# Neutral-Current Electroweak Physics with SoLID and a positron beam at JLab

#### Xiaochao Zheng, Univ. of Virginia March 7<sup>th</sup>. 2023



https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.15081



An experimental program with high duty-cycle polarized and unpolarized positron beams at Jefferson Lab

Eur. Phys. J. A manuscript No. (will be inserted by the editor) https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.12555

Accessing weak neutral-current coupling  $g_{AA}^{eq}$  using positron and electron beams at Jefferson Lab

(A New Proposal to Jefferson Lab PAC-49)

Measurement of the Asymmetry  $A_d^{e^+e^-}$  between  $e^+-{}^2\text{H}$  and  $e^--{}^2\text{H}$ Deep Inelastic Scattering Using SoLID and PEPPo at JLab

May 24, 2021



# The Landscape of (Neutral-Current) Electroweak Study



EIC projections from <u>arxiv.org/2204.07557</u> [hep-ph] LHeC projection (60GeV x 7 TeV, ~1000fb<sup>-1</sup>) from EPJC 80 (2020) 9, 831 <u>arxiv.org/2007.11799</u>; FCC-ep projections: priv. comm. D. Britzger points with uncertainties comparable to or smaller than Qweak are shown, full range shown as arrows) March 7-8, 2023 Neutral-Current Effective Couplings in (Low Energy) Electron Scattering



- A new set of notation  $g_{AV,VA,AA}^{eq}$  introduced in 2013 <u>Erler&Su, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 71</u>, 119 (2013)
- Example: In PVES, we can measure C<sub>1,2</sub>



## Current Knowledge on C1q,C2q

https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.12555 **APV 2019** all data 2019 Qweak + APV all data 2019 Qweak SM SLAC-E122 SM P2 (expected) eDIS JLab-Hall A SoLID (expected)  $[2 g^{eu} - g^{ed}]_{AV}$  $[2 g^{eu} - g^{ed}]_{AV}$ 0.5 0.9 0.4 0.51 -0.06 0.8 0.3 0.50 -0.08 0.7 0.2 0.49 -0.10 [g<sup>eu</sup>+ 2 g<sup>ed</sup>]<sub>AV</sub> 0.6 [2 g<sup>eu</sup>– g<sup>d</sup>]<sub>VA</sub> 0.48 0.1 -0.12 -0.74-0.73-0.72-0.71-0.70 0.5 0 -0.14 0.4 -0.1 -0.16 0.3 -0.2 -0.18 0.2 -0.3 0.1 -0.20 -0.4 -0.76-0.74-0.72-0.70-0.68 0 -0.5\_1 -0.9 -0.8 -0.7 -0.6 -0.5 -0.4 -0.3 -0.2 -0.1 -0.9 -0.8 -0.7 -0.6 -0.5 -0.4 -0.3 -0.2 **\_**1 -0.1 0

CERN for muon:  $2C_{3u}^{\mu q} - C_{3d}^{\mu q} = 1.57 \pm 0.38$  Argento et al., PLB120B, 245 (1983)

Positron working group meeting March 7-8, 2023

all are 68% C.L. limit

# In the Parton Model (low energy)

$$A_{RL}^{e^{*.}} = \frac{\sigma_{R}^{e^{*.}} - \sigma_{L}^{e^{*.}}}{\sigma_{R}^{e^{*.}} + \sigma_{L}^{e^{*.}}} \qquad A_{d} = |\lambda| (108 \, ppm) Q^{2} [(2C_{1u} - C_{1d}) + Y(y)(2C_{2u} - C_{2d}) R_{V}(x)]$$

$$(A_{RL}^{e^{*.}} = -A_{LR}^{e^{*.}}) \qquad beam polarization \qquad Y(y) = \frac{1 - (1 - y)^{2}}{1 + (1 - y)^{2}} \qquad R_{V}(x) = \frac{u_{V}(x) + d_{V}(x)}{u(x) + \overline{u}(x) + d(x) + \overline{d}(x)}$$
(in diagona gain flip, of everylap)

(indicates spin flip of quarks)



Positron working group meeting March 7-8, 2023

# In the Parton Model (low energy)

# In the Parton Model (low energy)

## e<sup>+</sup>e<sup>-</sup> for Structure Function Study

Approximately: 
$$A_{\text{unpol}}^{e^+e^-} = \frac{G_F Q^2}{2\sqrt{2}\pi \alpha} \frac{g_A^e}{2} Y(y) \frac{F_3^{\gamma Z}}{F_1^{\gamma}}$$
 (in Apv,  $F_3^{\gamma Z}$  is suppressed by  $g_V^e$ )

In the parton model:  $F_1^{\gamma}(x, Q^2) = 1/2 \sum Q_q^2[q + \overline{q}] = F_3^{\gamma Z}(x, Q^2) = 2 \sum g_A^q[q - \overline{q}]$ 



(in a similar manner, PV with hadron spin flip can access new  $g_{4,5}^{\gamma Z}$  functions)









#### SoLID PVDIS configuration + 40cm LD2 PEPPo: 3uA unpolarized beam Reverse magnet polarity of SoLID for positron detection





Positron working group meeting March 7-8, 2023 What can we do with 80 days of 3uA beam on a 40cm LD2 target? (in absence of all challenges):



#### **SoLID PVDIS** configuration + 40cm LD2 **PEPPo**: 3uA unpolarized beam **Reverse magnet** polarity of SoLID for positron detection

However, flipping e- vs. e+ beam is unlike PVES (30Hz spin flip + Parity DAQ)

#### **Experimental challenges:**

- beam energy difference
- beam position difference
- charged pion background
- pair production background
- magnet and detector stability

## Theoretical challenges:

 QED higher order effect (no prior precision measurement of e+e- asymmetry in DIS, HERA, SLAC)





# All Possible Contributions to the Measured Asymmetry

- slow drift in BCM  $_{\rightarrow}$  (unknown) luminosity difference  $\Delta \,Lumi$
- possible difference in Ebeam ("standard" Hall A  $\rightarrow$  5x10<sup>-4</sup>)  $\rightarrow$  can calculate effect  $\Delta A_{E_{b},max}$
- possible difference in magnet strength (E')  $\rightarrow$  has a plan to control this to <1x10<sup>-5</sup>  $\rightarrow$  can calculate effect  $\Delta A_{E', max}$
- background subtraction  $\rightarrow$  bin by bin
- QED higher order contributions: used Djangoh generator to calculate, proof-of-principle results exist (summer student working on improvement):  $\Delta A_{OED}$ ;
- Coulomb effect: follow Aste et al. https://arxiv.org/abs/nucl-th/0502074 (update from proposal):

Deuteron RMS radius: 2.1421 fm (https://www-nds.iaea.org/ardii)  $\rightarrow R_{eff} = \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}} R_{rms}^2$ 

- $\rightarrow V_0 = \frac{3}{2} \frac{\alpha \hbar Z}{R_{eff}} \rightarrow V_{eff} = (0.775 \pm 0.025) V_0 \text{ and focusing factor (ff)} = \frac{E_b + V_{eff}}{E_b}$
- $\rightarrow \sigma_{Coulomb}(E, E', \theta) = \sigma_{Born}(E + V_{eff}, E' + V_{eff}, \theta) * \text{ff}^2 \text{can calculate} \Delta A_{Coulomb}$
- Higher twist is unknown for  $F_3^{\gamma Z}(x, Q^2)$ , calculated using CJ15's H<sub>2</sub> calculated for SoLID kinematics  $\Delta A_{CJ15}$

Positron working group meeting March 7-8, 2023



## Generating Pseudo Data and Apply Multi-Parameter Fit

- For each set of pseudo data (each experiment), initialize random "pre" factors for lumi, Eb, and E': d<sub>0</sub>(lumi)∈(-1%,1%),d<sub>1</sub>,d<sub>2</sub>∈(-1,1) that follow normal distribution;
- Calculate effect in each (x,Q2) bin the statistical uncertainty (using rates), and the expected maximum effect of lumi, Eb (using 5×10<sup>-4</sup>), E' (using 1×10<sup>-5</sup>), and add background effect:

$$\Delta A_{stat}(x, Q^2), \quad d_0(\text{lumi}), \quad \Delta A_{Eb, \max}(x, Q^2), \quad \Delta A_{E', \max}(x, Q^2)$$

- Produce pseudo data in each fine (x,Q<sup>2</sup>) bin, with statistical fluctuation, and add in effect of lumi, Eb, Ep:  $A_{data}(x,Q^2) = A_{SM} + d_{stat} \Delta A_{stat+bg} + d_0 + d_1 \Delta A_{Eb} + d_2 \Delta A_{E'}$
- Fit (analyze) all pseudo data points using

$$A_{\text{data}}(x, Q^2) = p_0 A_{SM} / 1.5 + p_{\text{lumi}} + p_1 \Delta A_{Eb} + p_2 \Delta A_{E'} \qquad p_0 \rightarrow (2C_{3u} - C_{3d})$$

17

fitting pseudo data with lumi ("lumi fit"):  $\Delta p_0 = \pm 0.032$ including also Eb factor ("2exp fit"):  $\Delta p_0 = \pm 0.038$ including also E' factor ("3exp fit"):  $\Delta p_0 = \pm 0.065 \rightarrow$  Controlling E' to <10<sup>-5</sup> desired

• Repeat for 1000 (or 3000) times with random QED+HT, and plot the fitted  $p_0$ :  $\Delta (2C_{3u}-C_{3d})_{\text{total}} = \pm 0.053(\text{exp}) \pm 0.009(1\% \text{ QED}) + 0.000 - 0.035(\text{HT, CJ15}) \approx \pm 0.060$ 

#### PR12-21-006 Lepton Charge Asymmetry

- 104 PAC days
- positron beam 3uA unpolarized
- beam control (1E-4 beam energy, ? beam position, "fast switch")

```
\Delta (2C_{3u} - C_{3d})_{\text{total}} = \pm 0.053(\exp) \pm 0.009(1\% \text{ QED}) \\ + 0.000 - 0.035(\text{HT, CJ15}) \approx \pm 0.060
```



PAC49 report:

**Issues:** The PAC is pleased to see such an interesting and farreaching proposal. ... At the same time, the requirements on the accelerator and theory are both daunting.

**Summary:** ... leads us to defer the proposal in its present form.

# Summary

– By comparing e- vs. e+ DIS cross section, we can form lepton-charge asymmetry that is directly proportional to a new set of eq EW NC coupling:  $C_{3q}$  or  $g_{AA}$ .

 So far, challenges in both experimental and theoretical systematic effects are both daunting and require further work to make the measurement compelling.

- $\rightarrow$  charged pion background, tracking efficiency/accuracy
- $\rightarrow$  beam position control?

 A phased-approach can also be considered: non-EW physics, TPE in DIS, then EW physics



# Backup



Positron working group meeting March 7-8, 2023

# Summary of Challenges and Why They Exist?

 With a positron beam, the best physics impact comes from comparison between e+ and e- scattering, rather than measuring the same observable (e.g. Apv) as electrons

- If positron vs. electron comparison is our goal, then all systematic effect related to the beam need to be controlled to high precision
- Frequent ("weekly") and fast switch between e+ and e- beams is required to control differences in beam and run conditions  $\rightarrow$  impact on positron beam design.
- Measurements where signal is tiny (EW physics) will be extremely difficult
- Particle background effects on the detector, trigger, and DAQ system.

 There is no well established calculation for TPE (QED NLO) in DIS. All previous (SLAC) data indicated zero but with poor precision;

HERA data provided only slight constraint on QED NLO in DIS

– We could consider a "phase" approach: study DIS TPE first, then EW physics

#### Past Experiment – BCDMS

#### 1983 CERN, using polarized $\mu$ + vs. $\mu$ - beams:





#### a measurement for the electron is highly desired

Positron working group meeting
March 7-8, 2023

22

# **Experimental** Challenges

**QED** higher order (scaled by  $1/5) \rightarrow \Delta A_{OED}$ 

NIVERO

