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

## COMPASS

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

HERMES $M_{p}^{\pi^{+}}$


HERMES $M_{p}{ }^{K^{+}}$


HERMES $M_{p}^{\pi}$


HERMES $M_{p}^{K^{-}}$

| $10^{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10^{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $P_{T}(\mathrm{GeV})$ |  |  |  |  |  |

HERMES Multiplicities.



HERMES $M_{p}^{\pi-}$

From P and D targets.
Hadron separation
3D-binning: $\left(Q^{2} X_{B}\right), z, P_{T}$
Total number of points: 1341

HERMES Multiplicities.


## Particularly suitable for

flavor-dependence studies
(Previous talk A. Signori).

HERMES Multiplicities.

| $10^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10^{-1}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =1.80 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ x_{B} & =0.10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =2.90 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ x_{B} & =0.15 \end{aligned}$ |

## Particularly suitable for

flavor-dependence studies
(Previous talk A. Signori).

## TMD evolution?

HERMES Multiplicities.


## Particularly suitable for

flavor-dependence studies
(Previous talk A. Signori).

## TMD evolution?

- It is not possible to decouple the $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{B}}$ and $\mathrm{Q}^{2}$ dependences.
- $1.25 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}<\mathrm{Q}^{2}<9.20 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$



## COMPASS Multiplicities.

```
■ <z>=0.23
\bullet <z>=0.28
\Delta <z>=0.33
```



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

- From Deuteron only
- No hadron separation
- 4D-binning: $\mathrm{Q}^{2}, \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{B}}, \mathrm{z}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{T}}$
- Total number of points: 18624


## COMPASS Multiplicities.

```
■ <z>=0.23
- <z>=0.28
\Delta <z>=0.33
```



## TMD evolution?

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


## COMPASS Multiplicities.

```
    <z>=0.23
    - <z>=0.28
\triangle <z>=0.33
```

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


## COMPASS Multiplicities.

```
\square <z>=0.23
- <z>=0.28
\Delta <z>=0.33
```

- Multidimensional data! Q2, xB, z, PT dependence
- All of these dependences must be understood for TMDs.
- $1.11 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}<\mathrm{Q}^{2}<7.57 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ Might be hard to see TMDevolution.


## COMPASS Multiplicities.

```
<z>=0.23
- <z>=0.28
\Delta <z>=0.33
```

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


## COMPASS Multiplicities.

```
■ <z>=0.23
- <z>=0.28
\Delta <z>=0.33
```

Results presented here have been published in: DOI: 10.1007IJHEP04(2014)005
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Qualitatively.

| $Q^{2}$ | $\left(\mathrm{GeV}^{2}\right)$ $<\boldsymbol{z}$ $<\boldsymbol{z}$ | $\begin{aligned} & =0.23 \\ & =0.33 \end{aligned}$ | OMPASS | $M_{D}^{h^{+}} \quad$  <br>   <br>   <br>  4.0 <br>  3.0 <br>  3.0 <br>  2.0 <br>  1.0 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6.0 \\ & 5.0 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 3.0 \\ & 2.0 \\ & 1.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =4.07 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ x_{B} & =2.16 \mathrm{e}-02 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =4.57 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ x_{B} & =5.36 \mathrm{e}-02 \end{aligned}$  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 6.0 \\ & 5.0 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 3.0 \\ & 2.0 \\ & 1.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =2.90 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ x_{B} & =1.50 \mathrm{e}-02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =2.94 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ x_{B} & =2.13 \mathrm{e}-02 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =2.95 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ x_{B} & =3.19 \mathrm{e}-02 \end{aligned}$  |  | 0.250 .500 .751 .00 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6.0 \\ & 5.0 \\ & 4.0 \\ & 3.0 \\ & 2.0 \\ & 1.0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =1.92 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ x_{B} & =2.13 \mathrm{e}-02 \end{aligned}$  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.250 .500 .751 .00 0.25 0.500 .751 .00 |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.250 .500 .751 .00 \\ P_{T}(\mathrm{GeV}) \end{gathered}$ | 0.250 .500 .751 .00 | 0.250 .500 .751 .00 | $x_{B}$ |

## Qualitatively.



## Qualitatively.



## Qualitatively.



## Qualitatively.

## Two important points



## Qualitatively.

## Two important points

$\rightarrow$ At fixed y, Width \& Normalization roughly constant.


## Qualitatively.

## Two important points

$\rightarrow$ At fixed y, Width \& Normalization roughly constant.
$\rightarrow$ Normalization resembles a straight line.


## Quantitatively

## (a.k.a. Step 1)



## Extraction from HERMES

## and COMPASS data.

Model
Kinematical Cuts

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{q}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right)=f_{q}(x) \frac{1}{\pi\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle} e^{-k_{\perp}^{2} /\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle} Q^{2}>1.69 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\
& D_{q}^{h}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right)=D_{q}^{h}(z) \frac{1}{\pi\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle} e^{-p_{\perp}^{2} /\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle} 0.2<P_{T}<0.9 \mathrm{GeV} \\
& z<0.6
\end{aligned}
$$

Processes included
$\pi^{+}$and $\pi^{-}$production from both $P$ and $D$ targets.
$h^{+}$and $h^{-}$production from D .

| Cuts | $\chi_{p t s}^{2}$ | n. points | $\left[\chi_{p t s}^{2}\right]^{\pi^{+}}$ | $\left[\chi_{p t s}^{2}\right]^{\pi^{-}}$ | Parameters |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} Q^{2}>1.69 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ 0.2<P_{T}<0.9 \mathrm{GeV} \\ z<0.6 \end{gathered}$ | $1.69$ | 497 | 1.93 | 1.45 | $\begin{aligned} & \left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.57 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ & \left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.12 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \end{aligned}$ |

## Extraction from HERMES data.

| Cuts | $\chi_{p t s}^{2}$ | n. points | $\left[\chi_{p t s}^{2}\right]^{]^{+}}$ | $\left[\chi_{p t s}^{2}\right]^{\pi^{-}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

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

It is not possible to resolve additional z-dependence.

$$
\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle=\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle+z_{h}^{2}\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle
$$

Gaussian model.

## Extraction from HERMES data.

## HERMES $M_{p}^{\pi^{+}}$



|  |  |  | Extraction from COMPASS data. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cuts | $\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}$ | n. points | $\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{+}}$ | $\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{-}}$ |

## In the Gaussian model.

$$
F_{U U}=\sum_{q} \int d^{2} \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} f_{q}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right) D_{q}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right) \quad \propto \frac{1}{\pi\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle} e^{-P_{T}^{2} /\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle}
$$



Extraction from COMPASS data.

Cuts
$\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}$
n. points
$\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{+}}$
$\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{-}}$
Parameters


## In the Gaussian model.

$$
F_{U U}=\sum_{q} \int d^{2} \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} f_{q}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right) D_{q}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right) \quad \propto \frac{1}{\pi\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle} e^{-P_{T}^{2} /\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle}
$$



Extraction from COMPASS data.

Cuts
$\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}$
n. points
$\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{+}}$
$\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{-}}$
Parameters
$Q^{2}>1.69 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
$0.2<P_{T}<0.9 \mathrm{GeV}$
$z<0.6$


$$
8.94
$$

8.15

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.61 \pm 0.20 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\
& \left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.19 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
N_{y}=A+B y
$$

## In the Gaussian model.

$F_{U U}=\sum_{q} \int d^{2} \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} f_{q}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right) D_{q}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right) \quad \propto \frac{1}{\pi\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle} e^{-P_{T}^{2} /\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle}$


Extraction from COMPASS data.

Cuts
$\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}$
n. points
$\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{+}}$
$\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{-}}$
Parameters
$Q^{2}>1.69 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
$0.2<P_{T}<0.9 \mathrm{GeV}$ $z<0.6$

5385
8.94
8.15

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.61 \pm 0.20 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\
& \left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.19 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

| $Q^{2}>1.69 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0.2<P_{T}<0.9 \mathrm{GeV}$ | 3.42 |  |
| $z<0.6$ |  | 3.25 |
|  |  | 3.60 |
| $N_{y}=A+B y$ |  | $\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.60 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ |
|  |  | $A=0.20 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ |
|  |  | $B=-0.43 \pm 0.14$ |

## In the Gaussian model.

$F_{U U}=\sum_{q} \int d^{2} \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} f_{q}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right) D_{q}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right) \quad \propto \frac{1}{\pi\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle} e^{-P_{T}^{2} /\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle}$


Extraction from COMPASS data.

Cuts
$\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}$
n. points
$\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{+}}$
$\left[\chi_{\text {dof }}^{2}\right]^{h^{-}}$
Parameters
$Q^{2}>1.69 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
$0.2<P_{T}<0.9 \mathrm{GeV}$
8.54

5385
8.94
8.15


| $z<0.6$ |
| :---: |
| $Q^{2}>1.69 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$ |
| $0.2<P_{T}<0.9 \mathrm{GeV}$ |

$0.2<P_{T}<0.9 \mathrm{GeV}$
3.60

$$
\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.60 \pm 0.14 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}
$$

$$
z<0.6
$$

$$
N_{y}=A+B y
$$





## Extraction from COMPASS data.

|  | $\left(\mathrm{GeV}^{2}\right)$ | $\begin{aligned} & =0.23 \\ & =0.28 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { OMPASS } M$ | $\begin{aligned} & h^{+} \\ & D \end{aligned}$ $10^{0}$ $10^{-1}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =7.36 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ y & =0.45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =7.57 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ y & =0.27 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & <z \\ & <\boldsymbol{z} \\ & <\boldsymbol{z} \\ & <\boldsymbol{z} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} &>=0.33 \\ &>=0.38 \\ &>=0.45 \quad 10^{0} \\ &>=0.55 \\ & \\ & 10^{-1} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =4.07 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ y & =0.63 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =4.47 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ y & =0.46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =4.57 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ y & =0.28 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $10^{0}$ $10^{-1}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =2.94 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ y & =0.46 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}0.25 & 0.50 & 0.75\end{array}$ |
| 100 ${ }^{0}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =1.92 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ y & =0.43 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} Q^{2} & =1.92 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\ y & =0.30 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{array}{llll}0.25 & 0.50 & 0.75\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 0.25 & 0.50 & 0.75 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ccc} 0.25 & 0.50 & 0.75 \\ P_{T}(\mathrm{GeV}) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 0.25 & 0.50 & 0.75 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} \hline 0.25 & 0.50 & 0.75 \end{array}$ |  |
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Multiplicities


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left.F_{U U}^{\cos \phi_{h}}\right|_{C a h n}=-2 \sum_{q} \int d^{2} \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \frac{\left(\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{h}\right)}{Q} f_{q}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right) D_{q}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right) \\
& \left.F_{U U}^{\cos \phi_{h}}\right|_{B M}=\sum_{q} \int d^{2} \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \frac{k_{\perp}}{Q} \frac{\Delta^{N} f_{q^{\uparrow} / p}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right) \Delta^{N} D_{h / q^{\uparrow}}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right)}{p_{\perp}}\left[P_{T}-z_{h}\left(\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{h}\right)\right] \\
& \text { Azimuthal } \\
& \left.F_{U U}^{\cos 2 \phi_{h}}\right|_{C a h n}=2 \sum_{q} \int d^{2} \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \frac{2\left(\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \cdot \boldsymbol{h}\right)^{2}-k_{\perp}^{2}}{Q^{2}} f_{q}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right) D_{q}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right) \\
& \text { Asymmetries } \\
& \left.F_{U U}^{\cos 2 \phi_{h}}\right|_{B M}=\sum_{q} \int d^{2} \boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \frac{-\Delta^{N} f_{q^{\uparrow} / p}\left(x, k_{\perp}\right) \Delta^{N} D_{h / q^{\uparrow}}\left(z, p_{\perp}\right)}{2 k_{\perp} p_{\perp}}\left\{P_{T}\left(\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \cdot h\right)+z_{h}\left[k_{\perp}^{2}-2\left(\boldsymbol{k}_{\perp} \cdot h\right)^{2}\right]\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

# Must be careful when interpreting 

Parameters!!!

## Multiplicities

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

Azimuthal Asymmetries


$$
\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=A \quad\left\langle\left\langle P_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=A+\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle z^{2}\right.
$$

Multiplicities

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

Azimuthal Asymmetries
$\Rightarrow\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle \quad\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=A & \Longleftrightarrow\left\langle P_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=A+\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle z^{2} \\
\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=A+B z^{2} & \Longleftrightarrow\left\langle P_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=A+\left(\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle+B\right) z^{2}
\end{array}
$$

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

Azimuthal Asymmetries
$\Rightarrow\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle \quad\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle$

## A fit on Multiplicities $+\cos <\varphi>$ asymmetry using only

 Cahn effect

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

Azimuthal Asymmetries
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## 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.

## Extraction from COMPASS data.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=g_{1} \\
& \left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=g_{1}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$



## Extraction from COMPASS data.



## Extraction from COMPASS data.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=a_{1}+a_{2} \ln (10 y) \\
& \left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=a_{1}^{\prime}+a_{2}^{\prime} \ln (10 y)
\end{aligned}
$$



## Extraction from COMPASS data.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=a_{1}+a_{2} \ln (10 y) \\
& \left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=a_{1}^{\prime}+a_{2}^{\prime} \ln (10 y)+a_{3}^{\prime} \sqrt{y}
\end{aligned}
$$



## Extraction from COMPASS data.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=g_{1} \\
& \left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=g_{1}^{\prime} \\
& N=A+B y
\end{aligned}
$$



## COMPASS

$$
N=1.0 \quad N=A+B y
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=g_{1} \\
& \left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=g_{1}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
8.54
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3.42 \\
& A=1.06 \quad B=-0.43
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=g_{1}+g_{2} \ln \left(Q^{2} / Q_{0}^{2}\right)+g_{3} \ln (10 e x)
$$

$$
8.21
$$

$$
\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=g_{1}^{\prime}+z^{2} g_{2}^{\prime} \ln \left(Q^{2} / Q_{0}^{2}\right)
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 2.74 \\
& A=1.10 \quad B=-0.53
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=a_{1}+a_{2} \ln (10 y)
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
8.27 & 2.00
\end{array}
$$

$$
\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=a_{1}^{\prime}+a_{2}^{\prime} \ln (10 y)
$$

$$
A=1.13 \quad B=-0.62
$$

$\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=a_{1}+a_{2} \ln (10 y)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1.81 \\
& A=1.12 \quad B=-0.59
\end{aligned}
$$

## Extraction from HERMES data.

$\pi$ only, simplest model
$<\mathrm{k}_{\perp}^{2>}=0.57 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
$<\mathrm{p}_{\perp}^{2>}=0.12 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
$\pi$ only, $z$ dependence
$\left\langle p_{\perp}{ }^{2\rangle} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}(1-\mathrm{z})^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{z}^{\mathrm{C}}\right.$
$<\mathrm{k}_{\perp}{ }^{2>}=0.48 \pm 0.54 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
$\mathrm{A}=0.21 \pm 0.60 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
$B=0.34 \pm 6.42$
$C=0.27 \pm 0.73$


$$
\chi_{p t}^{2}=1.69
$$

$$
\chi^{2}{ }_{p t}=1.63
$$

Extraction from EMC data (2005)

$$
\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.25 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \quad\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.20 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}
$$

Extraction from HERMES data (2013)

$$
\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.57 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}, \quad\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.124 \pm 0.008 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}
$$

Extraction from COMPASS data (2013)

$$
\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.61 \pm 0.20 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \quad\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.19 \pm 0.02 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}
$$

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

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sigma \propto \frac{1}{\pi\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle} e^{-P_{T}^{2} /\left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle} \\
& \left\langle P_{T}^{2}\right\rangle=\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle+z_{h}^{2}\left\langle k_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

$\pi$ only, simplest model

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\langle\mathrm{k}_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.57 \pm 0.08 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} \\
& \left\langle\mathrm{p}_{\perp}^{2}\right\rangle=0.12 \pm 0.01 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\pi$ only, $z$ dependence

$$
\left\langle p_{\perp}^{2>} \rightarrow A(1-z)^{B} z^{C}\right.
$$

$$
\left\langle\mathrm{k}_{\perp}^{2>}=0.48 \pm 0.54 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}\right.
$$

$$
\mathrm{A}=0.21 \pm 0.60 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}
$$

$$
B=0.34 \pm 6.42
$$

$$
C=0.27 \pm 0.73
$$

## Flavor Dependence. HERMES.



| \#name |  | yal | err | lim | min | max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a | 1 | 5.91e-01 | $3.79 \mathrm{e}-02$ | 1 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ |
| b | 0 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 0 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ |
| C | 1 | 1.16e-01 | 4.92e-03 | 1 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ |
| A | 1 | (1.36e-01) | $6.35 \mathrm{e}-03$ | 1 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ |



| \#name |  |  | err | lim | min | max |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a |  | 6.04e-01 | 1.68e-02 | 1 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ |
| b | 0 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | 0 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.00 \mathrm{e}+02$ |
| C | 1 | 1.98e-01 | $4.31 \mathrm{e}-03$ | 1 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ |
| A | 1 | 2.02e-01 | $5.40 \mathrm{e}-03$ | 1 | $0.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ | $1.00 \mathrm{e}+00$ |

Extraction from HERMES data.






## Jlab SIDIS data (2012).





