SIDIS Dihadron Beam Spin Asymmetries

Christopher Dilks CLAS Collaboration Meeting 25 March 2020







Structure Functions \rightarrow PDFs and DiFFs



Structure Function	Twist	m = 0 Modulation	m = 1 Modulation	$\mathrm{PDF} \otimes \mathrm{DiFF}$
$F_{LU,T}^{P_{\ell,m}\sin(m\phi_h - m\phi_R)}$	2	0	$\sin\left(\phi_{\mathbf{h}} - \phi_{\mathbf{R}}\right)$	$f_1 \otimes {f G_1^{\perp \ell,{f m} angle}}$
$F_{LU}^{P_{\ell,m}\sin[(1-m)\phi_h+m\phi_R]}$	3	$\sin \phi_h$	$\sin\phi_{\mathbf{R}}$	$\mathbf{e}(\mathbf{x})\otimes H_1^{\perp \ell,m angle}+g^{\perp}\otimes D_1^{ \ell,m angle}$

- Differential cross sections are expanded in terms of modulations of ϕ_h , ϕ_R , and θ , with structure function coefficients
 - θ -dependent factors are for partial wave expansion of DiFFs \rightarrow beyond the scope of this paper
 - ϕ_{h} , ϕ_{R} dependent functions are Fourier series functions \rightarrow *focus on m=1 (and 0)*
- Structure functions contain convolutions of PDFs and Dihadron Fragmentation Functions (DiFFs)
 - m=1 azimuthal modulations are the *primary* dihadron A_{LU} modulations of interest, for accessing
 - $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}^{\perp}$: the helicity-dependent DiFF
 - e(x): the twist-3 collinear PDF
 - m=0 modulations can be identified with the single-hadron structure function modulations, and included as a *correction* in the multi-amplitude fit

Helicity Dependent DiFF: G_1^{\perp}



- Accessible in the $sin(\Phi_h \Phi_R)$ modulation of dihadron longitudinal beam spin asymmetries, weighted by P_h^{\perp} / M_h
- Sensitive to spin-orbit correlations in hadronization
- Not yet constrained by data; quark-jet hadronization model predicts sizable G_1^{\perp}

$$A_{LU}(x, y, z, M_h) = \frac{\langle P_h^{\perp} \sin(\phi_h - \phi_R) / M_h \rangle_{LU}}{\langle 1 \rangle_{UU}}$$

= $\lambda_l \frac{C'(y)}{A'(y)} \frac{\sum_a e_a^2 f_1^a(x) z G_1^{\perp a}(z, M_h^2)}{\sum_a e_a^2 f_1^a(x) D_1^a(z, M_h^2)}$

Matevosyan, et al.

- Phys.Rev. D96 (2017) no.7, 074010
- PoS DIS2018 (2018) 150

-0.02-0.03

-0.04

-0.05

0.4

0.6

• Recent spectator model calculation predicts sign change at the ρ mass Luo, et al., Phys.Rev. D101 (2020) no.5, 054020



Phys.Rev. D101 (2020) no.5, 054020

0.8

1.2

1.4

Twist-3 Collinear PDF e(x)



- e(x) decomposition: $e^q(x) = e^q_{sing}(x) + e^q_{tw3}(x) + e^q_{mass}(x)$
 - $e_{sing}(x)$ proportional to $\delta(x)$, which could broaden at low Q² (LaMET model, XiangdongJi:arXiv:2003.04478)
 - $e_{tw3}(x)$ pure twist-3 part \rightarrow interference between scattering from |q> vs. |qg>
 - $e_{mass}(x)$ proportional to current quark mass and moments of $f_1(x)$ [twist-2]
- \blacklozenge Physical interpretation from moments of e(x):
 - Force exerted by gluon field on $q\!\uparrow$ after scattering
 - Pion-nucleon σ term, representing the contribution to the nucleon mass from the finite quark masses



DNP2019 Preliminary Results



- There appears to be a sign change near M
- \mathbf{H}_{P} has opposite M_{h} dependence to $\mathsf{A}_{\mathsf{h}\mathsf{P}}$
- $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{h}}$ is a constant 3-4%
- ±3.8% polarization scale uncertainty

Simultaneous fit performed, because these modulations are **not orthogonal** within the acceptance limitations

https://www.jlab.org/indico/event/343/session/7/contribution/76



- ◆ Aim to publish a PRL paper with CLAS12 dihadron beam spin asymmetries
- ◆ The main focus is on the sin(ϕ_R) modulation, which will allow theorists to better constrain the twist-3 PDF e(x)
- ◆ Acceptance limitations necessitate the simultaneous measurement of additional azimuthal modulations, such as $sin(\phi_h \phi_R)$, sensitive to the not-yet-constrained helicity DiFF G_1^{\perp}
 - While we see a signal for the G_1^{\perp} modulation and can show it as part of the multiamplitude fit, more work needs to be done for its interpretation, e.g., this modulation needs to be weighted by the dihadron transverse momentum
 - Partial waves of the dihadron fragmentation can also be measured
 - These considerations are better left for a longer, subsequent paper; however, we should show all modulations that we include in the simultaneous fit regardless



.

April	Мау	June	July	August	September
Pass1 (Cooking	Analysis / OA full dataset		Collaboration Review	
Crosscheck		+ final crosscheck			
	Analysis Note			Conaborat	
Cha	racterize Syste				



Event-by-event Crosschecking: All variables match up to 6 sig-figs!

EVENT 25820) found (hash=	2582039491000)	
var	chris	timothy	diff
pipP	2.44338	2.44338	0.00000
pimP	1.50590	1.50590	0.00000
eleP	5.54208	5.54208	0.00000
Q2	3.16892	3.16892	0.00000
W	2.68524	2.68524	0.00000
х	0.33360	0.33360	0.00000
у	0.47736	0.47736	-0.00000
Mh	1.00462	1.00461	0.00000
хF	0.40326	0.40326	-0.00000
Zpair	0.78224	0.78224	0.00000
Mmiss	1.14164	1.14164	-0.00000
PhPerp	0.59682	0.59682	0.00000
theta	1.31385	1.31385	0.00000
PhiH	-2.48972	-2.48972	0.00000
PhiR	-0.36612	-0.36612	0.00000

This was the easy part....

- Significantly more effort needed to get our full data samples to match
- At first, we had a 10% difference in our overall yield, and a fraction of our events had some mismatches in several variables
- We made several small corrections, and now our total yield difference is at the 0.0025% level







Systematic Uncertainties



Uncertainty	Estimate*	Status / Comments
Beam Polarization	1.5–3% on scale	Straightforward: obtain from polarization measurements
Radiative Corrections	3% ?	Need to discuss with Harut
Acceptance		Plan to estimate with MC asymmetries
PID / Matching Fraction		Needs further study; MC matching fraction is around 75-80%
Baryonic Resonances	~14% on scale	Details below
Additional modulations of the unpolarized x-section	<40% on scale	This is likely very conservative; details below
Cut Boundary Choices		Started exploring; details below
Horizontal Uncertainties / bin migration		Details below

Systematic from Baryonic Contribution (Δ , Σ ,etc.)



 $A_{\text{measured}} = (1 - f)A_{\text{true}} + fA_{\text{baryonBG}}$

Baryon fraction: Contributions of ~12%. Strong z dependence, as expected.

Assume fA_{BG} is negligible



~14%





 Any z cut would have the effect of increasing statistical error bars by more than it decreased the systematic.



Two considerations:

- **Contributions from** |0,2> partial wave of D₁ DiFF
 - This term survives integration of $d\sigma_{_{UU}}$ over $\phi h, \phi R, \theta$
 - Following methodology developed by HERMES (see next slide)
 - https://arxiv.org/pdf/0803.2367.pdf
 - https://inis.iaea.org/collection/NCLCollectionStore/_Public/40/003/40003576.pdf
- Contributions from other non-orthogonal modulations
 - CLAS acceptance causes linear dependence with a few other modulations of $d\sigma_{uu}$
 - Subdominant, since they are suppressed by a factor of 0.4, but need to be thought about how to evaluate their effect
 - Could do a fit similar to Stefan's analysis, to determine the impact of the asymmetries with and without their inclusion

Systematic from Additional $d\sigma_{\nu\nu}$ Modulations



 $A_{LU} = \frac{d\sigma_{LU} \text{ moment}}{\int d\sigma_{UU}}$

With 4π acceptance, 2 terms survive in the denominator*; they contain the |0,0> and |2,0> partial waves of the DiFF $D_1^{|L,M>}$ * assumes truncation at L=2

Fit form:
$$A_{LU} = \frac{A(\theta, \phi_h, \phi_R)}{1 + B(3\cos^2\theta - 1)/4}$$

A parameter represents asymmetry amplitude(s)
B parameter represents: $B = D_{1,LL}/D_{1,OO}$

- Vary **B** within limits imposed by **DiFF positivity bounds**, in order to evaluate systematic effect on **A**; this is called the "B-scan"
- $D_{1,00}$ contains a pure p-wave part, and both are constrained in a positivity bound together with $D_{1,LL}$
- Use MC to evaluate the fraction of $D_{1,00}$ from the p-wave (vector meson) contribution
- Denote this fraction by $f_{_{V\!M}}$

Bounds on variation of B: $-2f_{VM} \le B \le 4f_V$

Systematic from Additional $d\sigma_{uu}$ Modulations



- The real value of this number is an experimental question.
- Inclusion of the "b-scan" with
 - F_{VM} = 0.5 is a good start.

Scale systematic of ΔA/A < 40%

- This may be a bit conservative...
- It may be more accurate to do a fit including the denominator amplitudes



15

Sensitivity to Fiducial Volume Cut Choices



• Performed simultaneous fit to φ_R , φ_H and φ_H - φ_R modulations using the so called loose, medium and tight cuts from the DPWG DNP fiducial volume cuts.

- No immediate large concerns.
- Values typically change by a few percent.
- Statistical errors always increase by a larger amount.



· Used MC in:

- /work/clas12/gangel/Simu_DNP19/T-1.00_S-1.0/F18/MC_DIS_LUND_*.hipo

 Calculated the difference between reconstructed and generated variables. Largest effect in x and z bins.





Bin Contamination

- Tracked the number of times a reconstructed value was assigned a different bin than the generated value.
- Depending on bin effects on the order of 0-13% of events (could optimize?).







- This analysis is making steady progress
- Current focus is resolving some last issues in the cross check and on estimating systematic uncertainties
- Analysis note is in progress, will focus on it more after the cross check
- Our analysis codes will likely be fully ready for the output of Pass-1 as soon as it is available
- We hope to have the analysis and paper ready by the end of the summer