# Multiplicities and Phenomenology (Part II)

# Jose Osvaldo Gonzalez Hernandez



**INFN** Torino

11-Jun-2014

# **Transversity 2014**



# **Multiplicities HERMES and COMPASS.**

**Extracting information from Multiplicites.** 

**Other observables** 

Conclusions

In collaboration with

M. Anselmino (Torino)
M. Boglione (Torino)
S. Melis (Torino)
V. Barone (Alessandria)
A. Prokudin (JLab) Jefferson Lab



# **Multiplicities HERMES and COMPASS.**

Extracting information from Multiplicites.

Other observables

Conclusions

We are discussing Multiplicies from

#### HERMES Airapetian, A. et al. Phys.Rev. D87 (2013) 074029

#### COMPASS Adolph, C. et al. Eur.Phys.J. C73 (2013) 2531





```
From P and D targets.
Hadron separation
3D-binning: (Q^2 \times_B), z , P<sub>T</sub>
Total number of points: 1341
```

$10^{-1}$ $(< z >= 0.42)$ $(< z >= 0.54)$	0.53	$ \begin{array}{c} \bullet <\!\! z \!\!> = \!\! 0.42 \qquad + \qquad \bullet \qquad + \qquad +$	$\diamond <\!\! z \!\!>=\!\! 0.41$ $\Box = - + +$ $\Box = - + + +$ $\Box = - + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +$
$Q^2 = 5$			



**Particularly suitable for** 

flavor-dependence studies

(Previous talk A. Signori).

10 <sup>-1</sup>	< z >= 0.42 ± ± $< z >= 0.54$	$\square \langle z \rangle = 0.53$	$ \begin{array}{c} \bullet < z > = 0.42 \\ \Box < z > = 0.53 \end{array} \qquad $	$\diamond = 0.41$ $\Box = 0.52$ $\pm$ $\Box$ $\phi$ $\phi$ $\phi$ $\phi$



Particularly suitable for

flavor-dependence studies

(Previous talk A. Signori).

## **TMD evolution?**





Particularly suitable for

flavor-dependence studies

(Previous talk A. Signori).

# **TMD evolution?**

- It is not possible to decouple the  $x_B$  and  $Q^2$  dependences.
- 1.25 GeV<sup>2</sup> < Q<sup>2</sup> < 9.20 GeV<sup>2</sup>

$10^{11}$ $(z) = 0.42$ $\pm$ $(z) = 0.54$	□ <z>=0.12 □<z>=0.53</z></z>	$ \begin{array}{c} \diamond <\!$	$\diamond <\!\! z \!\!>=\!\! 0.41$ $\downarrow 0$ $\downarrow  \downarrow +$ $\downarrow$
$Q^2 = 5.20  { m GeV}^2$	$Q^2 = 9.20 \text{ GeV}^2$ - 10 <sup>-2</sup>		$Q^2 = 9.20 \text{ GeV}^2$







Figure from: Adolph, C. et al. Eur.Phys.J. C73 (2013) 2531

- From **Deuteron** only
- No hadron separation
- 4D-binning: Q<sup>2</sup>, x<sub>B</sub>, z, P<sub>T</sub>
- Total number of points: 18624

$10^{-1}$ $x_B = 9.90e-03$ $x_B = 1.48e-02$ $x_B = 2.13e-02$ $x_B = 3.18e-02$ $x_B = 4.47e-02$	







*Figure from: Adolph, C. et al. Eur.Phys.J. C73* (2013) 2531

10"*	$x_B = 9.90e-03$	$x_B = 1.48 e-02$	$x_B = 2.13 e-02$	$x_B = 3.18 \text{e-} 02$	$x_B = 4.47 e-02$	





- Multidimensional data! Q2, xB, z, PT dependence
- All of these dependences must be understood for TMDs.

10-1	$x_B = 9.90e-03$	$x_B = 1.48 e-02$	$x_B = 2.13 e-02$	$x_B = 3.18e-02$	$x_B = 4.47 e-02$	



- Multidimensional data! Q2, xB, z, PT dependence
- All of these dependences must be understood for TMDs.
- 1.11 GeV<sup>2</sup> < Q<sup>2</sup> < 7.57 GeV<sup>2</sup> Might be hard to see TMDevolution.

10	$x_B = 9$	.90e-0	3	$x_B = 1$	.48e-0	2	$x_B = 2$	2.13e-0	2	$x_B = 3$	.18e-0	2	$x_B = 4$	.47e-0	$\frac{2}{2}$	



- Multidimensional data! Q2, xB, z, PT dependence
- All of these dependences must be understood for TMDs.
- 1.11 GeV<sup>2</sup> < Q<sup>2</sup> < 7.57 GeV<sup>2</sup> Might be hard to see TMDevolution.
- A control analysis or "Benchmark" helps to understand the data. That is step 1.





### Results presented here have been published in:

# DOI: 10.1007/JHEP04(2014)005

10	$x_B = 9.90 e-03$	$x_B = 1.48 \text{e-} 02$	$x_B = 2.13 e{-}02$	$x_B = 3.18e-02$	$x_B = 4.47 e-02$	



# Multiplicities HERMES and COMPASS.

# **Extracting information from Multiplicites.**

Other observables

Conclusions









Qualitatively.

**Two important points** 



# Qualitatively.

**Two important points** 

At fixed y, Width & Normalization roughly constant.



# Qualitatively.

Two important points

- → At fixed y, Width & Normalization roughly constant.
- Normalization resembles a straight line.



# Quantitatively

(a.k.a. Step 1)



#### and COMPASS data.

#### Model

#### **Kinematical Cuts**

$$f_q(x, k_\perp) = f_q(x) \frac{1}{\pi \langle k_\perp^2 \rangle} e^{-k_\perp^2 / \langle k_\perp^2 \rangle}$$

$$D_q^h(z, p_\perp) = D_q^h(z) \frac{1}{\pi \langle p_\perp^2 \rangle} e^{-p_\perp^2 / \langle p_\perp^2 \rangle}$$

 $Q^2 > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^2$  $0.2 < P_T < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ z < 0.6

#### **Processes included**

 $\pi^+$  and  $\pi^-$  production from both P and D targets.

h<sup>+</sup> and h<sup>-</sup> production from D.

#### **Extraction from HERMES data.**

Cuts	$\chi^2_{pts}$	n. points	$[\chi^2_{pts}]^{\pi^+}$	$[\chi^2_{pts}]^{\pi^-}$	Parameters
$Q^2 > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^2$ $0.2 < P_T < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ z < 0.6	1.69	497	1.93	1.45	



# Consideration of flavor-dependence on the fragmentation slightly improves the quality of the fit.

It is not possible to resolve additional z-dependence.

$$\langle P_T^2 \rangle = \langle p_\perp^2 \rangle + z_h^2 \langle k_\perp^2 \rangle.$$

Gaussian model.

#### **Extraction from HERMES data.**



	E	xtraction f	<b>L.</b>		
Cuts	$\chi^2_{ m dof}$	n. points	$\left[\chi^2_{\rm dof}\right]^{h^+}$	$[\chi^2_{ m dof}]^{h^-}$	Parameters
$Q^2 > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^2$ $0.2 < P_T < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ z < 0.6	8.54	5385	8.94	8.15	



$$\langle P_T^2 \rangle = \langle p_\perp^2 \rangle + z_h^2 \langle k_\perp^2 \rangle.$$

-P<sup>dLI</sup>IEr

-PILINE

 $5.0 \\ 4.0$ 

3.0

2.0 1.0

#### **Extraction from COMPASS data.**

......

Cuts	$\chi^2_{ m dof}$	n. points	$\left[\chi^2_{ m dof} ight]^{h^+}$	$[\chi^2_{ m dof}]^{h^-}$	Parameters
$Q^2 > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^2$ $0.2 < P_T < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ z < 0.6	8.54	5385	8.94	8.15	



Cuts	$\chi^2_{ m dof}$	n. points	$[\chi^2_{ m dof}]^{h^+}$	$[\chi^2_{ m dof}]^{h^-}$	Parameters
$Q^2 > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^2$ $0.2 < P_T < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ z < 0.6	8.54	5385	8.94	8.15	

$$N_y = A + B y$$





 $\begin{array}{c} 0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00\,\,0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00\,\,0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00\,\,0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00\,\,0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00}{P_{T}~({\rm GeV})} \end{array}$ 

Cuts	$\chi^2_{ m dof}$	n. points	$[\chi^2_{ m dof}]^{h^+}$	$[\chi^2_{ m dof}]^{h^-}$	Parameters
$Q^2 > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^2$ $0.2 < P_T < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ z < 0.6	8.54	5385	8.94	8.15	
$Q^{2} > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^{2}$ $0.2 < P_{T} < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ $z < 0.6$ $N_{y} = A + B y$	3.42	5385	3.25	3.60	$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.60 \pm 0.14 \text{ GeV}^2$ $\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.20 \pm 0.02 \text{ GeV}^2$ $A = 1.06 \pm 0.06$ $B = -0.43 \pm 0.14$





```
\begin{array}{c} 0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00\,\,0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00\,\,0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00\,\,0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00\,\,0.25\,0.50\,0.75\,1.00}{P_{T}~({\rm GeV})} \end{array}
```

Cuts	$\chi^2_{ m dof}$	n. points	$[\chi^2_{ m dof}]^{h^+}$	$[\chi^2_{ m dof}]^{h^-}$	Parameters
$Q^2 > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^2$ $0.2 < P_T < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ z < 0.6	8.54	5385	8.94	8.15	
$Q^2 > 1.69 \text{ GeV}^2$ $0.2 < P_T < 0.9 \text{ GeV}$ $z < 0.6$ $N_y = A + B y$	3.42	5385	3.25	3.60	$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.60 \pm 0.14 \text{ GeV}^2$ $\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.20 \pm 0.02 \text{ GeV}^2$ $A = 1.06 \pm 0.06$ $B = -0.43 \pm 0.14$









# Multiplicities HERMES and COMPASS.

Extracting information from Multiplicites.

**Other observables** 

Conclusions

## **Multiplicities**



Azimuthal Asymmetries

(Both COMPASS and HERMES available.)

$$F_{UU}^{\cos\phi_{h}}|_{Cahn} = -2\sum_{q} \int d^{2}k_{\perp} \frac{(k_{\perp} \cdot h)}{Q} f_{q}(x, k_{\perp}) D_{q}(z, p_{\perp})$$

$$F_{UU}^{\cos\phi_{h}}|_{BM} = \sum_{q} \int d^{2}k_{\perp} \frac{k_{\perp}}{Q} \frac{\Delta^{N} f_{q^{\uparrow}/p}(x, k_{\perp}) \Delta^{N} D_{h/q^{\uparrow}}(z, p_{\perp})}{p_{\perp}} [P_{T} - z_{h}(k_{\perp} \cdot h)]$$

$$F_{UU}^{\cos2\phi_{h}}|_{Cahn} = 2\sum_{q} \int d^{2}k_{\perp} \frac{2(k_{\perp} \cdot h)^{2} - k_{\perp}^{2}}{Q^{2}} f_{q}(x, k_{\perp}) D_{q}(z, p_{\perp})$$

$$Asymmetries$$

$$F_{UU}^{\cos 2\phi_h}|_{BM} = \sum_q \int d^2 k_\perp \frac{-\Delta^N f_{q^{\uparrow}/p}(x,k_\perp) \Delta^N D_{h/q^{\uparrow}}(z,p_\perp)}{2k_\perp p_\perp} \left\{ P_T(k_\perp \cdot h) + z_h \left[ k_\perp^2 - 2(k_\perp \cdot h)^2 \right] \right\}$$

Must be careful when interpreting

Parameters!!!





**Multiplicities** 

$$\langle P_{\perp}^2 \rangle = \langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle + \langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle \ z^2$$

**Azimuthal Asymmetries** 



 $\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle \quad \langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle$ 

**Multiplicities** 

$$\langle P_{\perp}^2 \rangle = \langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle + \langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle \ z^2$$

 $\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle \quad \langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle$ 

**Azimuthal Asymmetries** 

A fit on Multiplicities +  $\cos<\phi>$  asymmetry using only Cahn effect



# PRELIMINARY

ХВ



# Multiplicities HERMES and COMPASS.

Extracting information from Multiplicites.

Other observables

Conclusions

# Conclusions

- We conducted an analysis of both COMPASS and HERMES Multiplicities.
- Very simple approach works well for a portion of the (MULTIDIMENSIONAL) data.
- Different results (widths) for COMPASS and HERMES.
- HERMES : no much room for Q2-dependence.
- COMPASS: surprising and NOT subtle (seemingly) y-dependence In the normalization.
- This analysis serves as a step 1 to understand the information in these multidimensional sets.
- One MUST look at Azimuthal asymmetries. (careful with parameter interpretation.)

# Grazie Mille.



# Grazie Mille.



# Grazie Mille.





$$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1$$
$$\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1'$$



$$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1 + g_2 \ln \left( Q^2 / Q_0^2 \right) + g_3 \ln \left( 10ex \right)$$
  
 $\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1' + z^2 g_2' \ln \left( Q^2 / Q_0^2 \right)$ 

$$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = a_1 + a_2 \ln (10y)$$
$$\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = a_1' + a_2' \ln (10y)$$

$$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = a_1 + a_2 \ln (10y)$$
$$\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = a_1' + a_2' \ln (10y) + a_3' \sqrt{y}$$



$$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1$$
$$\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1'$$

$$N = A + By$$

	COMPASS		
		$\chi^2_{d.o.f}$	
	N = 1.0		N = A + By
$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1$	0.54		2.42
$\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1'$	8.54		3.42 A = 1.06 $B = -0.43$
$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1 + g_2 \ln \left( Q^2 / Q_0^2 \right) + g_3 \ln \left( 10 e x \right)$	0.01		0.54
$\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = g_1' + z^2 g_2' \ln{(Q^2/Q_0^2)}$	8.21		A = 1.10  B = -0.53
$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = a_1 + a_2 \ln \left( 10y \right)$			
$\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = a_1' + a_2' \ln \left( 10 y \right)$	8.27		2.00 A = 1.13 $B = -0.62$
$\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = a_1 + a_2 \ln \left( 10y \right)$			
$\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = a_1' + a_2' \ln \left( 10y \right) + a_3' \sqrt{y}$	7.75		1.81 A = 1.12 $B = -0.59$

#### **Extraction from HERMES data.**

 $\pi$  only, simplest model

$$< k_{\perp}^{2} > = 0.57 \pm 0.08 \text{ GeV}^{2}$$
  
 $< p_{\perp}^{2} > = 0.12 \pm 0.01 \text{ GeV}^{2}$ 

$$\chi^{2}_{pt} = 1.69$$

$$\pi$$
 only, z dependence  
 $\langle \mathbf{p}_{\perp}^{2} \rangle \rightarrow \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{z})^{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{C}}$   
 $\langle \mathbf{k}_{\perp}^{2} \rangle = 0.48 \pm 0.54 \text{ GeV}^{2}$   
 $A = 0.21 \pm 0.60 \text{ GeV}^{2}$   
 $B = 0.34 \pm 6.42$   
 $C = 0.27 \pm 0.73$ 

**Comparing extractions** Extraction from EMC data (2005)  $\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.25 \text{ GeV}^2$   $\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.20 \text{ GeV}^2$ Extraction from HERMES data (2013)  $\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.57 \pm 0.08 \text{ GeV}^2$ ,  $\langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.124 \pm 0.008 \text{ GeV}^2$ Extraction from COMPASS data (2013)  $\langle k_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.61 \pm 0.20 \text{ GeV}^2 \qquad \langle p_{\perp}^2 \rangle = 0.19 \pm 0.02 \text{ GeV}^2$ 

In order to compare, one needs to take into account correlations between parameters.

$$\sigma \propto \frac{1}{\pi \langle P_T^2 \rangle} e^{-P_T^2 / \langle P_T^2 \rangle}$$
$$\langle P_T^2 \rangle = \langle p_\perp^2 \rangle + z_h^2 \langle k_\perp^2 \rangle.$$

#### z dependence?

 $\pi$  only, simplest model

$$< k_{\perp}^{2} > = 0.57 \pm 0.08 \text{ GeV}^{2}$$
  
 $< p_{\perp}^{2} > = 0.12 \pm 0.01 \text{ GeV}^{2}$ 

$$\chi^{2}_{pt} = 1.69$$

$$\pi$$
 only, z dependence  
 $\langle \mathbf{p}_{\perp}^{2} \rangle \rightarrow \mathbf{A} (\mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{z})^{\mathbf{B}} \mathbf{z}^{\mathbf{C}}$   
 $\langle \mathbf{k}_{\perp}^{2} \rangle = 0.48 \pm 0.54 \text{ GeV}^{2}$   
 $A = 0.21 \pm 0.60 \text{ GeV}^{2}$   
 $B = 0.34 \pm 6.42$   
 $C = 0.27 \pm 0.73$ 

#TMDPDF version 0 : k2avg = a

```
#TMDFF version 0 : pt2avg = A
```

#name a	free 1	val 5.91e-01	err 3.79e-02	lim 1	min 0.00e+00	max 1.00e+00
b	0	0.00e+00	0.00e+00	0	0.00e+00	1.00e+00
С	1	1.16e-01	4.92e-03	1	0.00e+00	1.00e+00
А	1	1.36e-01	6.35e-03	1	0.00e+00	1.00e+00

\_\_\_\_\_

#### **Flavor Dependence. COMPASS.**

#TMDPDF version 0 : k2avg = a

```
#TMDFF version 0 : pt2avg = A
```

#name a	free 1	val 6.04e-01	err 1.68e-02	lim 1	min 0.00e+00	max 1.00e+00
b	0	0.00e+00	0.00e+00	0	0.00e+00	1.00e+02
С	1	1.98e-01	4.31e-03	1	0.00e+00	1.00e+00
А	1	2.02e-01	5.40e-03	1	0.00e+00	1.00e+00

\_\_\_\_\_

#### **Extraction from HERMES data.**







#### Jlab SIDIS data (2012).

