

MODELING DOUBLE PARTON SCATTERING AT LHC

Giulia Pancheri

INFN Frascati National Laboratories, 00044 Frascati, Italy

Agnes Grau

Departamento de Física Teórica y del Cosmos, Universidad de Granada, 18071 Granada, Spain

Simone Pacetti and Yogendra N. Srivastava

Department of Physics & Geology, University of Perugia, 06123 Perugia, Italy

Abstract

We examine present data for double parton scattering at LHC and discuss their energy dependence from its earliest measurements at the Intersecting Storage Rings (ISR). Different models for the effective cross-section are considered and their behavior studied for a variety of selected final states. We point out that data for $pp \rightarrow 4 \text{ jets}$ or $pp \rightarrow \text{quarkonium pair}$ indicate σ_{eff} to increase with energy. We compare this set of data with different models, including one inspired by our soft gluon resummation model for the impact parameter distribution of partons.

1 Introduction

Double parton scattering in hadron collisions has been searched for and measured since more than 30 years. Recently, the ATLAS collaboration ¹⁾ has examined all existing data for Double Parton Scattering events, from ISR to LHC 13 TeV, and a value for the effective cross-section has been extracted. For a process of the type $pp \rightarrow A + B + X$ the following expression was used

$$\sigma_{DPS}^{AB} = \frac{k \sigma_{SPS}^A \sigma_{SPS}^B}{2 \sigma_{eff}} \quad (1)$$

with k a symmetry factor to indicate identical or different final states, and σ_{eff} interpreted as the overlap area (in the transverse plane) between the interacting partons.

In this note, the energy dependence of σ_{eff} will be discussed in light of a few models and a rather general theorem. We shall start by presenting in Sect. 2 the general framework for multi-parton scattering as recently presented by D'Enterria in ²⁾ and then apply this formalism to show that, in general, σ_{eff} cannot be asymptotically a constant.

In Sect. 3 and Sect. 4 we consider various strategies for the calculation of σ_{eff} : a geometrical one in which σ_{eff} is interpreted as the area occupied by the partons involved in the collision and thus obtain it from modelling the impact parameter distribution of partons, another one in which the area is directly obtained as the Fourier transform of the scattering amplitude. These different strategies may lead to different energy dependence, as we shall see.

2 Matter distribution in a hadron

Theoretically multi-parton scattering (MPS) has been of great interest [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. A key element in an analysis of an n -parton process (NPS) with final particle states (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) in terms of the single-parton processes (SPS) is the role played by an *effective parton cross-section* defined as follows:

$$\sigma_{h_1 h_2 \rightarrow a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n}^{NPS} = \left[\frac{m}{\Gamma(n+1)} \frac{\sigma_{h_1 h_2 \rightarrow a_1}^{SPS} \sigma_{h_1 h_2 \rightarrow a_2}^{SPS} \dots \sigma_{h_1 h_2 \rightarrow a_n}^{SPS}}{(\sigma_{eff, NPS})^{n-1}} \right]. \quad (2)$$

As Eq. (2) deals with *probabilities* rather than *probability amplitudes*, it is clear that the description is *semi-classical* and ignores any correlation between production of particles. On the other hand, the degeneracy factor m in these equations, to be defined momentarily, does distinguish between identical and non-identical particle states and thus must be thought as of quantum-mechanical origin. For a two-parton process (DPS) (say, a_1, a_2), $m = 1$ if the two particle states are identical ($a_1 = a_2$) and $m = 2$ if they are different ($a_1 \neq a_2$). For a three particle process (TPS), $m = 1$ if $a_1 = a_2 = a_3$; $m = 3$ if $a_1 = a_2$, $m = 6$ if $a_1 \neq a_2 \neq a_3$ and so on.

Under a set of *reasonable* hypothesis of factorization of parallel and transverse momenta, the quantity of interest σ_{eff}^{NPS} is approximated in terms of the normalized *single* parton distribution or, generally a matter distribution $T(\mathbf{b})$ inside a hadron in impact-parameter space, as follows

$$\int (d^2\mathbf{b}) T(\mathbf{b}) = 1; \quad \Sigma^{(n)} \equiv \int (d^2\mathbf{b}) T^n(\mathbf{b}); \quad \sigma_{eff}^{NPS} = [\Sigma^{(n)}]^{-1/(n-1)} \quad (3)$$

Before turning our attention to the crucial input of the single-parton *overlap function* we present here an argument as to why σ_{eff} cannot - in general, i.e., for all types of final states in DPS or MPS scattering - be a constant.

In particular, we shall now show that, if $\sigma_{eff}(s)$ approaches a constant as $s \rightarrow \infty$, then *all*, multi-parton cross-sections $\sigma_{a_1, \dots, a_n}^n(s)$ must also approach some constants asymptotically, under the very mild hypothesis that $\sigma_{a_1, \dots, a_{n+1}}^{n+1}(s) < \sigma_{a_1, \dots, a_n}^n(s)$ for $a_i \neq a_j$. Consider in fact Eq.(9) of [2]:

$$\sigma_{a_1, a_2}^{(2)}(s) = \left(\frac{m}{2} \right) \frac{\sigma_{a_1}^{(1)}(s) \sigma_{a_2}^{(1)}(s)}{\sigma_{eff}(s)}; \quad m = 2 \text{ if } a_1 \neq a_2; \quad m = 1 \text{ if } a_1 = a_2, \quad (4)$$

in an obvious notation. Let

$$(i) \sigma_{a_i}(s) \rightarrow L_i(s), \text{ where } L_i(s) \text{ increase with } s; \quad \text{and} \quad (ii) \sigma_{eff}(s) \rightarrow \text{a constant}. \quad (5)$$

Then, it follows from (i) and (ii) that

$$\text{for } a_1 \neq a_2: \sigma_{a_1, a_2}^{(2)}(s) \propto L_1(s) L_2(s), \text{ but then } \left[\frac{\sigma_{a_1, a_2}^{(2)}(s)}{\sigma_{a_1}^{(1)}(s)} \right] \propto L_2(s) \text{ increases with } s \quad (6)$$

and thus it is not bounded by a constant, thereby violating the initial hypothesis. Hence, $L_2(s)$ cannot increase with s , but must be bounded by a constant. We can repeat the proof by exchanging $a_1 \leftrightarrow a_2$

and show that also $L_1(s)$ must be a constant. Ergo, also $\sigma_{a_1; a_2}^{(2)}(s)$ must go to a constant as $s \rightarrow \infty$. Extensions of the above result to the identical case ($a_1 = a_2$) and for $n = 3, 4, \dots$ are left as exercises to the reader. The proof is especially easy if Eqs.(3) and (7) of ²⁾ are recalled. In the next section, we turn our attention to $T(\mathbf{b})$.

3 The BN model for σ_{eff}

In this section we examine a model for σ_{eff} , in which the impact-parameter distribution of partons is obtained from soft-gluon resummation. As we shall see later, this model reproduces the order of magnitude of σ_{eff} but bears different energy trends depending on the parton distribution function (PDF) used. A suitable model for a normalized $T(\mathbf{b})$ - albeit with a different name $A(\mathbf{b})$ - has been the object of our attention for over two decades and detailed references can be found in our review ¹⁰⁾. We start with a model in which the area occupied by the partons involved in parton scattering can be related to soft-gluon resummation. In this model for the total cross-section, the energy behaviour of the total and inelastic cross-sections are obtained in the eikonal formalism, with *mini-jets*, i.e. partons with $p_t > p_{tmin} \approx 1.1-1.5$ GeV, to drive the rise and soft-gluon resummation to tame it. The impact-parameter distribution is determined by the Fourier transform of the k_t distribution of soft gluons emitted during semi-hard parton scattering. Namely, the normalized matter distribution in impact-parameter space, $T(\mathbf{b})$ in this model, is given by:

$$A(b, s) = N(s)\mathcal{F}[\Pi(\mathbf{K}_t)] = N(s) \int d^2\mathbf{K}_t \int d^2\mathbf{b} e^{i\mathbf{K}_t \cdot \mathbf{b}} e^{-h(b, s)}; \quad h(b, s) = \int_0^{q_{max}} d^3\bar{n}(k) [1 - e^{-i\mathbf{k}_t \cdot \mathbf{b}}], \quad (7)$$

where the overall distribution $\Pi(\mathbf{K}_t)$ is obtained by the resummation of soft gluons emitted with average number $\bar{n}(\mathbf{k})$. The above expressions are semi-classical and can be obtained by summing all the gluons emitted with momentum \mathbf{k}_t in a Poisson-like distribution. The effect of imposing energy-momentum conservation on all possible distributions results in the factor among square brackets in Eq. (7). Such a factor allows to integrate in k_t down to zero, if $\bar{n}(k)$ is no more singular than an inverse power. While this is true in QED, for gluons this is not possible. In our model for the total cross-section, which is related to the large-distance behaviour of the interaction, the impact-parameter distribution is related to very small k_t values. This implies including very small values of k_t , even lower than Λ_{QCD} , usually not included in the resummation or “lumped” into an intrinsic transverse momentum. In order to evaluate $h(b, s)$ down to such low values, we proposed a phenomenological approximation for $\alpha_s(k_t \rightarrow 0)$, namely our phenomenological choice is

$$\alpha_s(k_t \rightarrow 0) \propto \left[\frac{k_t}{\Lambda_{QCD}} \right]^{-2p}; \quad \alpha_s(k_t \gg \text{QCD scale}) = \alpha_s^{asym-free}(k_t) = \frac{1}{b_0 \ln(k_t^2/\Lambda_{QCD}^2)} \quad (8)$$

with $1/2 < p < 1$. Our model for σ_{eff} , using $A(b, s)$ from Eq. (7) is given by:

$$\sigma_{eff}(s) = \frac{[\int d^2\mathbf{b} e^{-h(b, s)}]^2}{\int d^2\mathbf{b} e^{-2h(b, s)}} \quad (9)$$

We have indicated that function $h(b, s)$ depends upon the c.m.s energy of the collision, which will then be true also for $A(b, s)$. Because of the minimum transverse momentum p_{tmin} allowed to the minijet cross-section, q_{max} will depend also on p_{tmin} . Through an averaging procedure ¹¹⁾, one can obtain $\langle q_{max} \rangle$ as a function of \sqrt{s} , PDF and p_{tmin} . The results from this resummation can then be used to model the eikonal function and calculate inclusive quantities such as total and inelastic cross-sections. In




Figure 1: For a given set of PDFs with corresponding p_{tmin} , left and center plots respectively show the maximum transverse momentum allowed to soft gluons emitted by partons participating to a semi-hard collision and the behaviour of the minijet cross-section used in the model from ¹²⁾. The figure at right shows the corresponding description of total and Non Single Diffractive inelastic cross-section with appropriate choices of the singularity parameter p .

our model, soft and semi-hard gluons contribute to the observed rise of the total cross-section with soft gluons tempering the fast rise (with energy) due to the mini-jet cross section. In Fig. 1 results for $\langle q_{max} \rangle$ and $\sigma_{jet}(\sqrt{s}, p_{tmin})$ are shown for different LO PDFs, together with the total or inelastic cross-section corresponding to the indicated parameter choice, including updated PDFs, such as MSTW. One should notice that the energy behaviour of $\langle q_{max} \rangle$ is different for different densities, as the one of σ_{jet} , but they compensate in the predicted behaviour of the total cross-sections, which both smoothly rise in accordance with the Froissart bound, as shown in ¹³⁾. This will not be true for σ_{eff} , as the model produces an energy dependence of σ_{eff} which correlates only with the energy dependence of q_{max} , i.e. the upper limit of the integration over the soft-gluon spectrum, so that if q_{max} increases with \sqrt{s} , then σ_{eff} decreases with \sqrt{s} and vice-versa.

4 The elastic amplitude and σ_{eff} energy dependence

According to ²⁾ and following the summary presented in Sec. 2:

$$\int (d^2\mathbf{b}) T(\mathbf{b}) = 1; \quad \Sigma^{(2)} \equiv \int (d^2\mathbf{b}) T^2(\mathbf{b}); \quad \sigma_{eff}^{DPS} = \frac{1}{\Sigma^{(2)}} \quad (10)$$

The above equation is obtained considering factorization between the hard jet cross-sections and the impact parameter distribution of the involved partons, whose \mathcal{F} -transform gives the transverse momentum of partons involved in the hard cross-section. This model has a theoretical basis, but one needs an expression for $T(\mathbf{b})$ to use. The derivation in D'Enterria gives the following expression for $T(\mathbf{b})$:

$$T(\mathbf{b}) = \int d^2\mathbf{b}_1 f(\mathbf{b}_1) f(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_1), \quad (11)$$

where $f(\mathbf{b})$ describes the transverse parton density of the hadron.

Apart from phenomenological fits of the type $\exp[-(b/\text{scale})^m]$, which have problems with analyticity if $m < 1$ ¹³⁾, let us consider what is at the root of the formalism being considered regarding the transverse-spatial (in short, the b) distribution adopted in Eq.(11). Also, we can recall the lessons learnt

from analyticity of hadronic form factors and the elastic amplitudes.

One begins with $f(\mathbf{b})$, a normalized b -density function and its Fourier transform, namely the transverse-momentum distribution $\hat{f}(\mathbf{q})$ for a single parton, as follows:

$$f(\mathbf{b}) = \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{q}} \hat{f}(\mathbf{q}); \quad \hat{f}(\mathbf{q}) = \int (d^2\mathbf{b}) e^{-i\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{q}} f(\mathbf{b}); \quad \hat{f}(\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}) = \int (d^2\mathbf{b}) f(\mathbf{b}) = 1. \quad (12)$$

Let us consider this parton distribution first in momentum space and then in b -space. The simplest case to start with is that of collinear partons. The probability density that two partons are at the same momentum transfer is given by:

$$\hat{T}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv [\hat{f}(\mathbf{q})]^2, \quad \text{with} \quad \hat{T}(\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}) = 1, \quad (13)$$

whose Fourier transform $T(\mathbf{b})$ reads

$$T(\mathbf{b}) \equiv \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{q}} \hat{T}(\mathbf{q}) = \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} e^{i\mathbf{b}\cdot\mathbf{q}} [\hat{f}(\mathbf{q})]^2 = \int (d^2\mathbf{b}_1) f(\mathbf{b}_1) f(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_1), \quad (14)$$

which exactly reproduces Eq.(11). Also, by virtue of Eqs.(12) and (13), $T(\mathbf{b})$ is properly normalized, viz.,

$$\int (d^2\mathbf{b}) T(\mathbf{b}) = \int d^2(\mathbf{b}) \int (d^2\mathbf{b}_1) f(\mathbf{b}_1) f(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}_1) = [\int (d^2\mathbf{b}) f(\mathbf{b})]^2 = 1; \quad \hat{T}(\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}) = \int (d^2\mathbf{b}) T(\mathbf{b}) = 1. \quad (15)$$

Now to some considerations about the effective cross-section $\sigma_{eff}(s)$, which for this simple identical parton model shall be taken to be (with a factor of a 1/2)

$$2\sigma_{eff}(s) = \left[\frac{1}{\int (d^2\mathbf{b}) T^2(\mathbf{b})} \right], \quad (16)$$

but, by virtue of Eqs.(13) *et sec*, it follows that

$$\int (d^2\mathbf{b}) T^2(\mathbf{b}) = \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} [\hat{f}(\mathbf{q})]^2 [\hat{f}(-\mathbf{q})]^2 = \int \frac{d^2\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} [\hat{f}(\mathbf{q})]^4 \quad (17)$$

Since, $\hat{f}(\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{0}) = 1$, at first sight, it may appear reasonable to assume that it is the elastic form factor. So, for this form factor assuming the dipole form, we have

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{1}{[1 + (q^2/t_o(s))]^2}; \quad \sigma_{eff}^{(el)}(s) = \frac{1}{\int \frac{d^2\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{[1 + (q^2/t_o(s))]^8}} = \left[\frac{14\pi}{t_o(s)} \right]. \quad (18)$$

To get a simple estimate, we can employ the result from a fit to the elastic differential cross-section, discussed in ¹⁴. At 13 TeV, our estimate for the elastic scattering form-factor value (work in preparation) is $t_o(13 \text{ TeV}) \approx 0.6 \text{ GeV}^2$, leading to

$$\sigma_{eff}^{(el)}(13 \text{ TeV}) \approx 28.6 \text{ mb}. \quad (19)$$

We notice that the value predicted for σ_{eff} appears large compared to present data ¹). Of course, what the above naive calculation might be telling us is that $\hat{f}(\mathbf{q})$ is related not so much to the elastic, but to an ‘‘inelastic form factor’’. Counting four protons being present in elastic events, whereas only two (initial) protons being present in a true ‘‘break up’’ inelastic event, we expect only the second power and not the fourth power of the elastic form factor to appear in Eq. (18). If so,

$$\sigma_{eff}^{(inel)}(s) = \frac{1}{\int \frac{d^2\mathbf{q}}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{[1 + (q^2/t_o(s))]^4}} = \frac{6\pi}{t_o(s)}; \quad \sigma_{eff}^{(inel)}(13 \text{ TeV}) \approx 12.3 \text{ mb}, \quad (20)$$




Figure 2: In the left panel, existing DPS data as described in the text from Axial Field Spectrometer (AFS), ¹⁵⁾, UA2 ¹⁶⁾, CDF 1993 ¹⁷⁾ for $\bar{p}p \rightarrow 4 \text{ jets}$ and ATLAS at $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$ ¹⁸⁾ for $pp \rightarrow 4 \text{ jets}$. We also have plotted CDF 1997 ¹⁹⁾ and D0 ²⁰⁾ for $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \gamma 3 \text{ jets}$, D0 ²¹⁾ for $\bar{p}p \rightarrow J/\Psi J/\Psi$, ATLAS ²²⁾ and LHCb for $pp \rightarrow J/\Psi J/\Psi$ ²³⁾, CMS for $pp \rightarrow \Upsilon \Upsilon$ ²⁴⁾, D0 for $\bar{p}p \rightarrow J/\Psi \Upsilon$ ²⁵⁾. At right, comparison of $\bar{p}/p p \rightarrow 4 \text{ jets}$ or with $\bar{p}/p p \rightarrow \text{quarkonia pair}$ with two models described in the text.

a bit closer to the phenomenological value estimated by exploration of the ATLAS compilation ¹⁾. In this model the energy dependence of σ_{eff} proceeds from that of the parameter $t_0(s)$. We notice here that in ¹⁴⁾ we have shown that the presently available data for the differential elastic cross-section as well as the total cross-section, i.e. the imaginary part of the forward elastic amplitude, can be described rather accurately through an expression which includes an energy-dependent form factor. In this model, $t_0(s)$ decreases with energy, hence this model would predict $\sigma_{eff}(s)$ increasing with \sqrt{s} . We now turn to a discussion of the data and a comparison with the models we have just illustrated.

5 About data and models

Available data not only span a very large energy range, but, as compiled by ATLAS, refer to very different types of final states. This may indeed generate confusion since parton distributions, hence the calculation of σ_{eff} , differ according to whether the initial state be mostly driven by gluon-gluon scattering or imply valence quarks as well. Thus we have focused on similarly homogenous final states and show them in the left panel of Fig. 2. The figure may indicate the following trends:

- for processes dominated by gluon-gluon scattering, such as $\bar{p}/p p \rightarrow 4 \text{ jets}$ and $\bar{p}/p p \rightarrow J/\Psi J/\Psi$, $\sigma_{eff}(\sqrt{s})$ grows with \sqrt{s} , although the scale is different, with $\sigma_{eff}^{singlet}(\sqrt{s}) \approx \frac{1}{3} \sigma_{eff}(\sqrt{s})^{all}$
- for processes in which at least one of the final state particles must originate from a valence quark, as in 3 jets + γ , the effective cross-section appears to be decreasing, as seen in the left panel of Fig. 2 (full blue symbols).

In the right-hand panel we have compared the selected sets of data *vs.* two models: the BN-inspired soft-gluon resummation model described in Sect. 3, and a model based on the ansatz that all inclusive cross-sections rise. This model would be adequate to describe the case of gluon-initiated processes, less so when valence quarks initiate the process, as it is likely to be the case for the 3 jets + γ final state. Our

ansatz, to describe σ_{eff} for $\bar{p}/p p \rightarrow 4$ jets, is the following:

$$\sigma_{eff} \propto \sigma_{inel}^{NSD} \quad (21)$$

We then use the description of σ_{inel}^{NSD} from the model of ¹⁴⁾ and plot it as a blue band in the right hand panel of Fig. 2, with an arbitrarily chosen factor 2/9 for normalization to the data.. We consider the two different cases of GRV or MSTW densities (MRST densities for total and inelastic cross-section are in good agreement with results from MSTW, as shown in the right hand panel of Fig. 1).

For the model which uses $A(b)$ from soft-gluon resummation (Sect.3) we see that at LHC energies the model gives good agreement with data, but the trend with energy is different.

In summary for $pp \rightarrow 4$ jets:

- the impact parameter description as from Sect. 3 (green, red and dotted curves in Fig. 2) gives an absolute overall normalization of LHC data in good agreement with the plotted data, but is inconclusive as far as the energy dependence is concerned;
- the scattering amplitude *cum* form factor model from Sect. 4 would also reproduce the correct order of magnitude at LHC, and may indicate a rising σ_{eff} from ISR to LHC;
- an empirical description from the NSD inelastic cross-section of ²⁶⁾ would reproduce a rising energy trend from ISR to LHC.

References

1. Morad Aaboud et al. Study of the hard double-parton scattering contribution to inclusive four-lepton production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Phys. Lett.*, B790:595–614, 2019.
2. David d’Enterria and Alexander Snigirev. Double, triple, and n -parton scatterings in high-energy proton and nuclear collisions. *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.*, 29:159–187, 2018.
3. N. Paver and D. Treleani. Multiple Parton Interactions and Multi - Jet Events at Collider and Tevatron Energies. *Phys. Lett.*, 146B:252–256, 1984.
4. L. Ametller, N. Paver, and D. Treleani. Possible Signature of Multiple Parton Interactions in Collider Four Jet Events. *Phys. Lett.*, 169B:289–292, 1986.
5. Torbjorn Sjostrand and Maria van Zijl. A Multiple Interaction Model for the Event Structure in Hadron Collisions. *Phys. Rev.*, D36:2019, 1987.
6. Mark Strikman and Werner Vogelsang. Multiple parton interactions and forward double pion production in pp and dA scattering. *Phys. Rev.*, D83:034029, 2011.
7. Michael H. Seymour and Andrzej Siodmok. Extracting $\sigma_{effective}$ from the LHCb double-charm measurement. 2013.
8. Paolo Bartalini and Jonathan Richard Gaunt. Multiple Parton Interactions at the LHC. *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.*, 29:pp.1–450, 2018.
9. Markus Diehl and Jonathan R. Gaunt. Double parton scattering theory overview. *Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.*, 29:7–28, 2018.

10. Giulia Pancheri and Y. N. Srivastava. Introduction to the physics of the total cross-section at LHC. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C77(3):150, 2017.
11. R. M. Godbole, A. Grau, G. Pancheri, and Y. N. Srivastava. Soft gluon radiation and energy dependence of total hadronic cross-sections. *Phys. Rev.*, D72:076001, 2005.
12. D. A. Fagundes, A. Grau, G. Pancheri, Y. N. Srivastava, and O. Shekhovtsova. Soft edge of hadron scattering and minijet models for the total and inelastic pp cross sections at LHC and beyond. *Phys. Rev.*, D91(11):114011, 2015.
13. Agnes Grau, Rohini M. Godbole, Giulia Pancheri, and Yogendra N. Srivastava. Soft Gluon $k(t)$ -Resummation and the Froissart bound. *Phys. Lett.*, B682:55–60, 2009.
14. Daniel A. Fagundes, Agnes Grau, Simone Pacetti, Giulia Pancheri, and Yogendra N. Srivastava. Elastic pp scattering from the optical point to past the dip: An empirical parametrization from ISR to the LHC. *Phys. Rev.*, D88(9):094019, 2013.
15. T. Akesson et al. Double Parton Scattering in pp Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 63$ -GeV. *Z. Phys.*, C34:163, 1987.
16. J. Alitti et al. A Study of multi - jet events at the CERN anti-p p collider and a search for double parton scattering. *Phys. Lett.*, B268:145–154, 1991.
17. F. Abe et al. Study of four jet events and evidence for double parton interactions in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV. *Phys. Rev.*, D47:4857–4871, 1993.
18. Morad Aaboud et al. Study of hard double-parton scattering in four-jet events in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV with the ATLAS experiment. *JHEP*, 11:110, 2016.
19. F. Abe et al. Double parton scattering in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV. *Phys. Rev.*, D56:3811–3832, 1997.
20. Victor Mukhamedovich Abazov et al. Double Parton Interactions in $\gamma + 3$ Jet and $\gamma + b/cjet + 2$ Jet Events in $p\bar{p}$ Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$ TeV. *Phys. Rev.*, D89(7):072006, 2014.
21. Victor Mukhamedovich Abazov et al. Observation and Studies of Double J/ψ Production at the Tevatron. *Phys. Rev.*, D90(11):111101, 2014.
22. Morad Aaboud et al. Measurement of the prompt J/ψ pair production cross-section in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C77(2):76, 2017.
23. Roel Aaij et al. Measurement of the J/ψ pair production cross-section in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. *JHEP*, 06:047, 2017. [Erratum: JHEP10,068(2017)].
24. Vardan Khachatryan et al. Observation of $\Upsilon(1S)$ pair production in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV. *JHEP*, 05:013, 2017.
25. Victor Mukhamedovich Abazov et al. Evidence for simultaneous production of J/ψ and Υ mesons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 116(8):082002, 2016.
26. Andrea Achilli, Rohini M. Godbole, Agnes Grau, Giulia Pancheri, Olga Shekhovtsova, and Yogendra N. Srivastava. Total and inelastic cross-sections at LHC at $\sqrt{s} = 7 - 13$ TeV and beyond. *Phys. Rev.*, D84:094009, 2011.