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## Deep Inelastic Scattering ep eX



In the Björken limit i.e. when the photon virtality $Q^{2}=-q^{2}$ and the squared hadronic c.m. energy $(p+q)^{2}$ become large, with the ratio $x_{B}=\frac{Q^{2}}{2 p \cdot q}$ fixed, the cross section factorizes into a hard partonic subprocess calculable in the perturbation theory, and a parton distributions.

## DIS

- Parton distributions encode the distribution of longitudinal momentum and polarization carried by quarks, antiquarks and gluons within fast moving hadron
- PDFs don't provide infomation about how partons are distributed in the transverse plane and ...
- about how important is the orbital angular momentum in making up the total spin of the nucleon.
- Recently - growing interest in the exclusive scattering processes, which may shed some light on these issues through the generalized parton distributions (GPDs).


## DVCS

The simplest and best known process is Deeply Virtual Compton Scattering: $e p \rightarrow e p \gamma$


Factorization into GPDs and perturbative coefficient function - on the level of amplitude.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { DIS }: & \sigma=\mathrm{PDF} \otimes \text { partonic cross section } \\
\text { DVCS }: & \mathcal{M}=\mathrm{GPD} \otimes \text { partonic amplitude }
\end{aligned}
$$

- GPDs enter factorization theorems for hard exclusive reactions (DVCS, deeply virtual meson production, TCS etc.), in a similar manner as PDFs enter factorization theorems for inclusive (DIS, etc.)
- GPDs are functions of $x, t, \xi, \mu_{F}^{2}$
- First moment of GPDs enters the Ji's sum rule for the angular momentum carried by partons in the nucleon,
- 2+1 imaging of nucleon,
- Deeply Virtual Compton Scattering (DVCS) is a golden channel for GPDs extraction,


## DVCS - what else, and why

- Difficult: exclusivity, 3 variables, GPD enter through convolutions, only $\operatorname{GPD}(\xi, \xi, t)$ accesible through DVCS at LO!
- universality,
- flavour separation,

- Meson production - additional information (and difficulties),

So, in addition to spacelike DVCS ...
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Figure: Deeply Virtual Compton Scattering (DVCS) : $l N \rightarrow l^{\prime} N^{\prime} \gamma$
we can also study timelike DVCS
Berger, Diehl, Pire, 2002


Figure: Timelike Compton Scattering (TCS): $\gamma N \rightarrow l^{+} l^{-} N^{\prime}$
Why TCS:

- universality of the GPDs
- another source for GPDs (special sensitivity on real part of GPD $H$ ),
- spacelike-timelike crossing,
- first step towards DDCVS,


## General Compton Scattering:

$$
\gamma^{*}\left(q_{\text {in }}\right) N(p) \rightarrow \gamma^{*}\left(q_{\text {out }}\right) N^{\prime}\left(p^{\prime}\right)
$$

variables, describing the processes of interest in this generalized Bjorken limit, are the scaling variable $\xi$ and skewness $\eta>0$ :

$$
\xi=-\frac{q_{o u t}^{2}+q_{i n}^{2}}{q_{o u t}^{2}-q_{i n}^{2}} \eta, \quad \eta=\frac{q_{o u t}^{2}-q_{i n}^{2}}{\left(p+p^{\prime}\right) \cdot\left(q_{i n}+q_{o u t}\right)} .
$$

- DDVCS: $q_{\text {in }}^{2}<0, \quad q_{\text {out }}^{2}>0, \quad \eta \neq \xi$
- DVCS: $\quad q_{i n}^{2}<0, \quad q_{o u t}^{2}=0, \quad \eta=\xi>0$
- TCS: $\quad q_{\text {in }}^{2}=0, \quad q_{\text {out }}^{2}>0, \quad \eta=-\xi>0$


## Coefficient functions and Compton Form Factors

CFFs are the GPD dependent quantities which enter the amplitudes. They are defined through relations:

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\mathcal{A}^{\mu \nu}(\xi, \eta, t)=-e^{2} \frac{1}{\left(P+P^{\prime}\right)^{+}} \\
\bar{u}\left(P^{\prime}\right) \\
+i g_{T}^{\mu \nu}\left(\tilde{H}(\xi, \eta, t) \gamma^{+}+\mathcal{E}(\xi, \eta, t) \frac{i \sigma^{+\rho} \Delta_{\rho}}{2 M}\right) \\
\left.\left(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\xi, \eta, t) \gamma^{+} \gamma_{5}+\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}(\xi, \eta, t) \frac{\Delta^{+} \gamma_{5}}{2 M}\right)\right] u(P),
\end{array}
$$

,where:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{H}(\xi, \eta, t)=+\int_{-1}^{1} d x\left(\sum_{q} T^{q}(x, \xi, \eta) H^{q}(x, \eta, t)+T^{g}(x, \xi, \eta) H^{g}(x, \eta, t)\right) \\
& \widetilde{\mathcal{H}}(\xi, \eta, t)=-\int_{-1}^{1} d x\left(\sum_{q} \widetilde{T}^{q}(x, \xi, \eta) \widetilde{H}^{q}(x, \eta, t)+\widetilde{T}^{g}(x, \xi, \eta) \widetilde{H}^{g}(x, \eta, t)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

## LO and NLO Coefficient functions

- DVCS vs TCS at LO

$$
\begin{aligned}
{ }^{D V C S} T^{q} & =-e_{q}^{2} \frac{1}{x+\eta-i \varepsilon}-(x \rightarrow-x)=\left({ }^{T C S} T^{q}\right)^{*} \\
{ }^{D V C S} \tilde{T}^{q} & =-e_{q}^{2} \frac{1}{x+\eta-i \varepsilon}+(x \rightarrow-x)=-\left({ }^{T C S} \tilde{T}^{q}\right)^{*}
\end{aligned}
$$

${ }^{D V C S} \operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{H}) \sim P \int \frac{1}{x \pm \eta} H^{q}(x, \eta, t), \quad{ }^{D V C S} \operatorname{Im}(\mathcal{H}) \sim i \pi H^{q}( \pm \eta, \eta, t)$

- DDVCS at LO

$$
{ }^{D D V C S} T^{q}=-e_{q}^{2} \frac{1}{x+\xi-i \varepsilon}-(x \rightarrow-x)
$$

${ }^{D D V C S} \operatorname{Re}(\mathcal{H}) \sim P \int \frac{1}{x \pm \xi} H^{q}(x, \eta, t), \quad{ }^{D V C S} \operatorname{Im}(\mathcal{H}) \sim i \pi H^{q}( \pm \xi, \eta, t)$
But this is only true at LO. At NLO all GPDs hidden in the convolutions.

- DVCS vs TCS at LO

The results for DVCS and TCS cases are simply related:

$$
{ }^{T C S} T(x, \eta)= \pm\left({ }^{D V C S} T(x, \xi=\eta)+i \pi \cdot C_{c o l l}(x, \xi=\eta)\right)^{*}
$$

D.Mueller, B.Pire, L.Szymanowski, J.Wagner, Phys.Rev.D86. Moutarde, Pire, Sabatié, Szymanowski, Wagner, Phys.Rev.D87.

TCS and Bethe-Heitler contribution to exclusive lepton pair photoproduction.


Figure: The Feynman diagram for the Bethe-Heitler amplitude.


Figure: The Feynman diagram for the Compton amplitude.

Berger, Diehl, Pire, 2002


Figure: Kinematical variables and coordinate axes in the $\gamma p$ and $\ell^{+} \ell^{-}$c.m. frames.

## Interference

B-H dominant for not very high energies:


Figure: LO (dotted) and NLO (solid) TCS and Bethe-Heitler (dash-dotted)
contributions to the cross section as a function of $t$ for $Q^{2}=\mu^{2}=4 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ integrated over $\theta \in(\pi / 4 ; 3 \pi / 4)$ and over $\phi \in(0 ; 2 \pi)$ for $E_{\gamma}=10 \mathrm{GeV}(\eta \approx 0.11)$.

The interference part of the cross-section for $\gamma p \rightarrow \ell^{+} \ell^{-} p$ with unpolarized protons and photons is given by:

$$
\frac{d \sigma_{I N T}}{d Q^{\prime 2} d t d \cos \theta d \varphi} \sim \cos \varphi \cdot \operatorname{Re} \mathcal{H}(\eta, t)
$$

Linear in GPD's, odd under exchange of the $l^{+}$and $l^{-}$momenta $\Rightarrow$ angular distribution of lepton pairs is a good tool to study interference term.

## JLAB 6 GeV data

Rafayel Paremuzyan PhD thesis


Figure: $e^{+} e^{-}$invariant mass distribution vs quasi-real photon energy. For TCS analysis $M\left(e^{+} e^{-}\right)>1.1 \mathrm{GeV}$ and $s_{\gamma p}>4.6 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ regions are chosen. Left graph represents e1-6 data set, right one is from e1f data set.

## Theory vs experiment

R.Paremuzyan and V.Guzey:

$$
R=\frac{\int d \phi \cos \phi \int d \theta d \sigma}{\int d \phi \int d \theta d \sigma}
$$



Figure: Thoeretical prediction of the ratio $R$ for various GPDs models. Data points after combining both e1-6 and e1f data sets.

## Jefferson Lab PAC 39 Proposal

Timelike Compton Scattering and $J / \psi$ photoproduction on the proton in $e^{+} e^{-}$pair production with CLAS12 at 11 GeV

I. Albayrak, ${ }^{1}$ V. Burkert, ${ }^{2}$ E. Chudakov, ${ }^{2}$ N. Dashyan, ${ }^{3}$ C. Desnault, ${ }^{4}$ N. Gevorgyan, ${ }^{3}$ Y. Ghandilyan, ${ }^{3}$ B. Guegan, ${ }^{4}$ M. Guidal ${ }^{*},{ }^{4}$ V. Guzey, ${ }^{2,5}$ K. Hicks, ${ }^{6}$ T. Horn* ${ }^{*}{ }^{1}$ C. Hyde, ${ }^{7}$ Y. Ilieva,,${ }^{8}$ H. Jo, ${ }^{4}$ P. Khetarpal, ${ }^{9}$ F.J. Klein, ${ }^{1}$ V. Kubarovsky, ${ }^{2}$ A. Marti, ${ }^{4}$ C. Munoz Camacho, ${ }^{4}$ P. Nadel-Turonski* ${ }^{* \dagger},{ }^{2}$ S. Niccolai, ${ }^{4}$ R. Paremuzyan ${ }^{*},{ }^{4,3}$ B. Pire, ${ }^{10}$ F. Sabatié, ${ }^{11}$ C. Salgado, ${ }^{12}$ P. Schweitzer, ${ }^{13}$ A. Simonyan, ${ }^{3}$ D. Sokhan, ${ }^{4}$ S. Stepanyan*, ${ }^{2}$ L. Szymanowski, ${ }^{14}$ H. Voskanyan, ${ }^{3}$ J. Wagner, ${ }^{14}$ C. Weiss, ${ }^{2}$ N. Zachariou, ${ }^{8}$ and the CLAS Collaboration.<br>${ }^{1}$ Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C. 20064<br>${ }^{2}$ Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, Newport News, Virginia 23606<br>${ }^{3}$ Yerevan Physics Institute, 375036 Yerevan, Armenia<br>${ }^{4}$ Institut de Physique Nucleaire d'Orsay, IN2P3, BP 1, 91406 Orsay, France<br>${ }^{5}$ Hampton University, Hampton, Virginia 23668<br>${ }^{6}$ Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701

Approved experiment at Hall B, and LOI for Hall A.

## Ultraperipheral collisions


where $k_{A, B}=\frac{1}{2} x_{A, B} \sqrt{s}$.

## BH cross section at UPC

(b)


Figure: (a) The BH cross section integrated over $\theta \in[\pi / 4,3 \pi / 4], \varphi \in[0,2 \pi]$, $Q^{\prime 2} \in[4.5,5.5] \mathrm{GeV}^{2},|t| \in[0.05,0.25] \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$, as a function of $\gamma p$ c.m. energy squared $s$. (b) $\sigma_{T C S}$ as a function of $\gamma p$ c.m. energy squared $s$, for GRVGJR2008 NLO parametrizations, for different factorization scales $\mu_{F}^{2}=4$ (dotted), 5 (dashed), 6 (solid) $\mathrm{GeV}^{2}$.

For very high energies $\sigma_{T C S}$ calculated with $\mu_{F}^{2}=6 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ is much bigger then with $\mu_{F}^{2}=4 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. Also predictions obtained using LO and NLO GRVGJR2008 PDFs differ significantly.

## The interference cross section at UPC <br> (a)


(b)

(c)


Figure: The differential cross sections (solid lines) for $t=-0.2 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}, Q^{\prime 2}=5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ and integrated over $\theta=[\pi / 4,3 \pi / 4]$, as a function of $\varphi$, for $s=10^{7} \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ (a), $s=10^{5} \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ (b), $s=10^{3} \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ (c) with $\mu_{F}^{2}=5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$. We also display the Compton (dotted), Bethe-Heitler (dash-dotted) and Interference (dashed) contributions.

## UPC Rate estimates

The pure Bethe - Heitler contribution to $\sigma_{p p}$, integrated over $\theta=[\pi / 4,3 \pi / 4]$, $\phi=[0,2 \pi], t=\left[-0.05 \mathrm{GeV}^{2},-0.25 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}\right], Q^{\prime 2}=\left[4.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}, 5.5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}\right]$, and photon energies $k=[20,900] \mathrm{GeV}$ gives:

$$
\sigma_{p p}^{B H}=2.9 \mathrm{pb} .
$$

The Compton contribution (calculated with NLO GRVGJR2008 PDFs, and $\mu_{F}^{2}=5 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ ) gives:

$$
\sigma_{p p}^{T C S}=1.9 \mathrm{pb}
$$

LHC: rate $\sim 10^{5}$ events/year with nominal luminosity $\left(10^{34} \mathrm{~cm}^{-2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$

## Gluon GPDs in the UPC production of heavy mesons

Work in progress with D.Yu.Ivanov and L.Szymanowski


Figure 1: Kinematics of heavy vector meson photoproduction.
D. Yu. Ivanov, A. Schafer, L. Szymanowski and G. Krasnikov - Eur.Phys.J. C34 (2004) 297-316

The amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ is given by factorization formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M} & \sim\left(\frac{\left\langle O_{1}\right\rangle_{V}}{m^{3}}\right)^{1 / 2} \int_{-1}^{1} d x\left[T_{g}(x, \xi) F^{g}(x, \xi, t)+T_{q}(x, \xi) F^{q, S}(x, \xi, t)\right] \\
F^{q, S}(x, \xi, t) & =\sum_{q=u, d, s} F^{q}(x, \xi, t)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $m$ is a pole mass of heavy quark, $\left\langle O_{1}\right\rangle_{V}$ is given by NRQCD through leptonic meson decay rate.

Hard scattering kernels

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_{g}(x, \xi) & =\frac{\xi}{(x-\xi+i \varepsilon)(x+\xi-i \varepsilon)} \mathcal{A}_{g}\left(\frac{x-\xi+i \varepsilon}{2 \xi}\right) \\
T_{q}(x, \xi) & =\mathcal{A}_{q}\left(\frac{x-\xi+i \varepsilon}{2 \xi}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- LO

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathcal{A}_{g}^{(0)}(y)=\alpha_{S}, \quad \text { In the first paper it was : } \alpha_{S}(1+\epsilon) \\
\mathcal{A}_{q}^{(0)}(y)=0 .
\end{array}
$$

- NLO
$T_{g}(x, \xi)$ - unchanged, and in $T_{q}(x, \xi)$ one has to correct:

$$
\left(\log \frac{4 m^{2}}{\mu_{F}^{2}}-1\right) \rightarrow\left(\log \frac{4 m^{2}}{\mu_{F}^{2}}\right)
$$

Erratum is being written, but phenomenological consequences unchanged.

## Photoproduction amplitude and cross section - LO




Figure: (left) Imaginary part of the amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ and (right) photoproduction cross section as a function of $W=\sqrt{s_{\gamma p}}$ for $\mu_{F}^{2}=M_{J / \psi}^{2} \times\{0.5,1,2\}$.

## Photoproduction amplitude and cross section - LO and NLO.



Figure: Photoproduction cross section as a function of $W=\sqrt{s_{\gamma p}}$ for $\mu_{F}^{2}=M_{J / \psi}^{2} \times\{0.5,1,2\}-\mathrm{LO}$ and NLO

## Photoproduction cross section

 NLO/LO for large $W$ :$$
\sim \frac{\alpha_{S}\left(\mu_{R}\right) N_{c}}{\pi} \ln \left(\frac{1}{\xi}\right) \ln \left(\frac{\frac{1}{4} M_{V}^{2}}{\mu_{F}^{2}}\right)
$$

What to do ??? (PMS??, BLM??, resummation?,...?)


Figure: Photoproduction cross section as a function of $W=\sqrt{s_{\gamma p}}$ for $\mu_{F}^{2}=M_{J / \psi}^{2} \times\{0.5,1,2\}$ - LO and NLO. Thick lines for LO and NLO for $\mu_{F}^{2}=1 / 4 M_{J / \psi}^{2}$.

## UPC cross section

Cross section for Ultraperipheral p-Pb collision in the EPA, $\sqrt{s}=5 \mathrm{TeV}$ as a function of $y$.

(left) LO and NLO $\mu_{F}^{2}=M_{J / \psi}^{2} \times\{0.5,1,2\}$.
(right) LO and NLO for $\mu_{F}^{2}=1 / 4 M_{J / \psi}^{2}$.

## Summary

- GDPs enter factorization theorems for hard exclusive reactions (DVCS, deeply virtual meson production etc.), in a similar manner as PDFs enter factorization theorem for DIS - Ji's sum rule, ,tomographic" 3D images
- DVCS is a golden channel, a lot of new experiments planned to measure DVCS - JLAB 12, COMPASS, EIC(?)
- ,but we want to descibe other exclusve processes - TCS, double DVCS, DVMP, photoproduction of heavy mesons...
- TCS already measured at JLAB 6 GeV , but much richer and more interesting kinematical region available after upgrade to 12 GeV , maybe possible at COMPASS.
- Ultraperipheral collisions at hadron colliders opens a new way to measure GPDs,
- NLO corrections very important, also important for GPD extraction at $\xi \neq x$.
- Situation for $\Upsilon$ should be better - higher factorization scale, and $\xi$ not that small (comparing to $J / \Psi$ ).

