Partonic structure and small x: TMD PDFs and GPDs

GDR QCD "From Hadronic Structure to Heavy Ion Collisions" 10-14 June 2024 IJCLab, Orsay, France

Comunidad de Madrid Charlotte Van Hulse University of Alcalá

Wigner distributions *W*(*x,* \overline{k} k_T , \overline{b} $b_\perp)$

$\begin{CD} \mathsf{equation}\ \mathsf{w}(x, \vec{k}_T, \vec{b}_\perp) \ \mathsf{r}_\infty^{k_T} & x P_{z} \end{CD}$ The various dimensions of the nucleon structure

 \overline{k} k_T , \overline{b} $b_\perp)$

 \overline{k} k_T , \overline{b} $b_\perp)$

 \overline{k} k_T , \overline{b} $b_\perp)$

The various dimensions of the nucleon structure

 \overline{k} k_T , \overline{b} $b_\perp)$

0*.*5

The various dimensions of the nucleon structure

0*.*5

The various dimensions of the nucleon structure

0*.*5 1*.*0 1*.*5 2*.*0 2*.*5

3*.*0

nucleon polarisation nucleon polarisation

Transverse momentum dependent parton distribution functions

survive integration of parton transverse momentum

nucleon polarisation nucleon polarisation

Transverse momentum dependent parton distribution functions

nucleon polarisation nucleon polarisation

Transverse momentum dependent parton distribution functions

nucleon polarisation nucleon polarisation

Transverse momentum dependent parton distribution functions

Transverse momentum dependent parton distribution functions

Spin-spin correlations

Spin-momentum correlations

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

$$
Q^2 = -q^2
$$

$$
x_B = \frac{Q^2}{2P \cdot q}
$$

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

parton distribution function $PDF(x_R)$

$$
Q^2 = -q^2
$$

$$
x_B = \frac{Q^2}{2P \cdot q}
$$

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

parton distribution function $PDF(x_R)$

fragmentation function $FF(z)$

$$
Q^{2} = -q^{2}
$$

$$
x_{B} = \frac{Q^{2}}{2P \cdot q}
$$

$$
z \stackrel{\text{lab}}{=} \frac{E_{h}}{E_{\gamma*}}
$$

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

$$
Q^{2} = -q^{2}
$$

$$
x_{B} = \frac{Q^{2}}{2P \cdot q}
$$

$$
z \stackrel{\text{lab}}{=} \frac{E_{h}}{E_{\gamma*}}
$$

Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) parton distribution function $PDF(x_B, k_1)$

Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) fragmentation function $FF(z, p₁)$

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

$$
Q^{2} = -q^{2}
$$

$$
x_{B} = \frac{Q^{2}}{2P \cdot q}
$$

$$
z \stackrel{\text{lab}}{=} \frac{E_{h}}{E_{\gamma*}}
$$

Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) parton distribution function $PDF(x_{\mathcal{B}},k_{\perp},\mathcal{Q}^{2})$

k⊥ *p*⊥ } *PhT* Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) fragmentation function $FF(z,p_{\perp},\mathcal{Q}^2)$ ⇤(*q*) TMD evolution $\left\{\begin{array}{c}\n\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\bullet\n\end{array}\right\}$ **scale (=DGLAP) evolution**

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

$$
Q^{2} = -q^{2}
$$

$$
x_{B} = \frac{Q^{2}}{2P \cdot q}
$$

$$
z \stackrel{\text{lab}}{=} \frac{E_{h}}{E_{\gamma*}}
$$

Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) parton distribution function $PDF(x_{\mathcal{B}},k_{\perp},\mathcal{Q}^{2})$

Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) fragmentation function $FF(z,p_{\perp},\mathcal{Q}^2)$

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

$$
Q^{2} = -q^{2}
$$

$$
x_{B} = \frac{Q^{2}}{2P \cdot q}
$$

$$
z \stackrel{\text{lab}}{=} \frac{E_{h}}{E_{\gamma*}}
$$

Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) parton distribution function $PDF(x_{\mathcal{B}},k_{\perp},\mathcal{Q}^{2})$

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

$$
Q^{2} = -q^{2}
$$

$$
x_{B} = \frac{Q^{2}}{2P \cdot q}
$$

$$
z \stackrel{\text{lab}}{=} \frac{E_{h}}{E_{\gamma*}}
$$

Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) parton distribution function $PDF(x_{\mathcal{B}},k_{\perp},\mathcal{Q}^{2})$

Highly virtual photon: provides hard scale of process $Q^2 \gg 1$ GeV²

$$
Q^{2} = -q^{2}
$$

$$
x_{B} = \frac{Q^{2}}{2P \cdot q}
$$

$$
z \stackrel{\text{lab}}{=} \frac{E_{h}}{E_{\gamma*}}
$$

Transverse-momentum-dependent (TMD) parton distribution function $PDF(x_{\mathcal{B}},k_{\perp},\mathcal{Q}^{2})$

P $\bar{\bar{P}}$

 $h\perp$

 $\vec{l'}$

 \vec{S}

 ϕ_S

$$
= \sigma_{UU}^h \left\{ 1 + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{UU}^h \cos(\phi) + 2\langle \cos(2\phi) \rangle_{UU}^h \cos(2\phi) \right\}
$$

+ $\lambda_l 2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{LU}^h \sin(\phi)$
+ $S_L \left[2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{UL}^h \sin(\phi) + 2\langle \sin(2\phi) \rangle_{UL}^h \sin(2\phi) \right]$
+ $\lambda_l \left(2\langle \cos(0\phi) \rangle_{LL}^h \cos(0\phi) + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{LL}^h \cos(\phi) \right)$
+ $S_T \left[2\langle \sin(\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{UT}^h \sin(\phi - \phi_S) + 2\langle \sin(\phi + \phi_S) \rangle_{UT}^h \sin(\phi + \phi_S) \right]$
+ $2\langle \sin(3\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{UT}^h \sin(3\phi - \phi_S) + 2\langle \sin(\phi_S) \rangle_{UT}^h \sin(\phi_S)$
+ $2\langle \sin(2\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{UT}^h \sin(2\phi - \phi_S)$
+ $\lambda_l \left(2\langle \cos(\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{LT}^h \cos(\phi - \phi_S) \right)$
+ $2\langle \cos(\phi_S) \rangle_{LT}^h \cos(\phi_S) + 2\langle \cos(2\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{LT}^h \cos(2\phi - \phi_S) \right)$

- $\sigma^h(\phi, \phi_S) = \sigma^h_{UU} \left\{ 1 + 2 \langle \cos(\phi) \rangle \right\}$ $+ \lambda_l 2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{LU}^h \sin(\phi)$ $+$ S_L $\sqrt{ }$
	- $\quad + \quad \lambda_l$ $\sqrt{2}$
	- $+$ S_T $\sqrt{ }$ $2\langle\sin(\phi-\phi_S)\rangle$
	- $+ 2\langle sin(3\phi \phi_S) \rangle^h_U$
	- $+ 2\langle \sin(2\phi \phi_S) \rangle_U^h$
	- $+$ λ_l $\sqrt{2}$ $2\langle \cos(\phi - \phi_S)\rangle$
	-

target polarisation

P $\bar{\bar{P}}$

 $h\perp$

 $\vec{l'}$

 $|\vec{S}|$

 ϕ_S

$$
= \sigma_{UU}^h \left\{ 1 + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{UU}^h \cos(\phi) + 2\langle \cos(2\phi) \rangle_{UU}^h \cos(2\phi) \right\}
$$

+
$$
\frac{\lambda_l 2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{LU}^h \sin(\phi)}{\lambda_l 2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{UL}^h \sin(\phi) + 2\langle \sin(2\phi) \rangle_{UL}^h \sin(2\phi)}
$$

+
$$
\frac{S_L [2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{UL}^h \cos(0\phi) + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{LL}^h \cos(\phi))]}{\lambda_l (2\langle \cos(0\phi) \rangle_{UL}^h \cos(0\phi) + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{LL}^h \cos(\phi)) }
$$

+
$$
\frac{S_T [2\langle \sin(\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{UT}^h \sin(\phi - \phi_S) + 2\langle \sin(\phi + \phi_S) \rangle_{UT}^h \sin(\phi + \phi_S)]}{2\langle \sin(2\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{LT}^h \sin(2\phi - \phi_S) }
$$

+
$$
\frac{\lambda_l (2\langle \cos(\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{LT}^h \cos(\phi - \phi_S) }{\lambda_l (2\langle \cos(\phi_S) \rangle_{LT}^h \cos(\phi_S) + 2\langle \cos(2\phi - \phi_S) \rangle_{LT}^h \cos(2\phi - \phi_S)]] }
$$

$$
= \sigma_{UU}^{h} \{1 + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{UU}^{h} \cos(\phi) + 2\langle \cos(2\phi) \rangle_{UU}^{h} \cos(2\phi) \n+ \lambda_{l} 2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{LL}^{h} \sin(\phi) \n+ \lambda_{l} 2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{UL}^{h} \sin(\phi) + 2\langle \sin(2\phi) \rangle_{UL}^{h} \sin(2\phi) \n+ \lambda_{l} \{2\langle \cos(0\phi) \rangle_{LL}^{h} \cos(0\phi) + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{LL}^{h} \cos(\phi) \} \}
$$
\n
$$
+ \lambda_{l} \{2\langle \cos(0\phi) \rangle_{LL}^{h} \cos(0\phi) + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{LL}^{h} \cos(\phi) \}]
$$
\n
$$
+ \frac{S_{T} [2\langle \sin(\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{UT}^{h} \sin(\phi - \phi_{S}) + 2\langle \sin(\phi + \phi_{S}) \rangle_{UT}^{h} \sin(\phi + \phi_{S}) \} }{2\langle \sin(3\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{UT}^{h} \sin(2\phi - \phi_{S})}
$$
\n
$$
+ \lambda_{l} \{2\langle \cos(\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ \lambda_{l} \{2\langle \cos(\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S}) \} }{2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi_{S}) + 2\langle \cos(2\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(2\phi - \phi_{S}) \}] }
$$
\n
$$
+ \lambda_{l} \{2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi_{S}) + 2\langle \cos(2\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(2\phi - \phi_{S}) \}]
$$
\n
$$
+ \lambda_{l} \{2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S}) \} }{2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \} \frac{1}{\langle \cos(\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \} }
$$
\n<

$$
= \sigma_{UU}^{h} \{1 + 2(\cos(\phi))_{UU}^{h} \cos(\phi) + 2(\cos(2\phi))_{UU}^{h} \cos(2\phi) \n+ \lambda_{l} 2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{LU}^{h} \sin(\phi) \n+ \lambda_{l} 2\langle \sin(\phi) \rangle_{UL}^{h} \sin(\phi) + 2\langle \sin(2\phi) \rangle_{UL}^{h} \sin(2\phi) \n+ \lambda_{l} (2\langle \cos(0\phi) \rangle_{LL}^{h} \cos(0\phi) + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{UL}^{h} \cos(\phi)) \}
$$
\n
$$
+ \lambda_{l} (2\langle \cos(0\phi) \rangle_{LL}^{h} \cos(0\phi) + 2\langle \cos(\phi) \rangle_{LL}^{h} \cos(\phi)) \}
$$
\n
$$
+ \frac{S_{T} [2\langle \sin(\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{UT}^{h} \sin(\phi - \phi_{S}) + 2\langle \sin(\phi + \phi_{S}) \rangle_{UT}^{h} \sin(\phi + \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ 2\langle \sin(2\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{UT}^{h} \sin(3\phi - \phi_{S}) + 2\langle \sin(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{UT}^{h} \sin(\phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ 2\langle \cos(\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ \lambda_{l} (2\langle \cos(\phi - \phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ 2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ 2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ 2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ 2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ 2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$
\n
$$
+ 2\langle \cos(\phi_{S}) \rangle_{LT}^{h} \cos(\phi - \phi_{S})
$$

 $2\langle \sin(\phi + \phi_S)\rangle_{UT}^h = \epsilon F_{UT}^{\sin(\phi + \phi_S)}$

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

 $2\langle \sin(\phi + \phi_S)\rangle_{UT}^h = \epsilon F_{UT}^{\sin(\phi + \phi_S)}$

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

$$
F_{XY}\propto \mathcal{C}\,[\text{TMD\,PDF}
$$

⊆

quark polarisation

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

not necessarily lead to a more accurate description of the underlying physics, because it is a more accurate t

hadron polarisation polarisation hadron

U

quark polarisation

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

hadron polarisation polarisation hadron

ᄅ

quark polarisation
TMD PDFs and fragmentation functions (FFs)

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

hadron polarisation polarisation hadron

U

quark polarisation

TMD PDFs and fragmentation functions (FFs)

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

 h_{1L}^\perp

nucleon polarisation ucleon polarisation

U

hadron polarisation polarisation DOI

 $\frac{1}{1T}$ g_{1T}^{\perp}

 f_{1T}^{\perp} g_{1T}^{\perp} $h_{1T}h_{1T}^{\perp}$

L

T

*g*1*^L*

TMD PDFs and fragmentation functions (FFs)

Azimuthal amplitudes related to structure functions F_{XY} :

Spin-momentum $correlations$ \mathbb{H}^1

Unpolarized

Spin-spin correlations

Transverse momentum dependent fragmentation functions **Twist-2 3D Fragmentation Functions**

S) Fragmentation functions (FFs) mmm
(q,v) e $u(x)$ D

Fragmentation functions

Drell-Yan

Drell-Yan

inclusive hadron production in pp collisions

 \mathbf{r} , \mathbf{r} , \mathbf{r} , \mathbf{r}

Adapted from A. Bacchetta

Adapted from A. Bacchetta

Validity of TMD description

 $A_N \nmid$

Consistent results for TMD and CT3 in overlap region

2 characteristic scales: small P_{hT} and large Q^2

Spin-independent TMD PDFs: global analysis Experiments(TUDY ENDING

 $\vec{e} + \vec{p}, \vec{n}, \vec{d}$ Experiments(

 \overline{y}

SLACE:

EBY ANS

e

CERN:

 $\sum_{i=1}^N$

and Indiana

RHIC: 2009

µ+p,d

HERA:

HERMES

e+p,d,3He

J
James Company (1994)

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n}$

ation of the contract of the second of the
Property of the second o

PHENIX, 1997

Spin-independent TMD PDFs: global analysis Experiments(TUDY ENDING

 $\vec{e} + \vec{p}, \vec{n}, \vec{d}$ Experiments(

 \overline{y}

SLACE:

EBY ANS

e

CERN:

 $\sum_{i=1}^N$

and Indiana

µ+p,d

RHIC: 2009

HERA:

HERMES

e+p,d,3He

J
James Company (1994)

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n}$

ation of the contract of the second of the
Property of the second o

PHENIX, 1997

 $e^+ + e^-$

 \mathcal{S}

Spin-independent TMD PDFs: global analysis Experiments(TUDY ENDING

 $\vec{e} + \vec{p}, \vec{n}, \vec{d}$ Experiments(

 \overline{y}

SLACE:

EBY ANS

e

CERN:

 $\sum_{i=1}^N$

and Indiana

µ+p,d

RHIC: 2009

HERA:

HERMES

e+p,d,3He

J
James Company (1994)

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n}$

ation of the contract of the second of the
Property of the second o

PHENIX, 1997

 $e^+ + e^-$

 \mathcal{S}

Spin-independent TMD PDFs: global analysis Experiments(TUDY ENDING JFs: global and

Kinematic coverage

PDF 2 evolution of TMD PDF $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{C}}$ Large lever-arm in Q TMD \equiv arm ð evolution Large lever- $\frac{1}{2}$

Kinematic coverage

Spin-independent TMD

8 -3 15

 $30\,$ $\overline{\text{GeV}}$ 3 $\overline{\text{GeV}}$ $7\overline{ }$ $\overline{\text{GeV}}$ 8 $\overline{}$ \rm{GeV} 8 $_{\rm eeV}$ 8 $\frac{4.5}{\rm{GeV}}$ $7\overline{ }$ $\frac{4.5}{\rm{GeV}}$ 9 $4.5\,$

 $457\,$

Spin-independent TMD PDFs: global analysis

 $A_{UT} = \frac{1}{\langle |S_T|\rangle} \frac{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) - N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) + N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}$

 $A_{UT} = \frac{1}{\langle |S_T| \rangle} \frac{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) - N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) + N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}$

 $\sin(\phi + \phi_S)$ ∑ *q*

 $A_{UT} = \frac{1}{\langle |S_T| \rangle} \frac{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) - N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) + N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}$

 $\sin(\phi + \phi_S)$ ∑ *q*

 $A_{UT} = \frac{1}{\langle |S_T| \rangle} \frac{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) - N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) + N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}$

 $\sin(\phi + \phi_S)$ ∑ *q*

 h_1^q ¹*T*(*x*, *k*⊥) : transversity

 $A_{UT} = \frac{1}{\langle |S_T| \rangle} \frac{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) - N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}{N^{\uparrow}(\phi, \phi_S) + N^{\downarrow}(\phi, \phi_S)}$

 $\sin(\phi + \phi_S)$ ∑ *q*

 h_1^q ¹*T*(*x*, *k*⊥) : transversity $H_1^{\perp,q}$ ¹ (*z*, *p*⊥) : Collins fragmentation function

Collins amplitudes

string break, quark-antiquark pair with vacuum numbers:

X. Artru et al., Z. Phys. C**73** (1997) 527 X. Artru et al. , Z. Phys. C**73** (1997) 527

polarisation component in lepton scattering plane reversed by photoabsorption:

Collins fragmentation function: Artru model Artru model

Collins amplitudes

Collins amplitudes

Sivers amplitudes

- Sivers function:
- requires non-zero orbital angular momentum
- \cdot final-state interactions \rightarrow azimuthal asymmetries
-
-
- -
	-
	-
	-

Sivers amplitudes

- Sivers function:
- requires non-zero orbital angular momentum
- \cdot final-state interactions \rightarrow azimuthal asymmetries

Sivers amplitudes

- Sivers function:
- requires non-zero orbital angular momentum
- \cdot final-state interactions \rightarrow azimuthal asymmetries

- π^+ :
- positive -> non-zero orbital angular momentum
- π[−]:
- consistent with zero $\rightarrow u$ and d quark cancelation

Sivers function

nucleon polarised along *y*

Predicted Sivers sign change for SIDIS and Drell-Yan
\n
$$
\Phi_{ij}(p, P, S) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^4} \int d^4 \xi \ e^{ip \cdot \xi} \langle P, S | \overline{\psi}_j(0) U_{[0,\xi]} \psi_i(\xi) | P, S \rangle
$$
\nJ. C. Collins, Phys. Lett. B 536 (2002) 43

the process dependence of the gauge link usually cancels out. However, the situation is different for *f* ⊥

$d\sigma(\pi^-p^{\uparrow} \to \mu^+\mu^-X) \sim 1 + \overline{h}_1^{\perp} \otimes h_1^{\perp} \cos(2\phi)$ $+|S_T|$ $\overline{f}_1 \otimes \overline{f}_{1T}^{\perp} \sin \phi_S$ $+|S_T| \bar{h}_1^{\perp} \otimes h_{1T}^{\perp} \sin(2\phi + \phi_S)$ $+|S_T| \ \bar{h}_1^\perp \otimes h_{\rm 1\!} \sin (2\phi - \phi_S)$

 $d\sigma(\pi^-p^{\uparrow} \to \mu^+\mu^-X) \sim 1 + \overline{h}_1^{\perp} \otimes h_1^{\perp} \cos(2\phi)$ $+|S_T|$ $\overline{f}_1 \otimes \overline{f}_{1T}^{\perp} \sin \phi_S$ $+|S_T| \bar{h}_1^{\perp} \otimes h_{1T}^{\perp} \sin(2\phi + \phi_S)$ $+|S_T|\llbracket \overline{h}_1^\perp\otimes h_{\rm 1T} {\rm sin}(2\phi-\phi_S) \rrbracket$

$$
\rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-}X)\sim 1 + \overline{h}_{1}^{\perp} \otimes h_{1}^{\perp} \cos(2\phi)
$$

+|S_T| $\overline{f}_{1} \otimes \overline{f}_{1T}^{\perp} \sin \phi_{S}$
+|S_T| $\overline{h}_{1}^{\perp} \otimes h_{1T}^{\perp} \sin(2\phi + \phi_{S})$
+|S_T| $\overline{h}_{1}^{\perp} \otimes h_{1T} \sin(2\phi - \phi_{S})$

Investigation of the Sivers sign change in $p^{\uparrow}\pi^-$ collisions

29

Investigation of the Sivers sign change in $p^{\uparrow}p$ collisions

arXiv:2308.15496v1

Boer-Mulders PDF

Boer-Mulders modulation

spin-independent Boer-Mulders modulation

Boer-Mulders PDF

$$
e_q^2 C \left[h_1^{\perp,q}(x,k_\perp) \times H_1^{\perp,q}(z,p_\perp) \right]
$$

Spin-dependence with unpolarised hadrons!

Measurement in ep:

 $\langle \cos(2\phi_h) \rangle_{Born}(j)$

 $\langle \cos(2\phi_h) \rangle_{meas}(i)$

Measurement in ep:

 $\langle \cos(2\phi_h) \rangle_{Born}(j)$

 \bullet

- QED radiate effects
-

• limited geometric and kinematic acceptance of detector

- QED radiate effects
-
-

• limited geometric and kinematic acceptance of detector

• limited detector resolution

Measurement in ep: $\langle \cos(2\phi_h) \rangle_{Born}(j)$ $\langle \cos(2\phi_h) \rangle_{meas}(i)$

- QED radiate effects
-
-

• limited geometric and kinematic acceptance of detector

• limited detector resolution

Boer-Mulders.in.iodulation Save settings Content filter off on Royalty Free Editorial Exclusive Only with people Advanced Search **Stock Image: 4D Text ID 36460131 © Libux77 | Dreamstime.com Tweet G+1** \triangleleft **0** \vert **Like 0**

36

 $\left[h_1^{\perp,q} \times H_1^{\perp,q}\right]$ k_T \rightarrow \star

tector

Boer-Mulders asymmetries

H–D comparison: $h_1^{\perp,u} \approx h_1^{\perp,d}$ Negative for π^+ ; positive for $\pi^- \to H_1^{\perp,fav} \approx -\, H_1^{\perp,disfav}$

Boer-Mulders asymmetries

H–D comparison: $h_1^{\perp,u} \approx h_1^{\perp,d}$ Negative for π^+ ; positive for $\pi^- \to H_1^{\perp,fav} \approx -\, H_1^{\perp,disfav}$

Gluon TMD PDFs Gluon TMD PDFs FFs, which are as relevant as TMD distributions for processes which are sensitive to the role of transverse

nucleon polarisation nucleon polarisation

gluon polarisation

Gluon TMD PDFs Gluon TMD PDFs FFs, which are as relevant as TMD distributions for processes which are sensitive to the role of transverse

nucleon polarisation nucleon polarisation

gluon polarisation

• In contrast to quark TMDs, gluon TMDs are almost unknown

Gluon TMD PDFs Gluon TMD PDFs FFs, which are as relevant as TMD distributions for processes which are sensitive to the role of transverse

nucleon polarisation nucleon polarisation

- In contrast to quark TMDs, gluon TMDs are almost unknown
- Accessible through production of dijets, high-P_T hadron pairs, quarkonia

gluon polarisation

 $\sigma \propto F_1 \mathcal{C}[f_1^g f_1^g] + F_2 \mathcal{C}[w_2 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] + \left(F_3 \mathcal{C}[w_3 f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] + F_3' \mathcal{C}[w_3' f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (2\phi_{CS}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C}[w_4 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (4\phi_{CS})$ $\mathbf{F}[\mathbf{$ $W. h^{\circ +} h^{\circ +}$ | | C Ω | 4

 $\sigma \propto F_1 \mathcal{C}[f_1^g f_1^g] + F_2 \mathcal{C}[w_2 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] + \left(F_3 \mathcal{C}[w_3 f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] + F_3' \mathcal{C}[w_3' f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (2\phi_{CS}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C}[w_4 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (4\phi_{CS})$ $\mathbf{F}[\mathbf{$ $W. h^{\circ +} h^{\circ +}$ | | C Ω | 4

 $\sigma \propto F_1 \mathcal{C}[f_1^g f_1^g] + F_2 \mathcal{C}[w_2 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] + \left(F_3 \mathcal{C}[w_3 f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] + F_3' \mathcal{C}[w_3' f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (2\phi_{CS}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C}[w_4 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (4\phi_{CS})$ $\mathbf{F}[\mathbf{$ $W. h^{\circ +} h^{\circ +}$ | | C Ω | 4

 $\sigma \propto F_1 \mathcal{C}[f_1^g f_1^g] + F_2 \mathcal{C}[w_2 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] + \left(F_3 \mathcal{C}[w_3 f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] + F_3' \mathcal{C}[w_3' f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (2\phi_{CS}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C}[w_4 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (4\phi_{CS})$ $f(g|I)$ **,** $g(f|I)$ $f(f|I)$ $W\cdot h^{\delta+}h^{\delta+}$ | cos 4π

- *J*/*ψJ*/*ψ* production largely dominated by gluon-induced processes
- Invariant mass of pair \rightarrow scale variation

 $\sigma \propto F_1 \mathcal{C}[f_1^g f_1^g] + F_2 \mathcal{C}[w_2 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] + \left(F_3 \mathcal{C}[w_3 f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] + F_3' \mathcal{C}[w_3' f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (2\phi_{CS}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C}[w_4 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (4\phi_{CS})$ $f(g|I)$ **,** $g(f|I)$ $f(f|I)$ $W\cdot h^{\delta+}h^{\delta+}$ | cos 4π

- *J*/*ψJ*/*ψ* production largely dominated by gluon-induced processes
- Invariant mass of pair \rightarrow scale variation
- Need to subtract double-parton-scattering contribution from data

 $\sigma \propto F_1 \mathcal{C}[f_1^g f_1^g] + F_2 \mathcal{C}[w_2 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] + \left(F_3 \mathcal{C}[w_3 f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] + F_3' \mathcal{C}[w_3' f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (2\phi_{CS}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C}[w_4 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (4\phi_{CS})$ $f(g|I)$ **,** $g(f|I)$ $f(f|I)$ $W\cdot h^{\delta+}h^{\delta+}$ | cos 4π

 $x_2P_2+k_{2T}$ $P_{Q,2}$ $x_1P_1 + k_{1T}$ $P_{Q,1}$ $\left(\frac{2k_{1T}^{\mu}k_{1T}^{\nu}-g_{T}^{\mu\nu}k_{1T}^{2}}{M_{p}^{2}}\right)$

 $\sigma \propto F_1 \mathcal{C}[f_1^g f_1^g] + F_2 \mathcal{C}[w_2 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] + \left(F_3 \mathcal{C}[w_3 f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] + F_3' \mathcal{C}[w_3' f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (2\phi_{CS}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C}[w_4 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (4\phi_{CS})$ $f(g|I)$ **,** $g(f|I)$ $f(f|I)$ $W\cdot h^{\delta+}h^{\delta+}$ | cos 4π

 $d\lambda$

- *J*/*ψJ*/*ψ* production largely dominated by gluon-induced processes
- Invariant mass of pair \rightarrow scale variation
- Need to subtract double-parton-scattering contribution from data

- *J/ψJ/ψ* production largely dominated by gluon-induced processes
- Invariant mass of pair \rightarrow scale variation
- Need to subtract double-parton-scattering contribution from data

¹ *h*?*^g* P_2 $\overline{\overline{P_{\phi}}^{\rho\sigma}}$ $=\frac{-1}{2} \left\{ g_{\pi}^{\mu\nu} f_3^g \right\}$ $\int \frac{2k_{2T}^{\mu}k_{2T}^{\nu}}{2\pi i}$ $k_{2T}^{\mu}k_{2T}^{\nu}-g_{T}^{\mu\nu}k_{2T}^{\nu}$ *^c* ⁼ *^F*4*C*[*w*4*h*?*^g* $x_2 P_2 + k_{2T}$ $\begin{array}{ccc} P_1 + k_{2T} & & & \sigma \ & P_{2,1} & & & \sigma \ & & P_{3,2} & & \end{array}$) are hard-scattering coecients, *wi*(⁰ \sim \sim ∞ $x_1P_1 + k_{1T}$ and $P_{Q,1}$ is the unpolarised proton collision collisions, and $P_{Q,1}$ $\left\{\Phi_{g}^{\mu\nu}=\frac{1}{2x_{1}}\left\{g_{T}^{\mu\nu}f_{1}^{g}-\left(\frac{2k_{1T}^{\mu}k_{1T}^{\nu}-g_{T}^{\mu\nu}k_{1T}^{2}}{M_{P}^{2}}\right)h_{1}^{\perp g}\right\}\right\}$ The *d* processes and \overline{y} is an algebra of \overline{y}

di-*J/*

 $F'Z'_{11}/f^{2}_{18}$ di-*J/* $\cos(2\phi_{cs}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C} [w_4 h^{g_+} h^{g_+}] \right) \cos(4\phi_{cs})$ $\frac{36 \text{ L} \cdot \text{kg}}{100}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ / $\frac{66 \text{ L}}{100}$ $\frac{29 \text{ C}}{100}$ $\frac{46 \text{ L}}{100}$ $\frac{100}{100}$ $\frac{9 \text{ C}}{19 \text{ C}}$ $\sigma \propto F_1 \mathcal{C}[f_1^g f_1^g] + F_2 \mathcal{C}[w_2 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] + \left(F_3 \mathcal{C}[w_3 f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] + F_3' \mathcal{C}[w_3' f_1^g h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (2\phi_{CS}) + \left(F_4 \mathcal{C}[w_4 h_1^{g\perp} h_1^{g\perp}] \right) \cos (4\phi_{CS})$ $f(g|I)$ **,** $g(f|I)$ $f(f|I)$ $W\cdot h^{\delta+}h^{\delta+}$ | cos 4π

Spin-independent gluon TMDs via *J*/*ψJ*/*ψ* production

Upcoming

Meson structure

Upcoming

Upcoming

Future

 $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}}$ 38
Spin-independent TMD PDF: impact of EIC

DIS variables via scattered lepton

$$
Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
0.01 < y < 0.95
$$

\n
$$
W^2 > 10 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
10 \times 100 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
18 \times 100 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
18 \times 275 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
Q^2 > 10 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

$$
Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
0.01 < y < 0.95
$$

\n
$$
W^2 > 10 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
10 \times 100 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
18 \times 100 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n
$$
18 \times 275 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

$$
Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2
$$

\n $01 < y < 0.95$
\n $Q^2 > 10 \text{ GeV}^2$
\n $Q^2 > 10 \text{ GeV}^2$

Sivers TMD PDF: impact of EIC

Q=2 GeV

Parametrisation from M. Bury et al., JHEP, 05:151, 2021

DIS variables via scattered lepton and the seudo-shaded areas represent the current uncertainty of 2 GeV. The blue-shaded areas are the current uncertainty of the blue-shaded areas are the blue-shaded are the blue-shaded a

41

$\begin{CD} \mathsf{equation}\ \mathsf{w}(x,\vec{k}_T,\vec{b}_\perp) \ \mathsf{w}^{k_T}_{\bullet} = x P_{z} \end{CD}$ The various dimensions of the nucleon structure \overline{k} \overline{b} Wigner distributions *W*(*x,* k_T , $b_\perp)$ z
Zanada
Zanada Z $d^2\bar{b}$ $d^2\vec{k}_T$ b_{\perp} k_T *xP^z* transverse-momentum b_{\perp} *P*_z dependent (TMD) parton distribution functions γ^* PRD 92 ('00) 071503 (PDFs) Int. J. Mod Phys. A 18 ('03) 173 data exist (0.01 . *x* . 0.3) should be taken with due care. At variance with previous studies, in the denominator of z
Zanada
Zanada \sim (12) and (12) we are using unpolarized that we are using unpolarized that we are using uncontrolled in our previous \sim forward limit $d^2\vec{k}_T$ Pd^2k_T PDFs $\rho_{p^{\uparrow}}^{u}$ 1.0 ρ_n^d p^{\uparrow} 1*.*0 u 1*.*0 4 k_x d $\sqrt{k_x}$ 3*.*0 0*.*5 0.5 0.5 0*.*5 2*.*5 3 y (GeV) $_{\rm y}$ (GeV) 2*.*0 \mathbf{b}_{y} (fm) 0*.*0 0*.*0 2 0.0 0.0 1*.*5 \approx \rtimes -0.5 1*.*0 -0.5 1 0*.*5 $x = 0.1$ -0.5 0.5 $x = 0.1$ -1.0 $+$ -1.0 \downarrow 2 4 1 2 3 $\epsilon = 0 + 4$ $k_y = 0$ 2 2 -1.0 1 $1.0 - 1.0$ -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 -0.5 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 $\mathbf{b}_{\mathsf{x}}\left(\mathsf{fm}\right)$ \mathbf{k}_{x} (GeV) \mathbf{k}_{x} (GeV)

The nucleon structure
 $\begin{CD} \text{F}_{\mathcal{F}}^{k_T} & \text{F}_{\mathcal{F}}^{k_T} \end{CD}$ The various dimensions of the nucleon structure \overline{k} \overline{b} Wigner distributions *W*(*x,* k_T , $b_\perp)$ z
Zanada
Zanada Z $d^2\bar{b}$ $d^2\vec{k}_T$ b_{\perp} \blacktriangleright *kT xP^z* transverse-momentum *b*_{$\frac{1}{z}$} dependent (TMD) parton distribution functions γ^* PRD 92 ('00) 071503 (PDFs) Int. J. Mod Phys. A 18 ('03) 173 data exist (0.01 . *x* . 0.3) should be taken with due care. At variance with previous studies, in the denominator of z
Zanada
Zanada \sim and (12) and (12) we are using unpolarized that we are using unpolarized that we are using unpolarized from \sim forward limit $d^2\vec{k}_T$ Pd^2k_T is the set of d^2k_T PDFs $\rho_{p^{\uparrow}}^{u}$ 1.0 ρ_n^d p^{\uparrow} 1*.*0 u 1*.*0 4 $k_x = \vert 0$ d $\sqrt{k_x}$ 3*.*0 0*.*5 0.5 0.5 0*.*5 2*.*5 3 y (GeV) (GeV) 2*.*0 0*.*0 b_y (fm) 0*.*0 2 1*.*5 0.0 0.0 \approx \vec{x} 1*.*0 -0.5 -0.5 1 -0.5 $x = 0.1$ $x = 0.1$ 0.5 -0.5 -1.0 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ -1.0 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 2 4 1 2 3 $k_y = 0$ | 4 $k_{y} = 0$ 2 2 1 $1.0 - 1.0$ -0.5 -1.5 -0.5 0.0 0.5 $\mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{x}}$ (fm) -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 -1.0 -0.5 0.0 0.5 1.0 $k_x(GeV)$ \mathbf{k}_{x} (GeV)

- x=average longitudinal momentum fraction
- 2ξ=longitudinal momentum transfer
- t=squared momentum transfer to hadron
- experimental access to t and ξ
- in general: no experimental access to x

What are generalised parton distributions (GPDs)?

GPDs are probability amplitudes

Four parton helicity-conserving twist-2 GPDs

- x=average longitudinal momentum fraction
- 2ξ=longitudinal momentum transfer
- t=squared momentum transfer to hadron
- experimental access to t and ξ
- in general: no experimental access to x

 $E_T(x,\xi,t)$

What are generalised parton distributions (GPDs)?

GPDs are probability amplitudes

• for spin-1/2 hadron:

Four parton helicity-conserving twist-2 GPDs

Four parton helicity-flip twist-2 GPDs

for the nucleon:

In the forward limit

forward limit: $\xi = 0, t = 0$

GPD H GPDs H+E

M. Burkardt, PRD 92 ('00) 071503 mentum transfer. A transfer many process in the many process in F *e*+*p* collisions, the relevant hard scale is *Q*² Int. J. Mod Phys. A **18** ('03) 173

 $\overline{}$ impact-parameter dependent distributions: probobility to find probability to find parton (x,b_T)

 \overline{A} spin, and parton distributions can depend on GPDs

to convert the distributions of \overline{F} respectively. \vert transform for $\xi = 0$

What GPDs tell us about the nucleon $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ beyond the reach of lattice computations, in gluons, they provide a unifying they provide a unifying theoretical and they provide a unifying theoretical and f ametar for the direction for the direction of f structure in discussed. The contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the 2.24 structure 2.2 T

collider measurements are our only source of ton di: • 3D parton distributions

GPD H GPDs H+E

verse position *b^T* in the proton. • pressure distributions M. Burkardt, PRD 92 ('00) 071503 **nd. J. Mod Phys. A 18 ('03) 173** *e*+*p* collisions, the relevant hard scale is *Q*²

 $\overline{}$ impact-parameter dependent distributions: probobility to find probability to find parton (x,b_T)

 \overline{A} spin, and parton distributions can depend on GPDs

What GPDs tell us about the nucleon $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ beyond the reach of lattice computations, in gluons, they provide a unifying they provide a unifying theoretical and they provide a unifying theoretical and f ametar for the direction for the direction of f structure in discussed. The contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the 2.24 structure 2.2 T

collider measurements are our only source of ton di: • 3D parton distributions

gravitational form factors

pressure distributions Fourier transform

to convert the distributions of \overline{F} respectively. \vert transform for $\xi = 0$

verse position *b^T* in the proton. • pressure distributions M. Burkardt, PRD 92 ('00) 071503 mentum transfer. A transfer many process in the many process in F *e*+*p* collisions, the relevant hard scale is *Q*² Int. J. Mod Phys. A **18** ('03) 173

 $\overline{}$ impact-parameter dependent distributions: probobility to find probability to find parton (x,b_T)

 \overline{A} spin, and parton distributions can depend on GPDs

What GPDs tell us about the nucleon $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ $\left(\begin{array}{cc} -\end{array} \right)$ beyond the reach of lattice computations, in gluons, they provide a unifying they provide a unifying theoretical and they provide a unifying theoretical and f ametar for the direction for the direction of f structure in discussed. The contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the 2.24 structure 2.2 T

collider measurements are our only source of ton di: • 3D parton distributions

to convert the distributions of \overline{F} respectively. \vert transform for $\xi = 0$

(a) (b)

GPD H GPDs H+E

… and its spin

longitudinally polarised nucleon

Deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) Hard scale=large $Q^2 = -q^2$

Deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) Hard scale=large $Q^2 = -q^2$

CLAS – PRC 80 ('09) 035206; PRL 87 ('01) 182002; 100 ('08) 162002

COMPASS – arXiv:1702.06315

JLab Hall A Collaboration – PRL 99 ('07) 242501; PRC 92 ('15) 055202; Nat. Com. **8** ('17) 1408

HERMES – JHEP 10 ('12) 042; PLB 704 ('11) 15; NPB 842 ('11) 265

H1 – PLB 681 ('09) 391; 659 ('07) 796; EPJ C 44 ('05) 1

ZEUS – PLB 573 (2003) 46; JHEP 05 ('09) 108

Deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) Hard scale=large $Q^2 = -q^2$

Experimental access to GPDs: electroproduction chirality +1 1 *q*¯ helicity 1*/*2 +1*/*2

CLAS – PRC 80 ('09) 035206; PRL 87 ('01) 182002; 100 ('08) 162002

COMPASS – arXiv:1702.06315

JLab Hall A Collaboration – PRL 99 ('07) 242501; PRC 92 ('15) 055202; Nat. Com. **8** ('17) 1408

HERMES – JHEP 10 ('12) 042; PLB 704 ('11) 15; NPB 842 ('11) 265

H1 – PLB 681 ('09) 391; 659 ('07) 796; EPJ C 44 ('05) 1

ZEUS – PLB 573 (2003) 46; JHEP 05 ('09) 108

Deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) Hard scale=large $Q^2 = -q^2$

Experimental access to GPDs: electroproduction chirality +1 1 *q*¯ helicity 1*/*2 +1*/*2

Hard exclusive meson production Hard scale=large Q²

CLAS – PRC 80 ('09) 035206; PRL 87 ('01) 182002; 100 ('08) 162002

COMPASS – arXiv:1702.06315

JLab Hall A Collaboration – PRL 99 ('07) 242501; PRC 92 ('15) 055202; Nat. Com. **8** ('17) 1408

HERMES – JHEP 10 ('12) 042; PLB 704 ('11) 15; NPB 842 ('11) 265

H1 – PLB 681 ('09) 391; 659 ('07) 796; EPJ C 44 ('05) 1

ZEUS – PLB 573 (2003) 46; JHEP 05 ('09) 108

CLAS – PRC 95 ('17) 035207; 95 (2017) 035202 COMPASS – PLB 731 ('14) 19; NPB 915 ('17) 454 JLab Hall A Collaboration – PRC 83 ('11) 025201 HERMES – EPJ C 74 ('14) 3110; 75 ('15) 600; 77 ('17) 378

Deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) Hard scale=large $Q^2 = -q^2$

Experimental access to GPDs: electroproduction chirality +1 1 *q*¯ helicity 1*/*2 +1*/*2

CLAS – PRC 80 ('09) 035206; PRL 87 ('01) 182002; 100 ('08) 162002

COMPASS – arXiv:1702.06315

JLab Hall A Collaboration – PRL 99 ('07) 242501; PRC 92 ('15) 055202; Nat. Com. **8** ('17) 1408

HERMES – JHEP 10 ('12) 042; PLB 704 ('11) 15; NPB 842 ('11) 265

H1 – PLB 681 ('09) 391; 659 ('07) 796; EPJ C 44 ('05) 1

ZEUS – PLB 573 (2003) 46; JHEP 05 ('09) 108

Deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) Hard scale=large $Q^2 = -q^2$

CLAS – PRC 80 ('09) 035206; PRL 87 ('01) 182002; 100 ('08) 162002

COMPASS – arXiv:1702.06315

JLab Hall A Collaboration – PRL 99 ('07) 242501; PRC 92 ('15) 055202; Nat. Com. **8** ('17) 1408

HERMES – JHEP 10 ('12) 042; PLB 704 ('11) 15; NPB 842 ('11) 265

H1 – PLB 681 ('09) 391; 659 ('07) 796; EPJ C 44 ('05) 1

ZEUS – PLB 573 (2003) 46; JHEP 05 ('09) 108

 \rightarrow fixed target: medium/large x_B , quarks

 \rightarrow fixed target: medium/large x_B, quarks

Exclusive meson photoproduction

 \mathbf{l}

 \rightarrow fixed target: medium/large x_B, quarks

Exclusive meson photoproduction

 \rightarrow fixed target: medium/large x_B , quarks

Experimental access to GPDs: photoproduction \sim 1 \sim 1 \sim 1 *x* tal access to GP em em

 \rightarrow fixed target: medium/large x_B , quarks

Exclusive meson photoproduction

Experiments(

 T and T ∞ ∞ \mathbb{R} \mathbb{R} \mathbb{R}

HERA: A RAY AND A RAY

RHIC:

 $\vec{e} + \vec{p}, \vec{n}, \vec{d}$

HERMES

e+p,d,3He

A.Bazilevsky,(SPIN16(

 \Box

 $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{A}}$

$\vec{e} + \vec{p}, \vec{n}, \vec{d}$

RHIC:

 \equiv

PHENIX,

 $\frac{1}{\epsilon} \circ \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Q}$.

p+p collider

experience

Hall A, B, C

ERN

EMC, SMC,

COMPASS

µ+p,d

distance of State

e+p,d,3He

SLAC:

RHIC:

PHENIX,

STAR

EMC, SMC,

COMPASSION

H
NATIONAL

 $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$

HERMES

et de la provincia de la companya de

JLab:

JLab: Experience of the contract of Tremendous efforts over $\sum_{i=1}^n$ Experiments investigating GPDs

 $\vec{p}\,\vec{p}$ collider

p *p* comuel

CERNI

W dependence of exclusive production σ ∝ W^δ , δ =4(αIP − 1), αIP (t) = αIP (0) + α′ σ ∝ W^δ , δ =4(αIP − 1), αIP (t) = αIP (0) + α′

t dependence

]

]

γ∗ **p** → φ **Y**

γ∗ **p** → φ **p** 50

Q²+M_V dependence of b 2

dDVCS/d*t*= e-*B*|*t*| = *(Im*^H *)2* 2016 analysed statistics = 2.3 Ref In transverse plane Quark distribution in transverse plane ⊥⟩ ⁼ *(*0*.*⁵⁸ [±] ⁰*.*04stat + 0*.*01 ! ± 0*.*04model*)*fm. For this measurement, the average

²⁰⁶ lated as the ratio of the number of background events to 207 200 \overline{a} and application of all the samples constraints, the samples constraints, the samples constraints, the samples of all the samples constraints, the samples constraints, the samples constraints, the samples constrai Density Matrix Elements (SDMES) or 210 sample is referred to in the following as data in the following as data in the following as data in the "e
The following as data in the following as data in the "entire following" as data in the "entire following" as Fit angular distribution of decay pions $\,\mathcal{W}(\Phi, \phi, \Theta, \phi_S)$ and extract either $\,$ $\,$ 2388 as given in the first letter in the first letter in the superscripts. The sub-Spin Density Matrix Elements (SDMEs) or helicity amplitude ratios **National Elements**

Exclusive ρ^0 production on a transversely polarised target

²⁰⁵ ground under the exclusive peak. This fraction is calcu-

21 invariant-mass distribution of the state o
The state of the st

 $k = 1/2$, the $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\$

²⁴⁰ (*T*) denotes unpolarized (transversely polarized) target.

2I) $\overline{1}$. Exclusive ρ^0 production on a transversely polarised target

*

via unpolarised target

via transversely polarised target

B0 detector was encoded in the simulation, allowing for accurate mod-Future: EIC

Fig. 33. Projected DVCS differential cross-section measurements as a function of the

 $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E} \mathbf$

 γ U

Exclusive meson photoproduction
Hard scale = darge mass
Hard scale = darge pharm/bottom-quark mass h al e^{\pm} harge e^{\pm} harge mass h arge mass h arge mass Exclusive meson photoproduction
scale^d=&from photoproduction
scale^{d=&from photoproduction} Hard scale^{d La}arge chargy bottom-quark mass

H1 – EPJ C 46 ('06) 585; 73 ('13) 2466; PLB 541 ('02) 251

$$
W_{\gamma p} = [30, 300]~\mathrm{GeV}
$$

down to $x_B=10^{-4}$

 γ U γ

Exclusive meson photoproduction
Hard scale = darge mass
Hard scale = darge pharm/bottom-quark mass ale^a targe eham /botton quark mass and search the large mass large mass Exclusive meson photoproduction
scale^d=&from photoproduction
scale^{d=&from photoproduction} Hard scale^{d La}arge chargy bottom-quark mass

 $\frac{\text{rad}\, \text{g}}{\text{large}}$ Q^2

$$
W_{\gamma p} = [30, 300]~\mathrm{GeV}
$$

down to $x_B=10^{-4}$

 γ U

Exclusive meson photoproduction
Hard scale = darge mass
Hard scale = darge pharm/bottom-quark mass large *Q*² hard scale = hard scale = large mass Exclusive meson photoproduction
scale^d=targe mange Hard scale^{d La}arge chargy bottom-quark mass

H1 – EPJ C 46 ('06) 585; 73 ('13) 2466; PLB 541 ('02) 251

$$
W_{\gamma p} = [30, 300]~\mathrm{GeV}
$$

down to $x_B=10^{-4}$

σ oper to verte end the LHC Phase-space covered at the LHC

large–impact-parameter interactions

large–impact-parameter interactions

hadronic interactions strongly suppressed

instead: electromagnetic interactions

RA

RA

large–impact-parameter interactions

hadronic interactions strongly suppressed

instead: electromagnetic interactions

Z photon flux ∝ Z2

RA

large–impact-parameter interactions

hadronic interactions strongly suppressed

instead: electromagnetic interactions

 $\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{D}$ **b**>R_A+R_B |

photon virtuality
$$
Q^2 < \left(\frac{\hbar c}{R_A}\right)^2
$$

 \rightarrow quasi-real photons

Ultra-peripheral collisions

maximum photon energy = $\frac{2\gamma\hbar c}{\hbar}$ $b_{\rm min}$ 2 Figure 1. Schematic diagram of an ultraperipheral collision of two ions. The impact

Z photon flux ∝ Z2

RA

large–impact-parameter interactions

hadronic interactions strongly suppressed

instead: electromagnetic interactions

 $\mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{D} \cdot \mathbf{D}$ **b**>R_A+R_B | instead: electromagnetic interactions

Ultra-peripheral collisions Ultra-peripheral collisions nuclei is due to Lorentz contraction.

large–impact-parameter interactions large–impact-parameter interactions

hadronic interactions strongly suppressed hadronic interactions strongly suppressed

flux $\propto Z^2$ t lux ∝ Z^2

 $\log \varrho^2$ \sim $\log \frac{1}{\text{large}} Q^2$

Exclusive single ѱ production in pp collisions

- Exclusive J/ψ and $ψ(2S): \sqrt{s} = 7$ TeV and part of $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV data (from 2015)
- \rightarrow x_B down to 2x10⁻⁶
- Reconstruction via dimuon decay, with $2 <$ η<4.5.
- No other detector activity.
- Quarkonia J// ψ and ψ (2S): 2<y<4.5 and p_T^2 <0.8 GeV²

Exclusive single ѱ production in pp collisions

-
- \rightarrow x_B down to 2x10⁻⁶
- Reconstruction via dimuon decay, with $2 <$ η<4.5.
- No other detector activity.
- Quarkonia J// ψ and ψ (2S): 2<y<4.5 and p_T^2 <0.8 GeV²

Background: feed down and proton dissociation r \cap

 $\frac{\sigma_{\psi\to\mu^+\mu^-}}{dy}(2.0 < \eta_\mu < 4.5) = \frac{N}{\Delta y}$ $d\sigma_{\psi\to\mu^+\mu^-}$ *dy*

 $\frac{\partial^2 \psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-}{\partial y} (2.0 < \eta_\mu < 4.5) = \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial y}$ $d\sigma_{\psi\to\mu^+\mu^-}$ *dy*

 $\frac{\partial^2 \psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-}{\partial y} (2.0 < \eta_\mu < 4.5) = \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial \eta^2} \frac{\partial^2 W}{\partial y^2}$ $d\sigma_{\psi\to\mu^+\mu^-}$ *dy*

run1/run2

 $\frac{d\sigma_{\psi\to\mu^+\mu^-}}{d\psi}(2.0 < \eta_{\mu} < 4.5) = \frac{|\mathcal{P}|N}{\epsilon_{\rm rec}|\epsilon_{\rm sel}|\Delta y}$ *dy*

run1/run2

 $\frac{d\sigma_{\psi\to\mu^+\mu^-}}{d\psi}(2.0 < \eta_{\mu} < 4.5) = \frac{|\mathcal{P}|N}{\epsilon_{\rm rec}|\epsilon_{\rm sel}|\Delta y|\epsilon_{\rm s}}$ *dy*

run1/run2

 $\frac{d\sigma_{\psi\to\mu^+\mu^-}}{d\psi}(2.0 < \eta_{\mu} < 4.5) = \frac{|\mathcal{P}|N}{\epsilon_{\rm rec}|\epsilon_{\rm sel}|\Delta y|\epsilon_{\rm s}}$ *dy*

dy $\frac{P}{du}$ beam crossings with no visible activity and is calculated over the data-taking period in \mathcal{L} $un2$

signal purity number of events
\n
$$
\frac{d\sigma_{\psi \to \mu^+ \mu^-}}{dy} (2.0 < \eta_{\mu} < 4.5) = \frac{|\overline{P}|N|}{|\overline{\epsilon_{\text{rec}}|\overline{\epsilon_{\text{sel}}}| \Delta y [\overline{\epsilon_{\text{single}}|} \overline{\epsilon_{\text{tot}}}|}
$$
 luminosity
\nreconstruction efficiency selection single-interaction
\n
$$
\approx 0.3-0.7/0.4-0.6
$$
 efficiency efficiency $\approx 0.24/0.33$ run1/n
\n
$$
\approx 0.87/0.6-0.7
$$

 $\frac{d\sigma_{\psi\to\mu^+\mu^-}}{d\psi}(2.0 < \eta_{\mu} < 4.5) = \frac{|\mathcal{P}|N}{\epsilon_{\rm rec}|\epsilon_{\rm sel}|\Delta y|\epsilon_{\rm s}}$ *dy*

reconstruction eff $≈0.3-0.7/0.4-0.6$

pp cross section

$$
\left. \frac{d\sigma}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \propto [g(x_B)]^2
$$

Z. Phys. C**57** ('93) 89–92; arXiv:1609.09738

JMRT prediction, based on gluon PDF:

At low xB, approximate GPD to gluon PDF

Exclusive single Y production in pp collisions

 $10¹$

In (a), the Υ(1*S*) cross-section in bins of rapidity is shown, compared to LO and NLO predictions.

Figure 4. Measurements of exclusive Υ(1*S*) photoproduction compared to theoretical predictions. higher Q2 scale

+ Requirement on forward/backward scintillators and far-foward/backward neutron zero-degree calorimeters (ZDCs)

+ Requirement on forward/backward scintillators and far-foward/backward neutron zero-degree calorimeters (ZDCs)

+ Requirement on forward/backward scintillators and far-foward/backward neutron zero-degree calorimeters (ZDCs)

Extraction of the J/ѱ photoproduction

Extraction of the J/ѱ photoproduction

 $\log \max_{\text{large}} \log Q^2$ \approx \log^2 \log^2 ϵ meson production production ϵ $\lim_{\text{erge}} \frac{\text{rad}}{\text{g}} \frac{\text{g}}{\text{g}} \lim_{\text{g}} \frac{Q^2}{\text{g}}$ has $\lim_{\text{g}} \frac{\text{rad}}{\text{g}} \lim_{\text{g}} \frac{Q}{\text{g}}$ pp: ambiguity in ID of photon emitter

large mass
large mass

Extraction of the J/ѱ photoproduction To compare with theoretical predictions, which are generally expressed with-

$$
\underline{\rightarrow} p \psi p = r(W_+)k_+ \frac{\mathrm{d}n}{\mathrm{d}k_+} \sigma_{\gamma p \to \psi p}(W_+) + r(W_-)k_- \frac{\mathrm{d}n}{\mathrm{d}k_-} \sigma_{\gamma p \to \psi p}(W_-)
$$

relation pp and $γ$ p cross section:

Extraction of the J/ѱ photoproduction To compare with theoretical predictions, which are generally expressed with-

$$
\dfrac{\mathrm{d}n}{\mathrm{d}k_{+}}r(W_{+})k_{+}\dfrac{\mathrm{d}n}{\mathrm{d}k_{+}}\sigma_{\gamma p\to \psi p}(W_{+})+r(W_{-})k_{-}\dfrac{\mathrm{d}n}{\mathrm{d}k_{-}}\sigma_{\gamma p\to \psi p}(W_{-})
$$

LHCb used HERA data for low-E_y (W_{-}) contribution. Here, *^r* is the gap survival factor, *^k[±]* [≡] *^M*ψ*/*2*e±^y* is the photon energy, d*n/*d*k[±]* is the L **HCD** used **HERA** λ data for low-E_y (W_{-}) contribution.

67

67

67

Y photoproduction cross section

consistent with the collision-energy dependence of the J*/*ψ p_{max} overall compatibility between pp, Pbp and ep data: hint of universality of underlying physics

Coherent interaction: interaction with target as a whole. ∼ target remains in same quantum state.

Coherent interaction: interaction with target as a whole. ∼ target remains in same quantum state.

Incoherent interaction: interaction with constituents inside target.

∼ target does not remain in same quantum state. Ex.: target dissociation, excitation

Coherent interaction: interaction with target as a whole. ∼ target remains in same quantum state. Sonerent interaction. Interaction

< target remains in same quantum

> ∼ target does not remain in same quantum state. Ex.: target dissociation, excitation $\mathsf{L} \mathsf{X}$. Let $\mathsf{G} \mathsf{X}$ and $\mathsf{G} \mathsf{X}$ and $\mathsf{G} \mathsf{X}$ are $\mathsf{G} \mathsf{X}$ and $\mathsf{G} \mathsf{X$

Incoherent interaction: interaction with constituents inside target.

Ultra-peripheral collision Ultra-peripheral collisions in PbPb

What object are we probing? V

Nuclear GPDs (PDFs at low xB)

Nuclear GPDs (PDFs at low XB)

Probing saturation

of saturation effect for ions

ALICE, Phys. Lett. B **817** (2021) 136280

Coherent photoproduction in PbPb at ALICE **CONCRETT DIOLOPIOULION IN FUFU AL ALIVE**

$$
R_g = \frac{g^{Pb}}{A g^p} \approx 0.65 \text{ at } x \approx 10^{-1}
$$

$$
\sigma(y) = N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,s}) \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,l}) \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$

$$
\sigma(y)=N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,s})\ \sigma_{J/\psi}
$$

 $\psi(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,l}) \ \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l}) \ ,$

$$
\sigma(y)=N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,s})\ \sigma_{J/\psi}
$$

Photon flux $N_{\gamma/A}(E_\gamma)$ is function of impact parameter: enhanced for large E_γ at small impact parameter.

 $\int_{\mathcal{V}}(E_{\gamma,s})+N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,l})\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})$

$$
\sigma(y) = N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,s}) \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,l}) \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$

Photon flux $N_{\gamma/A}(E_\gamma)$ is function of impact parameter: enhanced for large E_γ at small impact parameter. λ is function of impact parameter:

 σ Small impact parameter, b \longrightarrow higher probability for exciting (∝1/b²) \longrightarrow higher probability to emit neutrons.

Picture from André Ståhl

$$
\sigma(y) = N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,s}) \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}(E_{\gamma,l}) \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$

Photon flux $N_{\gamma/A}(E_\gamma)$ is function of impact parameter: enhanced for large E_γ at small impact parameter. λ is function of impact parameter:

 σ Small impact parameter, b \longrightarrow higher probability for exciting (∝1/b²) \longrightarrow higher probability to emit neutrons.

Picture from André Ståhl

CMS central detector and the (far-)forward region

CMS central detector and the (far-)forward region

 $1.6 < |y_{\mu}|$

$$
_{\iota^+\mu^-}|<2.4
$$

CMS central detector and the (far-)forward region

$$
_{\iota^+\mu^-}|<2.4
$$

measured

 $\sigma_{\gamma/A}^{0n0n}(E_{\gamma,s})$ $\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s})$ + $N_{\gamma/A}^{0n0n}(E_{\gamma,l})$ $\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})$

 $\sigma_{\gamma/A}^{0nXn}(E_{\gamma,s})\; \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) \; + \; N_{\gamma/A}^{0nXn}(E_{\gamma,l})\; \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})$

 $\frac{1}{\gamma/A}^{Xn}Kn}(E_{\gamma,s})\ \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}^{XnXn}(E_{\gamma,l})\ \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})$

$$
\sigma^{0n0n}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{0n0n}(E_{\gamma,s})
$$
\n
$$
\sigma^{0nXn}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{0nXn}(E_{\gamma,s})
$$
\n
$$
\sigma^{XnXn}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{XnXn}(E_{\gamma,s})
$$

measured computed (StarLight) **computed (StarLight)**

$$
\sigma^{0n0n}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{0n0n}(E_{\gamma,s}) \left[\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}^{0n0n}(E_{\gamma,l}) \right] \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$
\n
$$
\sigma^{0nXn}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{0nXn}(E_{\gamma,s}) \left[\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}^{0nXn}(E_{\gamma,l}) \right] \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$
\n
$$
\sigma^{XnXn}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{XnXn}(E_{\gamma,s}) \left[\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}^{XnXn}(E_{\gamma,l}) \right] \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$

(StarLight)

$$
\sigma^{0n0n}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{0n0n}(E_{\gamma,s}) \left[\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}^{0n0n}(E_{\gamma,l}) \right] \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$
\n
$$
\sigma^{0nXn}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{0nXn}(E_{\gamma,s}) \left[\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}^{0nXn}(E_{\gamma,l}) \right] \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$
\n
$$
\sigma^{XnXn}(y) = N_{\gamma/A}^{XnXn}(E_{\gamma,s}) \left[\sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,s}) + N_{\gamma/A}^{XnXn}(E_{\gamma,l}) \right] \sigma_{J/\psi}(E_{\gamma,l})
$$
\nmeasured\n
$$
\text{computed} \quad \text{computed} \quad \text{computed} \quad \text{computed} \quad \text{extracted} \quad \text{extracted} \quad \text{extracted}
$$

dipole models and manufactured. rapidity region, but fail to describe the data at \mathcal{L} and systematic uncertainties $\mathbf{3}4$. Considering the systematic uncertainties $\mathbf{3}4$. Considering the systematic uncertainties $\mathbf{4}$ CMS: yPb cross section, energy dependence

Incoherent production

average cross sections

average amplitude over target configurations: probes average distributions

Incoherent = difference between both: probes event-by-event fluctuations

$$
\sigma_{\rm tot} \sim \langle |A|^2 \rangle
$$

$$
\sigma_{\rm coh} \sim |\langle A \rangle|^2
$$

$$
\sigma_{\text{incoh}} \sim \sum_{f \neq i} |\langle f|A|i\rangle|^2
$$

=
$$
\sum_{f} \langle i|A|f\rangle^{\dagger} \langle f|A|i\rangle - \langle i|A|i\rangle^{\dagger} \langle i|A|i\rangle
$$

=
$$
(\langle |A|^2 \rangle - |\langle A \rangle|^2)
$$

Incoherent production

average cross sections

average amplitude over target configurations: probes average distributions

$$
\sigma_{\rm tot} \sim \langle |A|^2 \rangle
$$

$$
\sigma_{\rm coh} \sim |\langle A \rangle|^2
$$

$$
\sigma_{\text{incoh}} \sim \sum_{f \neq i} |\langle f|A|i\rangle|^2
$$

=
$$
\sum_{f} \langle i|A|f\rangle^{\dagger} \langle f|A|i\rangle - \langle i|A|i\rangle^{\dagger} \langle i|A|i\rangle
$$

=
$$
(\langle |A|^2 \rangle - |\langle A \rangle|^2)
$$

Incoherent = difference between both: probes event-by-event fluctuations ¹*.*⁰ ¹ Re Tr *V* (*x, y*)*, y* = [0*.*0*,* 1*.*8*,* 3*.*5*,* 5*.*3]

H. Mäntysaari and B. Schenke. Phys. Rev. D 98, 034013 (2018)

Dissociative production measured by ALICE

