Extracting the scalar dynamical polarizabilities from real Compton scattering data

# Paolo Pedroni

INFN-Sezione di Pavia, Italy

In collaboration with B. Pasquini and S. Sconfietti - University and INFN - Pavia





## SUMMARY

> Introduction

- RCS: theoretical framework
- Static and Dynamical polarizabilities
- ✓ Dispersion Relations and Low Energy Expansion

First evaluation of the scalar proton dynamical polarizabilities

- Problems in the existing data set
- New fit approach: simplex + bootstrap
- A cross check: static polarizabilities
- Dynamical polarizabilities

Conclusions and perspectives

B. Pasquini, P. Pedroni, S. Sconfietti, Phys. Rev.C 98, 015204 (2018) **Real Compton Scattering** 

Expansion of the Hamiltonian in incident photon energy (0)

0th order  $\longrightarrow$  charge, mass(\*point-like \* nucleon<br/>(Born terms)1st order  $\longrightarrow$  magnetic moment(\*point-like \* nucleon<br/>(Born terms)2nd order  $\longrightarrow$  2 scalar polarizabilitites(\*known)Baldin's sum rule:  $(\alpha_{E1} + \beta_{M1}) \sim known$ 

$$H_{eff}^{(2)} = -4\pi \left[ \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{E1} \vec{E}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \beta_{M1} \vec{H}^2 \right]$$

**3rd order 4 spin (vector) polarizabilitites only one direct measurement P. Martel et al, PRL 114,** 112501 (2015)

$$H_{eff}^{(3)} = -4\pi \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{E1E1} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \left(\vec{E} \times \dot{\vec{E}}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_{M1M1} \vec{\sigma} \cdot \left(\vec{H} \times \dot{\vec{H}}\right) \\ -\gamma_{M1E2} E_{ij} \sigma_i H_j + \gamma_{E1M2} H_{ij} \sigma_i E_j \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} E_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_i E_j + \nabla_j E_i) \\ H_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_i H_j + \nabla_j H_i) \\ H_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_i H_j + \nabla_j H_i) \\ H_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} (\nabla_i H_j + \nabla_j H_i) \end{bmatrix}$$

# Multipole Expansion for RCS

 $T_{fi} = \frac{4\pi W}{M} \sum_{i=1}^{6} \rho_i R_i(\omega, \cos\theta) \qquad R_i \implies 6 \text{ Independent amplitudes}$ 

$$R_{1} = \sum_{l \ge 1} \{ [(l+1)f_{EE}^{l+} + lf_{EE}^{l-}](lP_{l}' + P_{l-1}'') - [(l+1)f_{MM}^{l+} + lf_{MM}^{l-}]P_{l}'' \}$$

$$R_{2} = \sum \{ [(l+1)f_{MM}^{l+} + lf_{MM}^{l-}](lP_{l}' + P_{l-1}'') - [(l+1)f_{EE}^{l+} + lf_{EE}^{l-}]P_{l}'' \}$$

2 spin-independent amplitudes

R.Hildebtrandt et al.,

EPJA 20, 293 (2004)

$$f_{TT'}^{l\pm}$$
 Corresponds to the transition  $Tl \rightarrow T'l'$  with  $T, T' = E, M$ ;  $l' = l \pm \{0, 1\}$ 

Multipole expansion + nucleon polarizabilities  $\Rightarrow$ 

 $l \ge 1$ 

**Dynamical polarizabilities** 

$$\alpha_{E1-DYN}(\omega) = \frac{2f_{EE}^{1+}(\omega) + f_{EE}^{1-}(\omega)}{\omega^2} \quad ; \quad \beta_{M1-DYN}(\omega) = \frac{2f_{MM}^{1+}(\omega) + f_{MM}^{1-}(\omega)}{\omega^2}$$
$$\alpha_{E1} = \lim_{\omega \to 0} \alpha_{E1-DYN}(\omega) \quad ; \quad \beta_{M1} = \lim_{\omega \to 0} \beta_{M1-DYN}(\omega)$$

## How to extract dynamical polarizabilites from data? Our method $\Rightarrow$ Dispersion relations (DRs) + Low Energy Expansion (LEX) $(\omega < 140 \text{ MeV})$ B.Holstein et al., PRC61, RCS differential cross section $\rightarrow 6$ amplitudes $A_i(\nu, t)$ $\nu \rightarrow \omega + t/4M$ $\tau \rightarrow transferred$ momentum 034316 (2000) $A_i(v,t)$ are connected to $f_{TT'}^{l\pm}$ $\left[A_i(0,0) - A_i^B(0,0)\right]$ are connected to the 6 static polarizabilities $\operatorname{Re}\left[A_{i}(v,t)\right] = \left[A_{i}^{B}(v,t)\right] + \left[A_{i}(0,t)\right] - \left[A_{i}^{B}(0,t)\right] + \frac{2}{\pi}v^{2}P\int_{v_{thr}}^{+\infty} dv' \frac{\operatorname{Im}_{s}A_{i}(v',t)}{v'(v'^{2}-v^{2})}\right]$ Dispersion relations Can be evaluated from $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \pi \pi, \pi \pi \rightarrow N \overline{N}$ , Born terms (can be exactly calculated) $\gamma N \rightarrow N\pi(\pi)$ data $\alpha_{E1-DYN}^{DR}(\omega) = f_{\alpha}(\alpha_{E1}, \beta_{M1}, \alpha_{E1,\nu}, \beta_{M1,\nu}) + g_{\alpha}(\gamma_i) + h_{\alpha}(\text{any other term})$ (up to $\omega^5$ ) $\beta_{M1-DYN}^{DR}(\omega) = f_{\beta}(\alpha_{E1}, \beta_{M1}, \alpha_{E1,\nu}, \beta_{M1,\nu}) + g_{\beta}(\gamma_i) + h_{\beta}(\text{any other term})$ 2 new additional parameters to be fitted evaluated with DRs Calculated using measured $\gamma_i$ values

# The proton data base

#### $(\omega < 140 \text{ MeV})$





#### (Only) 150 points

(Half of the Spartans that King Leonidas led to the Battle of Thermopylae in 480 BC)



 $\Rightarrow$  Poor quality of the data set

Large statistic -and systematical- errors ; possible inconsistencies between subsets

# Complications

**3-parameter fit**  $(\alpha_{E1} - \beta_{M1})$ ;  $\alpha_{E1,\nu}$ ;  $\beta_{M1,\nu} \rightarrow (\alpha_{E1} + \beta_{M1})$  from Baldin's sum rule

**Standard gradient** (Newton) method to find the minimum of the " $\chi^2$  function" using first and second derivatives

Too high correlations between fitted parameters!

VERY low sensitivity of the data to dynamical polarizabilities

**NO WAY** to find the "right" minimum and to define "right" errors on fit parameters

Combination of **SIMPLEX** method and **BOOTSTRAP** technique (purely geometrical search) (Monte Carlo)

## Sampling using parametric bootstrap

 $S_{i,boot} \sim \text{Gauss}(S_{i,\text{exp}}, \sigma_{i,\text{exp}}^2)$ ;  $i = 1, ..., N_{tot}$  Gaussian distributed statistical errors

Differential cross section value of the i-th point

#### After each bootstap cycle

- Simplex minimization is performed and fitted parameters are stored in histograms.
- Their probability distribution can then empirically found after a sufficiently large number of cycles

#### How can systematical errors (common scale factor) be included ?

«standard method»

$$\chi^2_{mod} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{tot}} \left[ \frac{\mathcal{N}\mathcal{S}_{i,exp} - \mathcal{S}_{i,theory}}{\mathcal{N}\sigma_{i,exp}} \right]^2 + \left( \frac{\mathcal{N} - 1}{\sigma_{i,sys}} \right)^2$$

...one additional normalization factor per data subset is needed!

«bootstrap method»

$$S_{j,boot}^{SYS} = \xi_j^{Subset} \cdot S_{j,boot} ; \quad j = 1, ..., N_{TOT}^{Subset}$$

$$\xi \sim P(1, \sigma_{SYS}^2)$$

At every bootstrap cycle the systematical error is sampled independently for each subset

Often a uniform distribution

## A check: fit only scalar static polarizabilites

#### 2-parameter fit $\alpha_{E1}$ ; $\beta_{M1}$

10,000 replicas



**Expected Gaussian shape + broadening due to systematics** 



Systematics ON

## **"equivalent χ<sup>2</sup>" probability distribution from bootstrap**



## **Comparison: bootstrap vs gradient**

**1-parameter fit**  $(\alpha_{E1} - \beta_{M1}) \rightarrow (\alpha_{E1} + \beta_{M1})$  from Baldin's sum rule

	$\alpha_{E1}$	β <sub>M1</sub>
GRADIENT SYS OFF	11.8 ± 0.2	<b>2.0</b> ∓ 0.2
BOOTSTRAP SYS OFF	11.8 ± 0.2	<b>2.0</b> ∓ 0.2
BOOTSTRAP SYS ON	11.8 ± 0.3	<b>2.0</b> ∓ 0.3

#### Model: DRs+LEX

Systematical errors enlarge the error band of the polarizabilities

## **Summary plot**





We include Baldin's uncertainty & systematic sources! **Bootstrap and dynamical polarizabilities** 

**3-parameter fit**  $(\alpha_{E1} - \beta_{M1})$ ;  $\alpha_{E1,\nu}$ ;  $\beta_{M1,\nu}$ 

- ✓ Baldin's sum rule
- ✓ Systematical errors ON
- ✓ FULL data set (150 data)
- ✓ TAPS data set (55 data)  $\rightarrow$  O. De Leon et al., EPJA 10, 207 (2001)
- Frrors on Baldin's sum rule and  $γ_π$  included in the procedure

#### **Dynamical polarizabilities: fit distributions**





Probability distributions given by our technique (**not** assumed a priori)

#### **Dynamical polarizabilities: fit results**



Quite strong dependence on data set (maybe due to different covered angular regions ?)



Very strong correlations between the fit parameters

Very low sensitivity of the data to  $\alpha_{E1,\nu}$ 

 $(\alpha_{E1} + \beta_{M1})$  Constrained by the Baldin's rum rule value  $(\rho \neq 1 \text{ due to its uncertainty})$ 

## **Dynamical polarizabilities: fit results**



## **Dynamical polarizabilities: comparisons**





#### **Conclusions and perspectives**

First evaluation of the scalar proton dynamical scalar polarizabilites

#### Bootstrap technique

- Very useful and versatile method for data fitting
- No a priori assumption needed for the experimental errors
- Effect of systematic uncertainties included in a straightforward way

The only way to get a more accurate and consistent determination of the values of all different polarizabilities is to improve bot the quantity and the quality of the present Compton data base

Ongoing experiment at Mainz by the A2 collaboration
 E. J. Downie et al., Proposal MAMI-A2/04-16 (2016)

## Backup

# **LEX + residual functions**



Dispersion Relation formalism RCS  $\Rightarrow$  differential cross section  $\rightarrow$  6 amplitudes  $A_i$ 



# Unpolarized differential cross section: sensitivity plots





% variation of the observable when the particular polarizability is changed by a factor ± 10%



## **Differential cross section**



#### $d\sigma/d\Omega$ VS lab energy

100% error band from the bootstrap fit

# **Problems with the data set**

Very strong dependence of polarizabilities on the specific data set!

Outliers  $\rightarrow$  rescaling of all the statistic uncertainties by a factor



Effect: enlarging of errors on fitted parameters (~20%)