CJ fits:
Interplay of HT and offshell corrections
and other updates

Alberto Accardi

and many thanks to my CTEQ-JLab collaborators:
Shujie Li, Ishara Fernando, X. Jing, S. Park,
C.E. Keppel, W. Melnitchouk, P. Monaghan, J. Owens

JLUO Meeting
13 June 2022

This work is in part supported by the DOE Office of Science

Updates at a glance

- CJ global QCD analysis
  - Interplay of observables, targets
- **SeaQuest DY + RHIC W, Z bosons** - S. Park, X. Jing
  - Light-sea asymmetry at large *x*
- **Neutron F2 extraction** - S. Li, I. Fernando
  - Data driven, minimal theory input
  - F2(n) and F2(n/p)
  - Isoscalar moment vs lattice, GSR sum rule revisited
- **Interplay of Higher-Twists and Offshell Corrections** - I. Fernando, S. Li
  - CJ vs. AKP fits
  - Hidden large-*x* theoretical bias on $F_2(n)$ uncovered...
  - …and removed!
- **—> New CJ23 global fit**
  - Jlab 12 + LHC W bosons





Medium-x PDFs: the light sea triangle

W bosons @ RHIC



$$\frac{\sigma_{W^+}}{\sigma_{W^-}} \underset{y_W \approx 0}{\approx} \frac{\bar{d}/\bar{u}}{d/u}$$



DIS @ NMC (largely)



Drell-Yan @ Fermilab



$$\frac{\sigma^{pd}}{\sigma^{pp}} \approx 1 + \frac{\bar{d}(x_t)}{\bar{u}(x_t)}$$

Medium-x PDFs: the light sea tri

W bosons @ RHIC



$$\bar{d} - \bar{u}$$

DIS @ NMC (largely)



Drell-Yan @ Fermilab





Future:
DY @ JPARC
SIDIS @ JLab*

*LOI-22-002

Medium-x PDFs: the light sea triangle



SeaQuest pulls ratio up
⟶ **Tension with E866**
⟶ **How to quote PDF errors?**

STAR W bosons push down a bit,
but compatible with E866

Large-x PDFs: the valence quark triangle

W bosons @ Tevatron





$$A_W(y) \xrightarrow{y \to y_{max}} \frac{1 - d/u}{1 + d/u}$$



DIS on Deuterium



$$F_2^d \propto S_D \otimes \left[x u_{\rm off}(x) + x d_{\rm off}(x) \right]$$

“BoNuS” tagged DIS



$$\frac{F_2^n}{F_2^d} \propto x u(x) + 4 x d(x)$$

Deuteron 1: Fermi motion and binding

- **Weak binding approximation:**
  - Incoherent scattering from not too fast individual nucleons
  - Neglects FSI



$$F_{2d}(x,Q^2) = \int \frac{dz}{z} dp_T^2\, \mathcal{K}(z,p^2,\gamma)\,\left|\psi_{N/d}(|\vec{p}\,|)\right|^2 F_{2N}(x/z,Q^2,p^2)$$

kinematic and "flux" factors

Nucleon wave function

structure function of **bound, off-shell nucleon**

→ $z = \frac{p\cdot q}{p_d \cdot q} \approx 1 + \frac{p_0 + \gamma p_z}{M}$ $\left[p_0 = M + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon = \varepsilon_d - \frac{\vec{p}^{\,2}}{2M}\right]$

momentum fraction of d carried by N

→ at finite Q^2, $\gamma = \sqrt{1 + 4x^2p^2/Q^2}$

quantifies how far the nucleon is from the light cone ($\gamma = 1$)

Off-shell corrections in Deuteron

- **Nucleons are bound in the deuteron:**
  - $p^2 < M^2$
  - Structure functions are deformed (but not too much if x not too large)



- **Offshell expansion:**
  - parametrize first order coefficient

$$F_{2N}(x, Q^2, p^2) = F_{2N}^{\text{free}}(x, Q^2)\left[1 + \frac{p^2 - M^2}{M^2}\delta f(x)\right]$$

Free proton, neutron structure function

"offshell function"

  - Parametrized and fitted (see the earlier triangle)

    ⟶ **CJ15, AKP**

When fitted, this effectively becomes a phenomenological "catch-all" term (see later)

CJ15 and AKP: free nucleons





CJ15: *PRD 93 (2016) 114017*
AKP: *PRD 96 (2017) 054005*
(see also 2203.07333)

- **AKP has smaller *d/u* but bigger *n/p* ???**
  - Not possible at Leading Twist!
  - → **Large HT contributions to high-*x* *n/p* ratio**

CJ15 and AKP17: off-shell function





Kulagin, Petti (e+A fits), NPA 765 (2006) 126

Alekhin + KP (e+d global fits) PRD96 (2017) 054005

CJ15:
PRD 93 (2016) 114017

- **Different shape and size ??**
- **But many (<u>MANY</u>) differences**
  - Extended d-quark (CJ15) vs. conventional (AKP, d/u-->0)
  - Fit real W asymetry vs. only decay lepton W ⟶ l + (n) asymmetry
  - **Off-shell, HT choices**, and their interplay
  - ...

The most important, in our opinion!

Ongoing CJ + AKP benchmarking effort

Interplay of HT and offshell corrections

– A tale of th. systematic biases –

HT systematics

CTEQ-JLab study, in progress
See also Accardi, talk at DNP 2020

- **HT assumptions**
  - Additive vs. Multiplicative
    - ⟶ In both cases, Q^2-independent
  - Isospin symmetric or not

$$F_2(x,Q^2) = F_2^{LT}(x,Q^2) + \frac{H(x)}{Q^2}$$

$$F_2(x,Q^2) = F_2^{LT}(x,Q^2)\Big(1 + \frac{C(x)}{Q^2}\Big)$$

- **Isospin and Q^2 assumptions are not independent**
  - *e.g.*, a Q^2–independent, isospin symmetric multiplicative HT generates an equivalent additive HT that depends on both

$$\widetilde{H}_{p,n}(x,Q^2) = C(x)\, F_{2p,n}^{LT}(x,Q^2)$$

- **Non-negligible large-x bias**
  - **if using isospin-independent coefficients**
    - ⟶ Multiplicative (CJ15) underestimates
    - ⟶ Additive (AKP17) overestimates ($H > 0$)

$$\frac{n}{p} \xrightarrow[x\to 1]{} \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} & \text{mult. } p = n \\ \frac{1}{4} + \frac{H}{u} & p \neq n \\ \frac{1}{4} + 3\,\frac{H}{u} & \text{add. } p = n \end{cases}$$

CJ fits - isospin symmetric HT

CTEQ-JLab study, in progress
See also Accardi, talk at DNP 2020

- Additive *n*/*p*
  - Larger than Mult *n*/*p*
  - Even if *d*/*u* is smaller
- Fitted offshell function compensates *n*/*p* bias
  - *D*/*p* well fitted, indeed
- **CJ15/AKP17 differences are reproduced!**
  - And explained



* uses generic 2nd order polynomial δf

CJ fits - isospin breaking HT

CTEQ-JLab study, in progress
See also Accardi, talk at DNP 2020

- **Bias removed !!!**
  - Small systematics remains
- ***n/p & d/u***
  - **Much closer to CJ15**
  - Attention when using AKP!
- Small *δf* offshell correction
  - When averaged over *p* and *n*
  - Large cancellation is possible (but need A=3 data to confirm)

    (Tropiano et al., PRC 2019)
    (Cocuzza et al., PRD 2021)



Open questions



- Can we confirm the picture just painted? Is δf zero or negative?
  - **Need direct experimental sensitivity to δf**
  - **Tagged DIS** experiments
- To start with, BONuS 6 don't seem to disagree!
  - But may not be precise enough at large x





Summary

- **Large-x $F_2(n)$ extraction in global fits:**
  - Can have large systematic bias due to HT assumptions
    ⟶ e.g. AKP with additive and isospin independent terms
  - This bias also deforms the extracted offshell function
  - **Isospin-asymmetric HT parameterization is needed**

- **Need good quality tagged DIS data to**
  - Measure bound nucleon structure function in nuclei
  - Confirm factorized formula for δf
  - BONuS 12, TDIS-n, BAND, LAD… at JLab / Electron-Ion Collider
    ⟶ And PVDIS on on-shell protons for precise d/u

- **Global QCD fits can exploit both tagged and inclusive data, and**
  - Combine the statistical power of proposed and future measurements
  - Identify pulls against, or confirm compatibility with, other DIS, DY, jet data
  - Measure δf, indeed, with highest precision and accuracy
    ⟶ And **provide robust free $F_2(n)$ extraction at large x**

The QCD parallelogram

- Can extend the CJ15 triangle to a parallelogram
  - ⟶ **and verify if off-shell protons ~ off-shell neutrons !!**



Main References

Large-x fits with nuclear corrections – CJ vs. AKP

- **CJ15**: Accardi et al., PRD 93 (2016) 114017
- **AKP**: Alekhin, Kulagin, Petti, PRD 96 (2017) 054005 & arXiv:2203.07333
- Accardi, DNP 2020 / Fernando, GHP 2021 / Accardi, APS 2022
- See also:
  - Cocuzza et al. (JAM), PRL 127 (2021) 24

Light quark asymmetry, QCD analysis

- Park, Accardi, Jing, and Owens, arXiv:2108.05786
- See also:
  - Guzzi et al. (CT), arXiv:2108.06596
  - Cocuzza et al. (JAM), PRD 104 (2021) 074031

General References

QCD global analysis from protons to nuclei:

- Accardi, PoS DIS2015 (2015) 001
- Jimenez-Delgado, Melnitchouk, Owens, *J.Phys.G40 (2013) 093102*
- Ethier, Nocera, *Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci. (2020) 70, 1-34*

QCD global analysis and statistical methods:

- Kovarik, Nadolsky, Soper, *Rev.Mod.Phys. 92 (2020) 4, 045003*

Thank you!

Global QCD fits

$$d\sigma_{\text{hadron}} = \sum_{f_1,f_2,i,j} \phi_{f_1} \otimes \hat{\sigma}^{f_1 f_2 \to ij}_{\text{parton}} \otimes \phi_{f_2}$$

pQCD calc.

PDFs (from DIS fits)

- pQCD factorization & universality:
  can fit PDFs to a variety of hard scattering data
  - Hadron-hadron collisions
    - ⟶ Jets
    - ⟶ Electro-weak boson production
  - Electron-proton DIS
  - Electron-Deuteron DIS



- >1000 data points
- 40+ years of experience,
  - "High-energy" fitters:
    - ⟶ CTEQ-TEA, MMHT, NNPDF, HERAPDF
  - Lower-energy / nuclear focus:
    - ⟶ **CTEQ-JLab, AKP**, ABMP, JAM

The CJ15 d/u ratio



- **Theoretical uncertainties**: difficult to quantify, e.g.:
  - <u>Nuclear</u>: wave function choice
  - Off-shell uncertainties are parametrized → partly included in <u>Statistical</u> band
  - <u>Parametrization</u>: *d*-quark flexibility in extrapolation region
- **Theoretical biases**: even less obvious!
  - We shall discuss those from HT and offshell implementation choices

What can we learn from TRITIUM

C. Cocuzza et. al., arXiv:2104.06946



FIG. 3. Ratio of off-shell to on-shell PDFs $\delta q/q$ (left) and the difference between proton valence quarks in ^{3}He and ^{3}H normalized to the sum, Δ_3^q (right), for valence u (red bands) and d (blue bands) quarks, at $Q^2 = 10$ GeV^2.



FIG. 2. Results from the present JAM analysis including MARATHON data (red bands) for the super-ratio $\mathcal{R}$ (top left), F_2^n/F_2^p ratio (top right), deuteron EMC ratio $R(D)$ (bottom left), and the d/u ratio (bottom right), compared with those without the MARATHON data (yellow bands). The super-ratio $\mathcal{R}$ is compared with the KP model input (gray band) used to extract the F_2^n/F_2^p ratio in [12]. The deuteron EMC ratio $R(D)$ is also compared with that from CJ15 [5] (green band) and AKP17 [6] (light blue band).

Backup for kinematics

$$x^* = \frac{Q^2}{2p_N^\mu q^\mu} \approx \frac{Q^2}{2M\nu(2-\alpha_s)} = \frac{x}{2-\alpha_s}$$

$$y^* = \frac{p_N^\mu q_\mu}{p_N^\mu k_\mu} \approx y,$$

$$M^{*2} = (M_d - E_s)^2 - \vec{p}_s^{\,2}.$$

$$M^{*2} = (M_d - E_s)^2 - \vec{p}_s^{\,2}.$$



Figure 11: Ratio of the extracted off-shell structure function F_{2n} at $x'=0.55$, $Q^2=2.8\,\mathrm{GeV}^2$ to that at $x'=0.25$, $Q^2=1.8\,\mathrm{GeV}^2$, divided by the ratio of free structure functions at those kinematic points. The error bars show the statistical uncertainty; the shaded band indicates the systematic uncertainty. [31]

The ratio between the $d(e,en_s)$ cross section at two different x' values, keeping the recoil nucleon kinematics the same, is:

$$\frac{d^4\sigma}{dx_1 dQ_1^2 d\vec{p}_s} \Big/ \frac{d^4\sigma}{dx_2 dQ_2^2 d\vec{p}_s} = (K_1/K_2)[F_2^*(x_1',\alpha_s,p_T,Q_1^2)/F_2^*(x_2',\alpha_s,p_T,Q_2^2)]$$

Using $x_1' \approx 0.5-0.6$ and $x_2' \approx 0.3$ we will measure the ratio of effective structure functions:

$$[F_2^*(x_1',\alpha_s,p_T,Q_1^2)/F_2^*(x_2',\alpha_s,p_T,Q_2^2)] = \left(\frac{d^4\sigma}{dx_1 dQ_1^2 d\vec{p}_s}/K_1\right) \Big/ \left(\frac{d^4\sigma}{dx_2 dQ_2^2 d\vec{p}_s}/K_2\right)$$

Integrating over the recoil scattering angle in the range where the FSI is expected to be small, we will compare the measured ratio as a function of α_s to the measured free proton structure function.

Are we done with (nuclear) corrections?

Theoretical choices →

Corrections (increasing-x) ↓

	KP	AKP	CJ15	AKP-like
shadowing	yes	yes (which one?)	MST x<0.1	(same)
smearing	Paris	AV18	AV18 x>0.1	(same)
pi-cloud	yes	yes	----	----
TMC	GP O(Q4)?	GP O(Q4)??	GP approx.	(same)
HT	H (p=n ??)	H (p=n)	C (p=n)	H & C, p=n & p!=n
HT(x)	??	5 pt. spline	parametrized	parametrized
off-shell	O(p2-M2)	O(p2-M2)	O(p2-M2)	(same)
df(x)	factorized	polyn. 2nd/3rd	factorized + sum rule	polyn. 2nd/3rd
pi thresh.	yes	yes	----	----

Are we done with (nuclear) corrections?

Theoretical choices →

Corrections (increasing-x) ↓

	KP	AKP	CJ15	AKP-like
shadowing	yes	yes (which one?)	MST x<0.1	(same)
smearing	Paris	AV18	AV18 x>0.1	(same)
pi-cloud	yes	yes	----	----
TMC	GP O(Q4)??	GP O(Q4)??	GP approx.	(same)
HT	H (p=n ??[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	H & C, p=n & p=[illegible]
HT(x)	??	5 pt. spline	parametrized	parametrized
off-shell	O(p2-[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(same)
df(x)	factorized	polyn. 2nd/3rd	[illegible] rule	polyn. 2nd/3rd
pi thresh.	yes	yes	----	----

There is no "off-the-shelf" nuclear correction model:

One needs to know and pay attention to the detail

(yes: that means reading the theory papers without rush....)

Tagged DIS to the rescue

Open questions



- Can we confirm the picture just painted? Is δf negative?
  - **Need direct experimental sensitivity to δf**
  - **Tagged DIS** experiments
- BONuS 6 data don't seem to disagree!
  - But may not be precise enough at large x





Open questions



- Is the simple proposed factorization correct?
  - Or at least phenomenologically acceptable ?

$$F_{2N}(x, Q^2, p^2) = F_{2N}^{free}(x, Q^2)\left[1 + v\,\delta f(x)\right]$$

$$v = \frac{p^2 - M^2}{M^2}$$

- Are FSI negligible?
  - Inclusive DIS only probes small off-shellness

More data, please!

- **One can extract δf**

$$\frac{F_{2N}}{F_{2N}^{free}} = 1 + v\,\delta f(x)$$

  - Experiment by experiment
  - or in a global QCD fit



- **Need more tagged DIS data with**
  - FSI under control (small *v*, backward *φ*)
  - Large lever arm, good resolution on *v* (or p_s)
  - x>0.6 would clearly distinguish the two cases



More data, please!

- **At JLab:**
  - BONuS 12, TDIS-n, BAND, LAD…
  - Proton and neutron tagging



- **At the EIC**
  - Simulated Data *(C.Weiss et al. - JLab LDRD 2014)*

    ⟶ Proton tagging + on-shell extrapolation method
  - Fits by *X.Jing and S.Li*

EIC yellow report, arXiv:2103.05419