarks in the projectile Fock state interact with the target [15]. Since such interactions are strong, charm production will occur primarily on the front face of the nucleus in the case of a nuclear target. Thus the intrinsic charm mechanism has a stronger $A$ dependence than charm production by leading-twist fusion.

In this work, we concentrate on the charm hadrons studied by WA89 and SELEX in order to further examine the relationship between fragmentation and coalescence mechanisms. The calculations are made within a two-component model: leading-twist fusion and intrinsic charm [11,12,16,17].
Leading particle correlations are also an integral part of the Monte Carlo program PYTHIA [18] based on the Lund string fragmentation model. In this model it is assumed that the heavy quarks are produced in the initial state with relatively small longitudinal momentum fractions by the leading-twist fusion processes. In order to produce a strong leading particle effect at large $x_F$, the string has to accelerate the heavy quark as it fragments into the final-state heavy hadron. Such a mechanism demands that large changes of the heavy quark momentum take place in the final state. Other models of leading charm production by recombination in the final state have been suggested [19,20]. However, in this work we will only compare our results with the commonly used PYTHIA Monte Carlo.

In this paper, we first discuss the conventional mechanism for charm production at leading-twist, parton fusion, and how the hyperon beam is taken into account in the model. Section 3 reviews the intrinsic charm model and describes the extension of the model used in this work. In Section 4 we compare our results on $\Sigma^-\Lambda$ interactions with the WA89 data and make predictions for SELEX with $\Sigma^-$ and $\pi^-$ beams as well as $p\Lambda$ interactions. Finally, we summarize our results.

2. Leading-twist charm production

In this section we briefly review the conventional leading-twist model for the production of charm hadrons in $\Sigma^-p$, $pp$ and $\pi^-p$ interactions. In leading-twist QCD, heavy quarks are produced by the fusion subprocesses $gg \rightarrow Q\bar{Q}$ and $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Q\bar{Q}$. The factorization theorem [6] predicts that fragmentation is independent of the quantum numbers of both the projectile and target. We will also show the corresponding distributions of charm hadrons predicted by the PYTHIA model [18].

Our calculations are at lowest order in $\alpha_s$. A constant factor $K \sim 2-3$ is included in the fusion cross section since the next-to-leading order $x_F$ distribution is larger than the leading-order distribution by an approximately constant factor [21]. An additional factor of two is included to obtain the single charm distribution, twice the $c\bar{c}$ cross section. Note that neither leading-order production nor the next-to-leading-order corrections can produce flavor correlations [22] such as those observed in leading charm production.

The charm hadron $x_F$ distribution, where $x_F = (2m_F/\sqrt{s}) \sinh y$, has the factorized form [17]

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dx_F} = \frac{\sqrt{s}}{2} x_a x_b \int H_{AB}(x_a, x_b) \frac{1}{E_1} \frac{D_{H/c}(z_3)}{z_3} dz_3 dy_2 dp_T^2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $a$ and $b$ are the initial partons, 1 and 2 are the produced charm quarks with $m_c = 1.5$ GeV, and 3 and 4 are the final-state charm hadrons. The convolution of the subprocess cross sections for $q\bar{q}$ annihilation and gluon fusion with the parton densities is included in $H_{AB}(x_a, x_b)$.
The fragmentation functions, \( H_{AB}(x_A, x_B) \), describe the hadronization of the charm quark where \( x = p_H/p_c \) is the fraction of the charm quark momentum carried by the charm hadron, assuming to be collinear to the charm quark. According to the factorization theorem, fragmentation is independent of the initial state and thus cannot produce flavor correlations, precluding a leading charm effect. This uncorrelated fragmentation will be modeled by two extremes: a delta function, \( \delta(z - 1) \), and the Peterson function [28], extracted from \( e^+e^- \) data. The Peterson function, derived from a non-hadronic initial state, predicts a softer \( x_F \) distribution than observed in hadroproduction, even at moderate \( x_F \) [17] since the fragmentation decelerates the charm quark. The parameters of the Peterson function we use here are taken from \( e^+e^- \) studies of D production [29]. Typically fits to charm baryon fragmentation functions suggest increased deceleration of the charm quark in final-state baryons relative to mesons. On the other hand, the delta-function assumes that the charm quark coalesces with a low-x spectator sea quark or a low momentum secondary quark with little or no momentum loss [17]. This
Since the differences between the same energies with our two choices of parton distributions in Figs. 2 and 3 respectively, differences between the dominance of gluon fusion, in Fig. 2a we show the ratio differences between the energy of the SELEX beam, using the GRV LO 94 parton densities. Gluon fusion contributions from Peterson fragmentation in harder distributions than those predicted by Peterson fragmentation. However, as shown in [8], even with this hard fragmentation the fusion model cannot account for the shape of leading charm baryon distributions. Fig. 1b shows the relative contributions from $gg$ fusion and $q\bar{q}$ annihilation to the total cross section at 650 GeV, the energy of the SELEX beam, using the GRV LO 94 parton densities. Gluon fusion clearly dominates the production until $x_F \approx 0.6$. We have checked that this is also true at the lower energy of the WA89 experiment, 330 GeV.

We compare the $\Sigma^- p$ distributions with those from $pp$ and $\pi^- p$ interactions at the same energies with our two choices of parton distributions in Figs. 2 and 3 respectively. Since the differences between the $\Sigma^- p$ and $pp$ $x_F$ distributions are rather small due to the dominance of gluon fusion, in Fig. 2a we show the ratio $\Sigma^- p/pp$ at 330 GeV. The differences between $\Sigma^- p$ and $pp$ production are somewhat larger for the GRV LO 94 assumption is more consistent with low $p_T$ charm hadroproduction data [30–32] than Peterson fragmentation.

In Fig. 1a we show the inclusive $x_F$ distributions calculated for both types of fragmentation in $\Sigma^- p$ interactions at 330 GeV. Both sets of parton distributions are also shown. Very little difference in either total cross section or shape of the $x_F$ distributions can be discerned between the two sets of parton distributions. The delta function results in harder distributions than those predicted by Peterson fragmentation for $x_F > 0.2$. However, as shown in [8], even with this hard fragmentation the fusion model cannot account for the shape of leading charm baryon distributions. Fig. 1b shows the relative contributions from $gg$ fusion and $q\bar{q}$ annihilation to the total cross section at 650 GeV, the energy of the SELEX beam, using the GRV LO 94 parton densities. Gluon fusion clearly dominates the production until $x_F \approx 0.6$. We have checked that this is also true at the lower energy of the WA89 experiment, 330 GeV.

We compare the $\Sigma^- p$ distributions with those from $pp$ and $\pi^- p$ interactions at the same energies with our two choices of parton distributions in Figs. 2 and 3 respectively. Since the differences between the $\Sigma^- p$ and $pp$ $x_F$ distributions are rather small due to the dominance of gluon fusion, in Fig. 2a we show the ratio $\Sigma^- p/pp$ at 330 GeV. The differences between $\Sigma^- p$ and $pp$ production are somewhat larger for the GRV LO 94
distributions. We note that in PYTHIA the hyperon valence quark distributions are an average of the proton valence distributions, based on 107 events, use all default program settings along with the GRV LO 94 parton distributions.

Fig. 2. Charm production by leading-twist fusion in $pp$ interactions. (a) The cross section ratios $\sigma_{pp}/\sigma_{\Sigma^- p}$ are given for two parton distribution functions with two different fragmentation functions at 330 GeV. The curves show calculations with the MRS D- set of parton distributions with delta function fragmentation (solid) and the Peterson function (dotted) and with the GRV LO 94 parton distributions with delta function fragmentation (dashed) and the Peterson function (dotted). In (b) calculations with the GRV LO 94 parton distributions with delta function fragmentation are given at 650 GeV for the $q\bar{q}$ component (dashed), $gg$ component (dot-dashed) and the total production cross section (solid). Charm hadron production in PYTHIA 6.115 at 330 GeV is shown in (c) and (d) with the distributions labeled as indicated.

The charm hadron distributions from PYTHIA 6.115 [18] for the three projectiles at 330 GeV beam energy are also shown in Figs. 1–3c,d. The PYTHIA calculations, based on $10^7$ events, use all default program settings along with the GRV LO 94 parton distributions. We note that in PYTHIA the hyperon valence quark distributions are an average of the proton valence distributions, $d_v^X = s_v^X = (u_v^0 + d_v^0)/3$. In Fig. 3c the $D^-$,
is weaker for charm-strange baryon production, presumably due to the additional mass.
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Fig. 3, Charm production by leading-twist fusion in π⁻ p interactions. (a) Two parton distribution functions with two different fragmentation functions are shown at 330 GeV. The curves show calculations with the MRS D⁻' parton distributions with delta function fragmentation (solid) and the Peterson function (dot-dashed) and with the GRV LO 94 parton distributions with delta function fragmentation (dashed) and the Peterson function (dotted). In (b) calculations with the GRV LO 94 parton distributions using delta function fragmentation are given at 650 GeV for the q̅q component (dashed), gg component (dot-dashed) and the total production cross section (solid). Charm hadron production in PYTHIA 6.115 at 330 GeV is shown in (c) and (d) with the distributions labeled as indicated.

$\Sigma_c^+(ddc)$, $\Lambda_c$ and $\Xi_c^0$ $x_F$ distributions are shown while the $D^+$, $D_s^-$, $\Sigma_c^0$ and $\Xi_c^+$ distributions are given in Fig. 3d. The magnitude of the curves reflect the relative abundancies of charm hadrons produced by PYTHIA.

The Lund string fragmentation model [18] produces charm quarks at string endpoints.

The strings pull the charm quarks toward the opposite endpoints, typically the beam remnants. When the two string endpoints are moving in the same general direction, the charm hadron can be produced with larger longitudinal momentum than the charm quark. In the case where the string invariant mass is too small for multiple particle production, a single hadron is produced [33], as in the $\Sigma_c^0(ddc)$ and $\Xi_c^0(dsc)$ which share two valence quarks with the $\Sigma^-$. These distributions have a minimum at $x_F \sim 0.3$ and 0.1 respectively and a peak at $x_F \sim 0.8$, illustrating the acceleration undergone by charm quarks by strings with small invariant mass. The $\Lambda_c$ and $\Xi_c^+$ are also accelerated by string fragmentation but the effect is not as strong because only one valence quark is in common with the projectile.

In contrast, with a proton beam, as shown in Fig. 2, only the $\Lambda_c$ shows strong forward acceleration due to the common $u$ and $d$ quarks with the maximum in the $x_F$ distribution occurring at $x_F \approx 0.8$. A second peak is notable for the $\Sigma_c^0$ but the acceleration effect is weaker for charm-strange baryon production, presumably due to the additional mass...
of the strange quark. While meson production does not show any significant leading behavior with a baryon projectile, the situation is reversed with the $\pi^{-}$ beam where $D$ and $D_{s}$ production is clearly forward of all charm baryon production, produced centrally in the forward $x_{F}$ region. We will make further comparisons with PYTHIA when our full model is discussed.

3. Intrinsic particle production

The wavefunction of a hadron in QCD can be represented as a superposition of Fock state fluctuations, e.g. $|n_{\nu}\rangle$, $|n_{\nu}g\rangle$, $|n_{\nu}Q\bar{Q}\rangle$, ... components where $n_{\nu} \equiv dds$ for a $\Sigma^{-}$, $uud$ for a proton and $\bar{u}d$ for a $\pi^{-}$. When the projectile scatters in the target, the coherence of the Fock components is broken and the fluctuations can hadronize either by uncorrelated fragmentation as for leading-twist production or coalescence with spectator quarks in the wavefunction [14,15]. The intrinsic heavy quark Fock components are generated by virtual interactions such as $gg \rightarrow Q\bar{Q}$ where the gluons couple to two or more projectile valence quarks. The probability to produce $Q\bar{Q}$ fluctuations scales as $\alpha_{s}^{2}(M_{Q\bar{Q}})/m_{Q}^{2}$ relative to leading-twist production [34]. Intrinsic $Q\bar{Q}$ Fock states are dominated by configurations with equal rapidity constituents so that, unlike sea quarks generated from a single parton, the intrinsic heavy quarks carry a large fraction of the parent momentum [14].

The frame-independent probability distribution of an $n$-particle $c\bar{c}$ Fock state is

$$\frac{dP_{c\bar{c}}^{n}}{dx_{i}...dx_{n}} = N_{n}\alpha_{s}^{4}(M_{c\bar{c}})\frac{\delta(1-\sum_{i=1}^{n}x_{i})}{(m_{h}^{2}-\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\tilde{m}_{i}^{2}/x_{i}))^{2}},$$

where $N_{n}$ normalizes the $|nc\bar{c}\rangle$ probability, $P_{c\bar{c}}^{n}$, and $n = 4, 5$ for meson and baryon production from the $|n_{\nu}c\bar{c}\rangle$ configuration. The delta function conserves longitudinal momentum. The dominant Fock configurations are closest to the light-cone energy shell and therefore the invariant mass, $M^{2} = \sum_{i}\tilde{m}_{i}^{2}/x_{i}$, is minimized where $\tilde{m}_{i}^{2} = k_{T,i}^{2} + m_{i}^{2}$ is the effective transverse mass of the $i$th particle and $x_{i}$ is the light-cone momentum fraction. Assuming $\langle k_{T,i}^{2}\rangle$ is proportional to the square of the constituent quark mass, we choose $\tilde{m}_{u} = 0.45$ GeV, $\tilde{m}_{s} = 0.71$ GeV, and $\tilde{m}_{c} = 1.8$ GeV [16,17].

The intrinsic charm production cross section for a single charm hadron from the $n$-particle state can be related to $P_{ic}^{n}$ and the inelastic $hN$ cross section by

$$\sigma_{ic}^{n}(hN) = P_{ic}^{n}\sigma_{hN}^{in}\frac{\mu^{2}}{4\tilde{m}_{c}^{2}}.$$  

The factor of $\mu^{2}/4\tilde{m}_{c}^{2}$ arises from the soft interaction which breaks the coherence of the Fock state. To set the scale of the coherence factor $\mu$ we assume that the NA3 diffractive $J/\psi$ cross section [35] can be attributed to intrinsic charm. In this experiment the nuclear dependence of $J/\psi$ production in $\pi^{-}A$ interactions into a "hard" contribution with a nearly linear $A$ dependence at low $x_{F}$ and a high $x_{F}$ "diffractive" contribution scaling as $A^{\beta}$ where $\beta = 0.77$ for pion and 0.71 for proton beams, characteristic of soft interactions.
Then we assume that the diffractive fraction of the production cross section [35] is the same for charmonium and charm hadrons. In Ref. [11], $\mu^2 \sim 0.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ was found. However, calculations with more recent parton densities suggest that $\mu^2 \sim 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2$. We thus obtain $\sigma_{1c}^A(\pi N) \approx 0.5 \mu\text{b}$ and $\sigma_{1c}^A(pN) \approx 0.7 \mu\text{b}$ at 200 GeV. We take $P_{\perp}^5 = 0.31\%$, as determined from an analysis of the EMC charm structure function data [36]. A recent reanalysis of the EMC data with next-to-leading-order calculations of leading-twist and intrinsic charm electroproduction with the presence of an intrinsic charm component in the proton at large $x_{Bj}$ of $\approx 1\%$ or less [37]. For simplicity, we will always assume that the total probability for a charm quark in an $|n_c\bar{c}\bar{c}\rangle$ state is $0.31\%$ [36,37], regardless of the projectile identity.

The inelastic $\Sigma^- p$ cross section has not been measured. However, the total and elastic $Ap$ cross sections have been parameterized for beam momenta less than 200 GeV albeit with large statistical uncertainties. Extrapolating these cross sections to 330 GeV, we found that $\sigma_{in}^{Ap} > \sigma_{pp}^{in}$ at this energy which seems unlikely. To be conservative, we therefore scaled $\sigma_{pp}^{in}$ to $\sigma_{Ap}^{in}$ at the highest measured $Ap$ energy and used the energy dependence of $\sigma_{pp}^{in}$ thereafter to set the scale for $\Sigma^- p$ interactions at larger values of $\sqrt{s}$.

There are two ways of producing charm hadrons from intrinsic $c\bar{c}$ states. The first is by uncorrelated fragmentation, previously discussed in Section 2. Additionally, if the projectile has the corresponding valence quarks, the charm quark can also hadronize by coalescence with the valence spectators. The coalescence mechanism thus introduces flavor correlations between the projectile and the final-state hadrons, producing e.g. $\Xi_0^+$'s with a large fraction of the $\Sigma^-$ momentum.

First we briefly discuss charm production by uncorrelated fragmentation. If we assume that the $c$ quark fragments into a $D$ meson, the $D$ distribution is

$$\frac{dP_{nC}^{ic}}{dx_H} = \int dz \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{dP_{nC}^{ic}}{dx_i} D_{D/c}(z) \delta(x_D - zx_c). \quad (8)$$

These distributions are assumed for all intrinsic charm production by uncorrelated fragmentation with $D_{H/c}(z) = \delta(z - 1)$. We will not use Peterson function fragmentation further in this work.

The coalescence distributions, on the other hand, are specific for the individual charm hadrons. It is reasonable to assume that the intrinsic charm Fock states are fragile and can easily materialize into charm hadrons in high-energy, low momentum transfer reactions through coalescence. These contributions, taken from Ref. [14], do not include any binding energy of the produced hadrons or any mass effects. The coalescence contribution to charm hadron production is

$$\frac{dP_{nF}^{ic}}{dx_D} = \int \prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{dP_{nF}^{ic}}{dx_i} \delta(x_H - x_{H_1} - \ldots - x_{H_n}). \quad (9)$$

The coalescence function is simply a delta function combining the momentum fractions of the quarks in the Fock state configuration that make up the valence quarks of the final-state hadron.
Table 1
The lowest number of partons needed in an intrinsic charm Fock state configuration for the charm particle to be produced by coalescence. Note that 4 and 5 correspond to the minimal \(|n_{vcc}\) configuration while the higher states refer to \(|n_{vccdd}\), etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>(\Sigma^-) (dds)</th>
<th>(p) (uud)</th>
<th>(\pi^-) ((\overline{ud}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D^- (d\overline{c}))</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D^+ (\overline{d}c))</td>
<td>7((d\overline{d}))</td>
<td>7((d\overline{d}))</td>
<td>6((d\overline{d}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Lambda_c (udc))</td>
<td>7((u\overline{u}))</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6((u\overline{u}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Sigma_c^0 (dsc))</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7((d\overline{s}))</td>
<td>6((d\overline{s}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D_s^- (s\overline{c}))</td>
<td>7((s\overline{s}))</td>
<td>7((s\overline{s}))</td>
<td>6((s\overline{s}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Xi_c^0 (dsc))</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7((s\overline{s}))</td>
<td>6((s\overline{s}))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\Xi_c^+ (usc))</td>
<td>7((u\overline{u}))</td>
<td>7((s\overline{s}))</td>
<td>8((s\overline{s}))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We now compare and contrast \(D^-, D^+, D_s^-\) and \(D_s^+\) meson and \(\Lambda_c\), \(\Sigma_c^0\), \(\Xi_c^0\) and \(\Xi_c^+\) baryon production by coalescence from \(\Sigma^-, p\) and \(\pi^-\) projectiles. We note that not all of these hadrons can be produced from the minimal intrinsic charm Fock state configuration, \(|n_{vcc}\). However, coalescence can also occur within higher fluctuations of the intrinsic charm Fock state. For example, in the proton, the \(D^+\) and \(\Xi_c^0\) can be produced by coalescence from \(|n_{vccdd}\) and \(|n_{vccss}\) configurations. These higher Fock state probabilities can be obtained using earlier results [12,38]. In a previous study of \(\psi\psi\) production from \(|n_{vcc}\) states [38] the double intrinsic charm production probability, \(P_{icc}\), was determined assuming that all the measured \(\psi\psi\) pairs [39,40] arise from these configurations. The resulting upper bound on the model, \(\sigma_{\psi\psi} = \sigma_{\psi\psi} (\pi^- N) \approx 20\) pb set by experiment [39], requires \(P_{icc} \approx 4.4\% P_{ic} [38,41]\). This value can then be used to estimate the probability of light quark pairs in an intrinsic charm state. We expect that the probability of additional light quark pairs in the Fock states to be larger than \(P_{icc}\),

\[
P_{icq} \approx \left( \frac{\hat{m}_c}{\hat{m}_q} \right)^2 P_{icc} , \quad (10)
\]

leading to \(P_{icu} = P_{icd} \approx 70.4\% P_{ic}\) and \(P_{ics} \approx 28.5\% P_{ic}\). To go to still higher configurations, e.g. for \(\Xi_c^{+}\) production from a \(\pi^-\), one can make the similar assumption that \(P_{icsu} = 70.4\% P_{ics}\).

In Table 1 we show the minimum number of partons needed in each configuration to produce a given charm hadron. When more than the minimal \(|n_{vcc}\) state is necessary for coalescence to occur, the additional light quark pairs required in the state are indicated. While we include the eight particle configuration necessary to produce a \(\Xi_c^+\) by coalescence from a \(\pi^-\) projectile, we will confine our discussion to charm hadron production from the minimal state and states with one additional \(q\overline{q}\) pair only.

The total intrinsic charm contribution to charm hadron production is a combination of uncorrelated fragmentation and coalescence. In previous works [11,12,16,17] only production by uncorrelated fragmentation from the minimal \(|n_{vcc}\) states and coalescence from the minimum Fock state configuration was considered. This was so because a significant leading effect is present only in the minimal configuration, i.e. there is
Fig. 4. Charm hadron production in the intrinsic charm model with a $\Sigma^-$ projectile. The probability distributions, $(1/P_{inc}^e)(dP_{inc}^e/dx_H)$, for uncorrelated fragmentation and coalescence are given for the minimal 5-particle Fock state (a) and for the 7-particle Fock states with light quarks $q = u, d$ (b) and with strange quarks (c). The solid curve in each case is the charm quark distribution which also serves as the hadron distribution for independent fragmentation. The other curves are the probability distributions for hadron production by coalescence, including: $D^-$ (dashed), $\Sigma^0_2$ (dot-dashed), $\Xi^0_c$ (dot-dash-dashed) and $D_s^+$ (dotted). If the shape of the probability distribution is the same for any two hadrons (such as the $\Sigma^0_c$ and the $A^+_c$ in (b)) in a configuration, it is indicated.

no difference between $D^+$ and $D^-$ mesons produced from $|n_v c\bar{c}d\bar{d}|$ states. Also, as more partons are included in the Fock state, the coalescence distributions soften and approach the fragmentation distributions, eventually producing charm hadrons with less momentum than uncorrelated fragmentation from the minimal $c\bar{c}$ state if a sufficient number of $q\bar{q}$ pairs are included. There is then no longer any advantage to introducing more light quark pairs into the configuration—the relative probability will decrease while the potential gain in momentum is not significant. However, if some fraction of the final-state hadrons are assumed to be produced from higher Fock configurations, then all possible final states from those configurations should also be included. Therefore in this paper, we consider production by fragmentation and coalescence from the minimal state and the next higher states with $u\bar{u}, d\bar{d}$ and $s\bar{s}$ pairs.

The probability distributions, $(1/P_{inc}^e)(dP_{inc}^e/dx_H)$, are given in Figs. 4–6 for $\Sigma^-$, $p$ and $\pi^-$ projectiles respectively. It is clear from Fig. 4 that the $\Sigma^-$ projectile allows the greatest coalescence production of charm hadrons from the minimal Fock configuration, Fig. 4a. The charm baryons are quite fast, taking more than 50% of the projectile momentum. The difference between charm and charm-strange hadron production is very small due to the strange and light quark mass difference. Because the strange quark is more massive, it carries a somewhat larger fraction of the $\Sigma^-$ momentum than the light quarks, resulting in a slightly larger average momentum for the $\Xi^0_c$ and the $D_s^-$. 
relative to the $\Sigma^0$ and $D^-$, on the order of 3–4%, as can be seen in Table 2. The $c$ quark distribution itself, leading to uncorrelated fragmentation, carries $\approx 25\%$ of the projectile momentum in the minimal state. This is reduced by $\approx 35\%$ in the seven-particle Fock configurations. In this model, the $c$ and $\bar{c}$ probability distributions are identical. We note that these higher configurations can produce, for example, $\Sigma^0$ and $\Lambda_c$ baryons from $|n c \bar{c} d d\rangle$ and $|n c \bar{c} u u\rangle$ states respectively with the same probability distribution, shown in Fig. 4b, but not necessarily with the same relative probability, as we will show shortly. Introducing an $s\bar{s}$ pair to the 7-particle configuration reduces the average momentum of the final-state hadron by $\approx 2\%$ over the average in the 7-particle configurations with lighter $q\bar{q}$ pairs. In addition to the reduction of the average momentum of the $c$ quark in the higher configurations, the final-state charm hadron momentum from this configuration is reduced as well, suggesting that no more significant contribution to the overall momentum of the final hadron will be obtained by including yet higher Fock configurations.

While fewer charm hadrons can be directly produced from the minimal configuration of a proton projectile, as evident from Fig. 5, their average momentum is somewhat higher than the $\Sigma^-$ due to the absence of the strange valence quark. However, this only affects the final-state average momentum by 1–2%. Final-state charm hadrons from a pion projectile, shown in Fig. 6 have, on average, 20% more momentum than from a
Fig. 6. Charm hadron production in the intrinsic charm model with a $\pi^-$ projectile. The probability distributions, $(1/P_{inc}^H)(dP_H^H/dx_H)$, for uncorrelated fragmentation and coalescence are given for the minimal 5-particle Fock state (a) and for the 7-particle Fock states with light quarks $q = u, d$ (b) and with strange quarks (c). The solid curve in each case is the charm quark distribution which also serves as the hadron distribution for independent fragmentation. The other curves are the probability distributions for hadron production by coalescence, including: $D^-$ (dashed), $A_c^+$ (dot-dashed), $B_c^0$ (dot-dash-dashed) and $D_S^+$ (dotted). If the shape of the probability distribution is the same for any two hadrons (such as the $\Sigma_c^0$ and the $A_c^+$ in (b)) in a configuration, it is indicated.

baryon projectile because the total velocity is shared between fewer initial partons. Note also that mesons from a four-particle Fock configuration and baryons from a six-particle Fock state each receive half of the projectile momentum.

4. Model predictions

We now turn to specific predictions of our model. We begin with the $x_F$ distribution of the final-state charm hadrons. The $x_F$ distribution for final-state hadron $H$ is the sum of the leading-twist fusion and intrinsic charm components,

$$\frac{d\sigma_{hN}^H}{dx_F} = \frac{d\sigma_{Ht}^H}{dx_F} + \frac{d\sigma_{ic}^H}{dx_F}, \quad (11)$$

where $d\sigma_{ic}^H/dx_F$ is related to $dP_H/dx_F$ by

$$\frac{d\sigma_{ic}^H}{dx_F} = \frac{\mu^2}{4m_c^2} \frac{dP_H}{dx_F}. \quad (12)$$

The probability distribution is the sum of all contributions from the $|n_H\bar{c}\bar{c}\rangle$ and the $|n_Hc\bar{c}q\bar{q}\rangle$ configurations with $q = u, d, s$ and includes uncorrelated fragmentation
production from the beam in our model in detail. The full complement of equations

Thus when a particular final-state hadron can be produced both by uncorrelated frag-

We note that the combined probability of fragmentation and coalescence of all charm

probabilities by 0.5 to keep the total probability fixed.

coalescence probability which enhances the production of leading charm at large

fragmentation have equal probability in both leading-twist fusion and intrinsic charm.

table 1, only a fraction of the possible final-state hadrons can be produced by coalescence. We use a simple counting scheme to arrive at the

coalescence probability which enhances the production of leading charm at large

and coalescence when appropriate, as described below. We use the same fragmentation

function, either the delta or Peterson function, to calculate uncorrelated fragmentation

in both leading-twist fusion and intrinsic charm. In this section, we use only the delta

function.

Since experimental information on the relative rates of charm hadron production is

incomplete, we assume that all the lowest lying charm hadrons produced by uncorrelated

fragmentation have equal probability in both leading-twist fusion and intrinsic charm. There are ten charm hadrons—and the same number of anticharm hadrons—if excited

charm hadrons such as D* and A+(2593) are excluded. Therefore the probability dis-

tribution for uncorrelated fragmentation into each of these hadrons is 10% of the total

probability. As can be seen in Table 1, only a fraction of the possible final-state hadrons

and coalescence production from the intrinsic charm model is calculated, we will describe D+ and D−

production from the Σ− beam in our model in detail. The full complement of equations
for all the final-state charm hadrons from $\Sigma^-$, $p$ and $\pi^-$ projectiles considered in this work can be found in Appendix A. In the $|ddsc\bar{c}\rangle$ configuration, there are four final-state hadrons with a valence $c$ quark ($2\Xi^0_c$, $\Sigma^0_c$ and $J/\psi$) and also four final-state hadrons with a valence $\bar{c}$ quark ($2D^-$, $D^-_s$ and $J/\psi$). Note that the $J/\psi$ has been counted in each category. The $D^-$ is then produced by coalescence with 50% of the total coalescence probability for hadrons with a valence $\bar{c}$ as well as by uncorrelated fragmentation of the $\bar{c}$ while the $D^+$ is only produced by uncorrelated fragmentation from state. The probability distributions from this minimal Fock configuration are then

\[
\frac{dP^5_{D^-}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{5F}_{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP^{5C}_{ic}}{dx_F} \right),
\]

\[
\frac{dP^5_{D^+}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{5F}_{ic}}{dx_F},
\]

where $F$ refers to uncorrelated fragmentation and $C$ to coalescence into the specific final state with the associated probability distribution, shown in Fig. 4a. The $|ddsc\bar{c}qq\rangle$ configurations where $q\bar{q} = u\bar{u}$, $d\bar{d}$ and $s\bar{s}$ allow coalescence production of eight final-state hadrons with a valence $c$ and five final-state hadrons with a valence $\bar{c}$ in each case. We will discuss $D^+$ and $D^-$ from each of these configurations in turn. When $q\bar{q} = u\bar{u}$, the possible hadrons produced by coalescence are: $2\Xi^+_c$, $\Xi^0_c$, $2\Lambda^+_c$, $\Sigma^0_c$, $D^0$ and $J/\psi$ with a valence $c$ and $2D^-$, $D^-_s$, $\bar{D}^0$ and $J/\psi$ with a valence $\bar{c}$. A final state $D^+$ can be produced by coalescence from the $d\bar{d}$ configuration in one of the eight possible final-state hadrons with a valence $c$ quark ($3\Sigma^0_c$, $3\Xi^0_c$, $D^+$ and $J/\psi$) while the $D^-$ is produced by coalescence in three out of five combinations ($3D^-$, $D^-_s$ and $J/\psi$) with a valence $\bar{c}$. The $s\bar{s}$ configuration yields no $D^+$ by coalescence—$4\Xi^0_c$, $\Sigma^0_c$, $\Omega^0_c(ssc)$, $D^+_s$ and $J/\psi$ are allowed—while $2D^-$ are allowed out of five possible hadrons with valence $\bar{c}$ quarks—$2D^-$, $2D^-_s$ and $J/\psi$. Finally, the total intrinsic charm probability distribution for these mesons is:

\[
\frac{dP_{D^-}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{7F}_{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP^{7C}_{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{7F}_{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{2}{5} \frac{dP^{7C}_{ic}}{dx_F} \right),
\]

\[
\frac{dP_{D^+}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{7F}_{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{7C}_{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{7F}_{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{8} \frac{dP^{7C}_{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{7F}_{ic}}{dx_F}.
\]

Lastly we note that only fragmentation from the minimal Fock state was included along with coalescence from the lowest possible configuration in earlier work [11,12,17]. This corresponds to the first term of the $D^-$ probability distribution while the $D^+$ distribution would be proportional to $0.5(\frac{1}{10} dP^{5F}/dx_F + \frac{1}{2} dP^{5C}/dx_F)$.

We must also account for the fact that most of the data are taken on nuclear targets. In this case, the model assumes a linear $A$ dependence for leading-twist fusion and an $A^\alpha$ dependence for the intrinsic charm component [35] where $\alpha = 0.77$ for pions and 0.71 for protons (and $\Sigma^-$)
We now compare the model calculations, both the full model of Eqs. (15) and (16) and the simpler model used previously, to the WA89 data [8] on carbon and copper targets in Fig. 7. Since the data are unnormalized, we have normalized all curves to the first data point. The dot-dashed and dotted curves are results with the previous simplified model [11,12,17] on carbon and copper targets respectively. The full model is illustrated in the solid and dashed curves for the same targets. The agreement with the data is quite reasonable given both the low statistics of the data and our normalization to the first data point rather than fitting the normalization to the data. The differences in the model distributions are most obvious for the $\Sigma^+$, shown in Fig. 7c. The simpler model emphasizes the coalescence production from the $\mathcal{N}c\bar{c}$ state only. As can be seen from Fig. 4 and Table 2, the average $x_F$ of the coalescence distribution is more than a factor of two larger than that of a $\Sigma^0$ production by independent fragmentation of a $c$ quark, producing a shoulder in the $x_F$ distribution, particularly for the carbon target (dot-dashed curve). Because the $\Sigma^+$ is produced by coalescence with $\approx 30\%$ less average momentum from the 7-particle Fock states, the intermediate $x_F$ region is partially filled in, resulting in a smoother $x_F$ distribution even though the probability

$$\frac{d\sigma^H_{hA}}{dx_F} = A \frac{d\sigma^H_{ic}}{dx_F} + A^a \frac{d\sigma^H_{ic}}{dx_F}. \tag{17}$$

This $A$ dependence is included in the calculations. The intrinsic charm contribution to the longitudinal momentum distributions per nucleon is thus reduced for nuclear targets.
Table 3
The average value of $x_F$ for charm particles produced in the full model for $\Sigma^-$, $p$ and $\pi^-$ projectiles on a copper target. The model results are given at 330 GeV and 650 GeV for $\Sigma^-$-Cu interactions, 650 GeV for $\pi^-$-Cu interactions and 800 GeV for $p$-Cu interactions. For comparison, the average from PYTHIA at $x_F > 0$ in each case is also shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This Model</th>
<th>$\Sigma^-$-Cu (330)</th>
<th>$\Sigma^-$-Cu (650)</th>
<th>$\pi^-$-Cu (650)</th>
<th>$p$-Cu (800)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$D^-$ ($d\bar{c}$)</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D^+$ ($\bar{d}c$)</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_c$ ($udc$)</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma^0$ ($ddc$)</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D^-$ ($s\bar{c}$)</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D^+$ ($\bar{s}c$)</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Xi^0_c$ ($dsc$)</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Xi^+$ ($usc$)</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PYTHIA</th>
<th>$\Sigma^-$-$p$ (330)</th>
<th>$\Sigma^-$-$p$ (650)</th>
<th>$\pi^-$-$p$ (650)</th>
<th>$pp$ (800)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$D^-$ ($d\bar{c}$)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D^+$ ($\bar{d}c$)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_c$ ($udc$)</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Sigma^0$ ($ddc$)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D^-$ ($s\bar{c}$)</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D^+$ ($\bar{s}c$)</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Xi^0_c$ ($dsc$)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Xi^+$ ($usc$)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is reduced for the higher Fock states. Similar results can be seen for the other charm hadrons in Fig. 7.

Note that the model results are in much better agreement with the data than the PYTHIA simulations at the same energy with the default settings, shown in Fig. 1c,d. If the PYTHIA predictions are superimposed on Fig. 7 with the same normalization as our model, the PYTHIA results would considerably exceed the data at large $x_F$ for the charm baryons. In particular, since the c quark is pulled forward by a valence $dd$ diquark, the $\Sigma^0_c$ rate from PYTHIA at $x_F \approx 0.8$ would exceed the data by nearly four orders of magnitude. The differences in the results are also obvious in Table 3 where the average $x_F$ of all the model distributions on a copper target are compared to PYTHIA calculations with a proton target at the same energy.

Another way to quantify leading charm production is through the asymmetry between leading and non-leading charm. The asymmetry is defined as

$$A(x_F) = \frac{d\sigma_L/dx_F - d\sigma_{NL}/dx_F}{d\sigma_L/dx_F + d\sigma_{NL}/dx_F},$$

where $L$ represents the leading and $NL$ the non-leading charm hadron. High statistics
Some of the discrepancies between the model and the data may arise from the relatively full model giving a larger asymmetry between enhanced by coalescence production from the 7-particle configurations, see also Fig. 7a. Our results with the full model are in qualitative agreement with the data, shown in Fig. 8a. The measured $D^-/D^+$ asymmetry. The measured $D^-/D^+$, $D_s^-/D_s^+$ and $\Lambda_c^+/$, as well as our prediction for the $D^-/\Xi_c^0$ asymmetry. The solid and dashed curves represent our full model, with the intrinsic charm probability distributions given in Eqs. (A.1)–(A.8) for carbon and copper targets respectively. The dot-dashed and dotted curves for carbon and copper targets respectively contrast the results with the simplified model which considers only fragmentation from the minimal Fock state and coalescence only from the state with the minimum number of partons necessary to produce it.

Statistics are unfortunately limited on charm production by baryon beams. Recently the WA89 collaboration has presented the $D^-/D^+$, $D_s^-/D_s^+$ and $\Lambda_c^+/$ asymmetries from their $\Sigma^-$ data [9]. In Fig. 8 we compare our calculations with both models to this data as well as show a prediction for the asymmetry between the $D^-$ and $\Xi_c^0$, both of which are produced from the partons of the minimal Fock configuration. The full model gives a larger asymmetry between $D^-$ and $D^+$ at low $x_F$ than the simpler assumptions of previous work [11,12] because $D^-$ production at intermediate $x_F$ is enhanced by coalescence production from the 7-particle configurations, see also Fig. 7a. Our results with the full model are in qualitative agreement with the data, shown in Fig. 8a. The measured $D_s^-/D_s^+$ and $\Lambda_c^+/$ asymmetries are larger than our predictions at intermediate $x_F$. The probability distribution for $\Lambda_c^+$ in our model is

$$\frac{dP_{\Lambda_c^+}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{\Lambda_c^+}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{\Xi_c^0}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{\Xi_c^0}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{\Xi_c^0}}{dx_F}. \quad (19)$$

Some of the discrepancies between the model and the data may arise from the relatively
section grows faster than from 330 GeV to 650 GeV. A smaller decrease is found from the PYTHIA model, leading the $\bar{c}c$ because the more massive valence s quark carries more of the velocity.

The asymmetry between $D_-$ and $\bar{c}$ can be thought of as a virtual $D_-$ fluctuation, as has been suggested for proton fluctuations into $K^+A$ [43,44] and $D^-\Lambda_c^+$ [44]. The $D^-/\Xi_c^0$ asymmetry is positive at first since the $D^- x_F$ distribution is larger at intermediate $x_F$, especially when the 7-particle configurations are included. At larger $x_F$, the baryon distributions always lead over charm mesons produced in the same configuration, causing the $D^-/\Xi_c^0$ asymmetry to approach $-1$ as $x_F \to 1$. Similar results should be expected from the models of Refs. [43,44].

We now turn to predictions of charm hadron production at SELEX with 650 GeV beams of $\Sigma^-$ and $\pi^-$ [10]. First we give the charm hadron $x_F$ distributions for $\Sigma^-\text{Cu}$ interactions and the relevant asymmetries in Fig. 9. Since the leading-twist fusion cross section grows faster than $\sigma^{\text{LT}}$, the average $x_F$ of the particles studied decreases $\approx 30\%$ from 330 GeV to 650 GeV. A smaller decrease is found from the PYTHIA model, showing the relative strength of the string fragmentation mechanism, as can be seen in Table 3. The $\Xi_c^0$ is clearly the hardest distribution, followed by the $\Sigma_c^0$. The $\Xi_c^0$ leads the $\Sigma_c^0$ because the more massive valence s quark carries more of the $\Sigma^-$ velocity.

Fig. 9. Predictions for charm hadron production are given in our full model for $\Sigma^-\text{Cu}$ interactions at 650 GeV. The individual $x_F$ distributions are given in (a) and (b). All cross sections are compared to the leading-twist fusion calculation in the solid curve. In (a) the hadron distributions are $D^-$ (dashed), $\Lambda_c^+$ (dot-dashed), $\Xi_c^0$ (dotted) and $D_s^-$ (dot-dashed-dashed). In (b) the hadron distributions are $D^+$ (dashed), $\Sigma_c^0$ (dot-dashed), $\Xi_c^0$ (dotted) and $D_s^+$ (dot-dashed-dashed). Predictions of the asymmetries are given in (c) for $D^-/D^+$ (solid) and $D^-/D_s^-$ (dashed) while the prediction for the $D^-/\Xi_c^0$ asymmetry is given in (d).
shown because the model predicts identical $D_-$ and $D^+$ meson and decreasing the predicted leading charm enhancement. Additionally, we note that charm fusion calculation in the solid curve. In (a) the hadron distributions are $D^-$ (dashed), $A_c^+$ (dot-dashed), $E_{c}^{0}$ (dotted) and $D_z^-$ (dot-dashed-dashed). In (b) the hadron distributions are $D^+$ (dashed), $s_{c}^{0}$ (dot-dashed), $E_{c}^{+}$ (dotted) and $D_z^{+}$ (dot-dashed-dashed). A prediction of the $D^-/D^+$ asymmetry is given in (c).

than the $d$ valence quarks. The $E_{c}^+$ leads the $A_c^+$ in the 7-particle $u\bar{u}$ state for the same reason. The $D^-$ and $D_z^-$, also produced from the 5-particle state have the hardest meson distributions but lag the baryons. The $D^+$ and $D_z^+$ have the softest distributions with the $D^+$ slightly harder because the quarks in the $dd$ configuration get slightly more velocity than the $s\bar{s}$ configuration with the more massive strange quarks. The asymmetries, which should be compared to the dashed curves in Fig. 8, are somewhat reduced at higher energies, again due to the larger leading-twist cross section.

Since SELEX will also measure charm hadroproduction with a $\pi^-$ beam at the same energy, these predictions are shown in Fig. 10. Because only the $D^-$ is produced from the minimal Fock state configuration, it shows the hardest $x_F$ distribution in Fig. 10a. Note that since $c\bar{c}$ production by leading-twist fusion alone is already significantly harder than the equivalent production by baryon projectiles, the distributions produced by coalescence from 6-particle configurations are not substantially enhanced over the fusion cross section, even at large $x_F$. The intrinsic charm cross section is proportional to $\sigma_N^{c\bar{c}}$, which increases slowly compared to the leading-twist cross section, further decreasing the predicted leading charm enhancement. Additionally, we note that charm baryons lead mesons produced by coalescence only in the 6-particle configurations since the baryons take $\approx 50\%$ of the pion momentum while the mesons take less, as seen in Fig. 6 and Table 2. The PYTHIA distributions in Fig. 3, aside from the leading $D^-$, are more central, also evident from Table 3. In Fig. 10c, only the $D^-/D^+$ asymmetry is shown because the model predicts identical $D_z^-$ and $D_z^+$ meson and $A_c$ and $\bar{A}_c$ baryon
suffered in the past from a lack of statistics and high precision proton data, compared to that from I- and projectiles, could eliminate certain models.

A comprehensive understanding of data with proton projectiles has compared to the 7-particle \( s^{-}\) state. The model predicts a strong \( D^{-}/D^{+} \) asymmetry as well as a \( D^{-}/A_{c}^{+} \) asymmetry, comparable to the \( D^{-}/E_{c}^{0}/D_{s}^{+} \) asymmetry predicted for the \( \Sigma^{-}A \) interactions. On the other hand, the \( D^{-}/D_{s}^{+} \) asymmetry is quite weak. Such measurements with a proton beam would provide a useful complement to a high statistics \( \Sigma^{-} \) measurement. A comprehensive understanding of data with proton projectiles has suffered in the past from a lack of statistics and high precision proton data, compared to that from \( \Sigma^{-} \) and \( \pi^{-} \) projectiles, could eliminate certain models.

Fig. 11. Predictions for charm hadron production are given in our full model for \( pCu \) interactions at 800 GeV. The individual \( x_{F} \) distributions are given in (a) and (b). All cross sections are compared to the leading-twist fusion calculation in the solid curve. In (a) the hadron distributions are \( D^{-} \) (dashed), \( A_{c}^{+} \) (dot-dashed), \( E_{c}^{0} \) (dotted) and \( D_{s}^{+} \) (dot dashed dashed). In (b) the hadron distributions are \( D^{+} \) (dashed), \( \Sigma_{c}^{0} \) (dot-dashed), \( E_{c}^{+} \) (dotted) and \( D_{s}^{+} \) (dot dashed dashed). Predictions of the asymmetries are given in (c) for \( D^{-}/D^{+} \) (solid) and \( D_{s}^{-}/D_{s}^{+} \) (dashed) while the prediction for the \( D^{-}/A_{c}^{+} \) asymmetry is given in (d).

distributions, see Appendix A, hence no asymmetry. We note that the asymmetry is reduced compared to calculations at lower energy [11].

The primary proton beam for fixed-target experiments at Fermilab is 800 GeV so for completeness, we also give predictions for a possible \( pA \) measurement at this energy in Fig. 11. In this case, the \( A_{c}^{+} \) has the hardest \( x_{F} \) distribution followed by the \( D^{-} \), both of which are produced by coalescence from the 5-particle Fock state. Again, the \( \Sigma_{c}^{0} \) and \( D^{+} \) are somewhat harder than the \( E_{c}^{+} \) and \( D_{s}^{+} \) distributions respectively due to the relative partitioning of the parton velocity in the 7-particle \( u\bar{u} \) and \( d\bar{d} \) configurations compared to the 7-particle \( s\bar{s} \) state. The model predicts a strong \( D^{-}/D^{+} \) asymmetry as well as a \( D^{-}/A_{c}^{+} \) asymmetry, comparable to the \( D^{-}/E_{c}^{0}/D_{s}^{+} \) asymmetry predicted for the \( \Sigma^{-}A \) interactions. On the other hand, the \( D_{s}^{-}/D_{s}^{+} \) asymmetry is quite weak. Such measurements with a proton beam would provide a useful complement to a high statistics \( \Sigma^{-} \) measurement. A comprehensive understanding of data with proton projectiles has suffered in the past from a lack of statistics and high precision proton data, compared to that from \( \Sigma^{-} \) and \( \pi^{-} \) projectiles, could eliminate certain models.
5. Summary and conclusions

We have refined the intrinsic charm model of Refs. [11,12,17], including both the minimal Fock state and all the configurations with an additional q̅q pair. We have applied a simple counting scheme to determine the relative contribution of each state to the final charm hadron distribution. The model compares rather favorably to the \( x_F \) distributions measured by WA89 [8] and produces reasonable agreement with their measured \( D^-/D^+ \) asymmetry while falling short of the \( D^-/D^+ \) and \( \Lambda_c/\bar{\Lambda}_c \) data [9] at intermediate \( x_F \).

Further, we have made predictions for charm hadron production at the energy of SELEX for both \( \Sigma^- \) and \( \pi^- \) projectiles. Predictions for production by an 800 GeV proton beam are also given. High statistics data on charm production from a combination of these projectiles could eliminate certain classes of models and perhaps distinguish between coalescence in the initial state, as in the intrinsic charm model, and in the final state, as in models such as PYTHIA [18]. The simple counting scheme employed here could be replaced with relative rates from data. However, the shapes of the distributions would not change significantly in our model. Therefore a collection of charm production data could define the role of intrinsic charm in future experiments.
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Appendix A

Here we give the probability distributions for \( D^- \), \( D^+ \), \( D_s^- \) and \( D_s^+ \) mesons and \( \Lambda_c^+, \Sigma_c^0, \Xi_c^0 \) and \( \Xi_c^+ \) baryons for production by the minimal and first three higher Fock state configurations from \( \Sigma^- \), proton and \( \pi^- \) projectiles. The probability distributions for each final state are given in Figs. 4–6. We note that the predictions for \( \Lambda_c^+ \) and \( \Sigma_c^+ \) are identical in all cases because their quark content is the same. Recall that \( P_{ic}^5 = 0.31\% \), \( P_{icd}^7 = P_{icd}^7 = 70.4\% \), \( P_{icd}^5 \) and \( P_{icd}^5 = 28.5\% \).

We begin with the \( \Sigma^- \). In the \( |ddsc\bar{c}\rangle \) configuration, there are four final-state hadrons with a valence \( c \) quark (\( 2\Sigma_c^0, \Xi_c^0 \) and \( J/\psi \)) and also four final-state hadrons with a valence \( \bar{c} \) quark (\( 2D_s^-, D_s^+ \) and \( J/\psi \)). The \( |ddsc\bar{c}q\bar{q}\rangle \) configurations where \( q\bar{q} = u\bar{u} \), \( d\bar{d} \) and \( s\bar{s} \) allow coalescence production of eight possible final-state hadrons with a valence \( c \) and five possible final-state hadrons with a valence \( \bar{c} \). When \( q\bar{q} = u\bar{u} \), the possible hadrons produced by coalescence are \( 2\Xi_c^+, \Xi_c^0, 2\Lambda_c^+, \Sigma_c^0, D_s^0 \) and \( J/\psi \) with a valence \( c \) and \( 2D_s^-, D_s^+, \bar{D}_s^0 \) and \( J/\psi \) with a valence \( \bar{c} \). The \( d\bar{d} \) configuration allows coalescence production of the following hadrons with a valence \( c \) quark, \( 3\Sigma_c^0, 3\Xi_c^0, D_s^+ \) and \( J/\psi \), and, with a valence \( \bar{c} \), \( 3D_s^-, D_s^- \) and \( J/\psi \). The \( s\bar{s} \) configuration yields \( 4\Xi_c^0 \),
We have

\[ \frac{dP_{D^-}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{17F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{2}{5} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right), \]  
\( A.1 \)

\[ \frac{dP_{D^+}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{7F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{17F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{8} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{7F}^{ic}}{dx_F}, \]  
\( A.2 \)

\[ \frac{dP_{A^+}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{17F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{8} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F}, \]  
\( A.3 \)

\[ \frac{dP_{D^0}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{17F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{5} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right), \]  
\( A.4 \)

\[ \frac{dP_{D^-}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{17F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{2}{5} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right), \]  
\( A.5 \)

\[ \frac{dP_{\Xi^0}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{17F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{8} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right), \]  
\( A.6 \)

\[ \frac{dP_{\Xi^+}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{17F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{8} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right), \]  
\( A.7 \)

\[ \frac{dP_{\Xi^-}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{17F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{8} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right), \]  
\( A.8 \)

Fewer charm hadrons are produced by coalescence from the five-quark configuration of the proton since it has no valence strange quark. In the \(uudc\bar{c}\) configuration, there are four final-state hadrons with a valence c quark (2\(\Lambda^+_c\), \(\Sigma^{++}_c\) (uuc) and \(J/\psi\)) and also four final-state hadrons with a valence \(\bar{c}\) quark (2\(D^-\), 2\(D_s^-\) and \(J/\psi\)). The \(uudc\bar{c}q\bar{q}\) configurations allow coalescence production of eight possible final-state hadrons with a valence c and five possible final-state hadrons with a valence \(\bar{c}\). When \(q\bar{q} = u\bar{u}\), the possible hadrons produced by coalescence are 3\(\Lambda^+_c\), 3\(\Sigma^{++}_c\), \(D^0\) and \(J/\psi\) with a valence c and \(D^-\), 3\(\bar{D}^0\) and \(J/\psi\) with a valence \(\bar{c}\). The \(dd\) configuration allows coalescence production of the following hadrons with a valence c quark, 4\(\Lambda^+_c\), \(\Sigma^{++}_c\), \(\Sigma^{'+}_c\), \(\bar{D}^-\) and \(J/\psi\), and, with a valence \(\bar{c}\), 2\(D^-\), 2\(\bar{D}^0\) and \(J/\psi\). The \(ss\) configuration yields 2\(\Xi^+_c\), \(\Xi^0_c\), 2\(\Lambda^+_c\), \(\Sigma^{++}_c\), \(D_s^-\) and \(J/\psi\) while the final-state valence \(\bar{c}\) quarks hadrons are 2\(D^-\), \(\bar{D}^0\), \(D_s^-\) and \(J/\psi\). Then
production of the following hadrons with a valence c quark, and there are two possible final-state hadrons with a valence c quark. Charm and anticharm hadron production is more symmetric from the a:

Charm and anticharm hadron production is more symmetric from the π⁻ because the projectile contains a valence antiquark of its own. In the minimal | udcc ¯c ⟩ configuration, there are two possible final-state hadrons with a valence c quark (D⁰ and J/ψ) and also two possible final-state hadrons with a valence ¯c quark (D⁻ and J/ψ). The | udcc ¯q ¯q ⟩ configurations allow coalescence production of four possible final-state hadrons with a valence c and likewise four possible final-state hadrons with a valence ¯c. When q ¯q = u ¯u, the possible hadrons produced by coalescence are: Λ⁺, 2D⁰ and J/ψ with a valence c and D⁻, D⁰, Σ⁺ and J/ψ with a valence ¯c. The d ¯q configuration allows coalescence production of the following hadrons with a valence c quark, Σ⁰, D⁰, D⁺ and J/ψ, and, with a valence ¯c, D⁻, D⁰, Λ⁺ and J/ψ. The s ¯s configuration yields Ξ⁰, D⁺, D⁰ and J/ψ with a valence c while the possible final-state valence ¯c quarks hadrons are D⁻, D⁻, Ξ⁻ and J/ψ. In this case

\[
\frac{dP_D^-}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{7F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right),
\]

\[
\frac{dP_D^+}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{5F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP_{5C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP_{7F}^{ic}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP_{7C}^{ic}}{dx_F} \right),
\]
\[
\frac{dP_{A_2}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{4F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP^{6C}_{1c}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{1}{dx_F}, \\
\frac{dP_{\Sigma^0}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{4F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP^{6C}_{1c}}{dx_F} \right) + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F}, \\
\frac{dP_{D^-}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{4F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP^{6C}_{1c}}{dx_F} \right), \\
\frac{dP_{D^+}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{4F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP^{6C}_{1c}}{dx_F} \right), \\
\frac{dP_{\Xi^0}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{4F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{dP^{6C}_{1c}}{dx_F} \right), \\
\frac{dP_{\Xi^{*+}}}{dx_F} = \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{4F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F} + \frac{1}{10} \frac{dP^{6F}_{1c}}{dx_F}. 
\]
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