Parton distributions in π^{\pm} within xFitter framework



Ivan Novikov JINR 18 March, 2019

- ▶ In comparison to proton, pion structure is poorly studied experimentally.
- Currently available pion PDF sets in LHAPDF5/6 library are provided without error bands
- Pion is more straightforward to describe theoretically than baryons: pion PDFs have been calculated in nonperturbative models, such as NJL model, light-front constituent quark model, chiral constituent quark model; first moments of pion PDFs have been calculated on lattice
- Anticipating new DY and direct photon data from COMPASS++/AMBER experiment

To describe π^- with a small number of parameters assume at starting scale $Q_0^2 = 1.9$ GeV SU(3)-symmetric sea and neglect electroweak corrections: Minimizer $\bar{u} = d \ \bar{d} = u = s = \bar{s}$ MINUIT or CERES vary parameters $v := \frac{(d - \bar{d}) - (u - \bar{u})}{2} = d - u \qquad xv = A_v x^{B_v} (1 - x)^{C_v}$ Parameterisation at starting scale $s := \frac{u + \bar{d}}{2} = u$ $xs = A_s x^{B_s} (1-x)^{C_s}$ Evolution $xg = A_{\sigma} x^{B_g} (1-x)^{C_g}$ g := gCross-section predictions A_{v} and A_{σ} are fixed by valence and momentum sum rules: $\int_{a}^{1} v \mathrm{d}x = 1$ $\int_{-\infty}^{1} x(2v+6s+g) \mathrm{d}x = 1$ Other parameters are varied to minimize χ^2 Data C-parameters determine high-x behavior, B-parameters determine low-x

behavior

2



PDFs are evolved from starting scale $Q_0^2 = 1.9$ by solving DGLAP equations numerically. xFitter uses QCDNUM or APFEL++ packages.

Theory predictions are calculated using APPLgrid package as a convolution PDF \otimes precomputed grid. The grids were generated using the MCFM generator

Evolution and cross-section calculations are performed at NLO

P _{lab} , GeV	Reaction	$N_{\rm points}$			
252		140			
194	$ \pi^{-}_{74}W \rightarrow \mu^{+}\mu^{-}X$	59			
286		73			
280	$\pi^{\pm} p ightarrow \gamma X$	99			
	Total:	371			
$ \begin{array}{c} \bar{q} & \mu^{-} & \bar{q} & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline & & & & & \\ \hline & & & &$					
	$\begin{array}{c} P_{\text{lab}}, \text{ GeV} \\ 252 \\ 194 \\ 286 \\ 280 \end{array}$	P_{lab} , GeVReaction252194 $\pi^-{}_{74}W \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-X$ 286 $\pi^\pm p \rightarrow \gamma X$ 280 $\pi^\pm p \rightarrow \gamma X$ Total:			

For tungsten target we used nuclear PDF set nCTEQ15⁴

 μ^{\dagger}

a

¹J. S. Conway *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **39** (1989) 92. ²B. Betev *et al.* [NA10 Collaboration], Z. Phys. C **28** (1985) 9. (data revised) ³M. Bonesini *et al.* [WA70 Collaboration], Z. Phys. C **37** (1988) 535. ⁴K. Kovarik *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.8, 085037 ⁴





While valence distribution is well-constrained, some sea and gluon parameters cannot be determined from the data



Red dots were obtained using pseudodata generated with central values based on theory and fluctuations based on data uncertainties.

6



Both Drell-Yan and direct photon data are not sensitive to these gluon variations



In general sensitivity of DY data to gluon is small; direct photon production data is sensitive to gluon, but also has large uncertainties, both uncorrelated and normalization

We compare sensitivity studies using pseudodata with errors based on data and with errors of direct photon production data rescaled by a factor of 0.3. One can see that more precise direct photon production data would allow us to better constrain gluon.



Fix some parameters to be HERA-like:

$$\frac{\chi^2}{N_{DoF}} = \frac{450.23}{374} = 1.204$$

$$\begin{vmatrix} B_v = 0.89 \pm 0.03 \\ C_v = 0.96 \pm 0.03 \\ A_s = 6.4 \pm 1.9 \\ B_s = 1.35 \pm 0.16 \\ C_s = 8 \\ B_g = 6.3 \pm 1.3 \\ C_g = 5 \end{vmatrix}$$

$$0.5$$

$$0.4$$

$$0.4$$

$$0.3$$

$$0.2$$

$$0.1$$

$$0.2$$

$$0.1$$

$$0.1$$

$$0.0$$

$$10^{-3}$$

$$10^{-2}$$

$$10^{-1}$$

$$10^{0}$$

~

Additional uncertainties

- ▶ Uncertainties in PDFs used for tungsten target and $\alpha_S = 0.118 \pm 0.001$ are treated as additional sources of correlated error
- Variation of starting scale $Q_0^2 = 1.9 \pm 0.1$
- Fixed parameters C_g, C_s and renormalization scale μ_R are varied by a factor of 2 up and down. μ_R variation has a strong impact on predictions:

μ_R factor	χ^2	
0.5	419.32	
1	445.09	
2	470.90	

 Valence distribution is well-constrained even with additional uncertainties



Momentum fractions in pion and proton



High-x behavior of valence distribution



- New look at the pion data using modern tools
- ▶ Data are described by NLO QCD reasonably well, sensitivity to μ_R indicates that NNLO corrections are significant
- Fraction of momentum carried by gluon is small in comparison to proton
- Valence distribution $\sim (1-x)^1$ at high x.
- Extracted PDFs with uncertainties will be submitted to LHAPDF6
- More precise direct photon data could help constrain gluon and sea

Backup

Experiment	P _{lab} , GeV	Reported Iuminosity uncertainty	Fitted normalisation factor	$\chi^2/\textit{N}_{\sf points}$
E615	252	15%	1.265 ± 0.015	172.16/140 = 1.230
NA10	194	6.4%	1.144 ± 0.014	81.7/67 = 1.219
	286	6.4%	1.075 ± 0.014	90.46/73 = 1.239
WA70	280	6%	0.95 ± 0.03	87.46/99 = 0.883



Data





Parameter correlations from MC



Without momentum sum