# N<sup>3</sup>LO extraction of the Sivers functions from SIDIS, DY and W±/Z data

### Alexei Prokudin

M. Bury, AP, A. Vladimirov, PRL 126, 112002 (2021)M. Bury, AP, A. Vladimirov, JHEP 05 (2021) 151



see, e.g., C. Lorcé, B. Pasquini, M. Vanderhaeghen, JHEP 1105 (11) 2

GPD

#### TMD





 $\begin{array}{ll} \text{Connection to 3D structure} & \begin{array}{l} \text{Ji, Ma, Yuan (2004)} \\ \text{Collins (2011)} \end{array} \\ \tilde{f}(x, \vec{b}_T) = \int d^2 \vec{k}_{\perp} \ e^{i \vec{k}_{\perp} \cdot \vec{b}_T} \ f(x, \vec{k}_{\perp}) \end{array}$ 

 $\vec{b}$  is the transverse separation of parton fields in configuration space AP (2012)



### **QCD FACTORIZATION IS THE KEY!**



### **QCD FACTORIZATION IS THE KEY!**



### HADRON'S PARTONIC STRUCTURE

**Collinear Parton Distribution Functions** 



Probability density to find a quark with a momentum fraction x

Hard probe resolves the particle nature of partons, but is not sensitive to hadron's structure at ~fm distances.

### HADRON'S PARTONIC STRUCTURE

To study the physics of *confined motion of quarks and gluons* inside of the proton one needs a new type "hard probe" with two scales.

**Transverse Momentum Dependent functions** 



One large scale (Q) sensitive to particle nature of quark and gluons

One small scale ( $k_T$ ) sensitive to how QCD bounds partons and to the detailed structure at ~fm distances.

### TRANSVERSE MOMENTUM DEPENDENT FACTORIZATION

Small scale  $q_T \ll Q$  — Large scale

The confined motion (kT dependence) is encoded in TMDsSemi-Inclusive DISDrell-YanDihadron in e+e- $\sigma \sim f_{q/P}(x, k_T) D_{h/q}(z, k_T)$  $\sigma \sim f_{q/P}(x_1, k_T) f_{\bar{q}/P}(x_2, k_T)$  $\sigma \sim D_{h_1/q}(z_1, k_T) D_{h_2/\bar{q}}(z_2, k_T)$ 



Meng, Olness, Soper (1992) Ji, Ma, Yuan (2005) Idilbi, Ji, Ma, Yuan (2004) Collins (2011)





Collins, Soper, Sterman (1985) Ji, Ma, Yuan (2004) Collins (2011)

Collins, Soper (1983) Collins (2011)  $\Phi_{q \leftarrow h}^{i \prime - j}(x, b) = f_1(x, b) + i \epsilon_T^{\mu\nu} b_\mu s_\nu M f_1^{\perp}(x, b)$ Our understanding of hadron evolves: TMDs with Polarization

Nucleon emerges as a strongly interacting, 1 relativistic bound state of quarks and gluo  $\overline{ns_1}$ 



Analogous tables for:  $\bigcirc$  Gluons  $f_1 \rightarrow f_1^g$  etc

xp,

- Fragmentation functions
- Nuclear targets  $S \neq \frac{1}{2}$

#### **Sivers function**



Sivers 1989

 Describes unpolarized quarks inside of transversely polarized nucleon



► Generates asymmetries in SIDIS and DY

Kotzinian (1995) Mulders, Tangerman (1995) Boer, Mulders (1998)

► Changes sign in DY w.r.t. SIDIS

Brodsky, Hwang, Schmidt (2002) Collins (2002)



The Sivers function: unpolarized quark distribution inside a transversely polarized nucleon



#### SIGN CHANGE OF THE SIVERS FUNCTION

Colored objects are surrounded by gluons, profound consequence of gauge invariance:

The Sivers function has opposite sign when gluon couple after quark scatters (SIDIS) or before quark annihilates (Drell-Yan)



Brodsky, Hwang, Schmidt `02 Belitsky, Ji, Yuan `04 Collins `02 Boer, Mulders, Pijlman `04 Kang, Qiu `08 Kovchegov, Sievert `18 etc

Crucial test of TMD factorization and collinear twist-3 factorization Several labs worldwide measure Sivers effect in SIDIS and Drell-Yan BNL, CERN, FERMILAB etc

The verification of the sign change is an NSAC (DOE and NSF) milestone 13

 $\label{eq:Large-N_c} \text{Large} - \text{N}_{\text{c}} \, \text{result} \qquad f_{1T}^{\perp u} = -f_{1T}^{\perp d}$ 

Pobylitsa 2003

- Confirmed by phenomenological extractions
- Onfirmed by experimental measurements

Relation to GPDs (E) and anomalous magnetic moment ~~ Burkardt 2002  $f_{1T}^{\perp q}\sim\kappa^q$ 

- Predicted correct sign of Sivers asymmetry in SIDIS
- → Shown to be model-dependent
- Jsed in phenomenological extractions

Meissner, Metz, Goeke 2007

Bacchetta, Radici 2011

Sum rule

Burkardt 2004

Conservation of transverse momentum

Average transverse momentum shift of a quark inside a transversely polarized nucleon

$$\langle k_T^{i,q} \rangle = \varepsilon_T^{ij} S_T^j f_{1T}^{\perp(1)q}(x)$$

$$f_{1T}^{\perp(1)q}(x) = \int d^2k_{\perp} \frac{k_{\perp}^2}{2M^2} f_{1T}^{\perp q}(x,k_{\perp}^2)$$

→ Sum rule

$$\sum_{a=q,g} \int_0^1 dx \langle k_T^{i,a} \rangle = 0 \qquad \sum_{a=q,g} \int_0^1 dx f_{1T}^{\perp(1)a}(x) = 0$$

# THE SCALE DEPENDENCE

### TMD FACTORIZATION IN A NUT-SHELL



#### **Collins-Soper Equations**



Collins, Soper, Sterman (85), Collins (11), Rogers, Collins (15)

$$F(x,k_{\perp};Q) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^2 b e^{ik_{\perp} \cdot b} F(x,b;Q) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty db \, b J_0(k_{\perp}b) F(x,b;Q)$$

$$F(x,b;Q) \approx C \otimes F(x,c/b^*) \times \exp\left\{-\int_{c/b^*}^Q \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \left(A \ln \frac{Q^2}{\mu^2} + B\right)\right\} \times \exp\left(-S_{\text{non-pert}}(b,Q)\right)$$

**OPE/collinear part** 

transverse part, Sudakov FF

- The evolution is complicated as one evolves in 2 dimensions
- The presence of a non-perturbative evolution kernel makes calculations more involved
- Theoretical constraints exist on both nonperturbative shape of TMD and the nonperturbative kernel of evolution

- ✓ Non-perturbative: fitted from data
- ✓ The key ingredient ln(Q) piece is spin-independent
- ✓ Non-perturbative shape of TMDs is to be extracted from data
- ✓ One can use information from models or ab-initio calculations, such as lattice QCD: shape of TMDs, non-perturbative kernel.

#### SUCCESS OF TMD FACTORIZATION PREDICTIVE POWER



*Qiu, Watanabe arXiv:1710.06928* 

Sun, Isaacson, Yuan, Yuan arXiv:1406.3073 Bertone, Scimemi, Vladimirov arXiv:1902.08474

**Upsilon production** 

Z boson production at the LHC

- TMD factorization (with an appropriate matching to collinear results) aims at an accurate description (and prediction) of a differential in q<sub>T</sub> cross section in a wide range of q<sub>T</sub>
- ► LHC results at 7 and 13 TeV are accurately predicted from fits of lower energies

#### 20

TMD EVOLUTION CONTAINS NON-PERTURBATIVE COMPONENT

TMD evolution is a two scale evolution
 Remarkably simple in the zeta-prescription

Scimemi, Vladimirov (18), (20) Vladimirov (20)

$$F(x,b;\mu,\zeta) = \left(\frac{\zeta}{\zeta_{\mu}(b)}\right)^{-\mathcal{D}(b,\mu)} F(x,b)$$

- F(x,b) is the "optimal" TMD
- $\zeta_{\mu}(b)$  calculable function
- $\mathcal{D}(b,\mu)$  Colins-Soper kernel or rapidity anomalous dimension. Fundamental universal function related to the properties of QCD vacuum



### THE ANALYSIS

#### THE SIVERS ASYMMETRY



#### THE PARAMETRIZATION



- 12 free parameters, flavor independent  $r_0, r_1, r_2$
- Valence quarks:  $N_{u,d}, \beta_{u,d}, \epsilon_{u,d}$
- Sea quarks:  $N_{s,sea}, \beta_s = \beta_{sea}$
- Data driven fit, no constraints
- Positivity is satisfied in the region covered by the data

#### DATA SELECTION

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)



#### FIT RESULTS

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)

 Replica method using Artemide framework
 Errors both from the data and the uncertainty due to unpolarized TMD

Name	$\chi^2/N_{pt}$ [SIDIS]	$\chi^2/N_{pt}[\mathrm{DY}]$	$\chi^2/N_{pt}$ [total]
SIDIS at $N^3LO$	$0.87^{+0.13}_{+0.03}$	$1.23^{+0.50}_{-0.24}$ no fit	$0.93^{+0.16}_{+0.01}$
SIDIS+DY at N <sup>3</sup> LO	$0.88^{+0.15}_{+0.04}$	$0.90^{+0.31}_{+0.00}$	$0.88^{+0.15}_{+0.05}$

- Unbiased parametrization
- No tension between SIDIS and DY data universality
- Good convergence of the fit for all data sets

#### **N3LO EXTRACTION OF THE SIVERS FUNCTION**

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)

#### HERMES 2020 3D binning description



#### **N3LO EXTRACTION OF THE SIVERS FUNCTION**

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)

#### COMPASS SIDIS data



27

### **N3LO EXTRACTION OF THE SIVERS FUNCTION**

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)

#### W/Z production, STAR



Pion induced Drell-Yan,

COMPASS

STAR Collab. Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 132301 (2016)



### **SIVERS FUNCTION IN THE POSITION SPACE**

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)





- Large uncertainties
- Node for u quark
- More data needed: EIC, JLab 12, etc



#### **SIVERS FUNCTION IN THE MOMENTUM SPACE**



### SIVERS FUNCTION IN THE MOMENTUM SPACE

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)



Comparison to JAM20 (LO) analysis

Cammarota, Gamberg, Kang, Miller, Pitonyak, Prokudin, Rogers, Sato (2020)

PV20, NLL analysis

Bacchetta, Delcarro, Pisano, Radici (2020)

EKT20, NNLL analysis

Echevarria, Terry, Kang (2020)

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)



## TOMOGRAPHY

#### **NUCLEON TOMOGRAPHY**

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)

 $\rho_{1;q \leftarrow h^{\uparrow}}(x, \mathbf{k}_T, \mathbf{S}_T, \mu) = f_{1;q \leftarrow h}(x, k_T; \mu, \mu^2) - \frac{k_{Tx}}{M} f_{1T;q \leftarrow h}^{\perp}(x, k_T; \mu, \mu^2)$ 



34

2

#### **NUCLEON TOMOGRAPHY**

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2021)

$$\rho_{1;q \leftarrow h^{\uparrow}}(x, \mathbf{k}_T, \mathbf{S}_T, \mu) = f_{1;q \leftarrow h}(x, k_T; \mu, \mu^2) - \frac{k_{Tx}}{M} f_{1T;q \leftarrow h}^{\perp}(x, k_T; \mu, \mu^2)$$



## **QS FUNCTIONS**

#### THE QIU-STERMAN MATRIX ELEMENT

▶ At small b<sub>T</sub> the Sivers function is related to the twist-3 function

$$\langle p, s | g\bar{q}(z_1n)[z_1n, z_2n] \not n F_{\mu+}(z_2n)[z_2n, z_3n]q(z_3n) | p, s \rangle$$

$$= 2\epsilon_T^{\mu\nu} s_\nu (np)^2 M \int_{-1}^1 dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 \delta(x_1 + x_2 + x_3) e^{-i(np)(x_1z_1 + x_2z_2 + x_3z_3)} T_q(x_1, x_2, x_3),$$

$$(4.9)$$

Scimemi, Tarasov, Vladimirov (19)



THE OIU –STERMAN MATRIX ELEMENT (1)  
Beyond LO it is complicated  

$$f_{1T;q\leftarrow h;DY}^{\perp}(x,b;\mu,\zeta) = \pi T(-x,0,x) + \pi a_s(\mu) \{$$
  
 $-2\mathbf{L}_{\mu}P \otimes T + C_F \left(-\mathbf{L}_{\mu}^2 + 2\mathbf{l}_{\zeta}\mathbf{L}_{\mu} + 3\mathbf{L}_{\mu} - \frac{\pi^2}{6}\right) T(-x,0,x)$   
 $+ \int d\xi \int_{0}^{1} dy \delta(x-y\xi) \left[ \left(C_F - \frac{C_A}{2}\right) 2\bar{y}T(-\xi,0,\xi) + \frac{3y\bar{y}}{2} \frac{G_{+}(-\xi,0,\xi) + G_{-}(-\xi,0,\xi)}{\xi} \right] \right\}$   
 $+ O(a_s^2) + O(b^2),$ 

Evolution of T is complicated and non closed









#### THE QIU-STERMAN MATRIX ELEMENT

Invert the formula for Operator Product Expansion of Sivers via the QS functions
Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2020)

$$T_{q}(-x,0,x;\mu_{b}) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \left( 1 + C_{F} \frac{\alpha_{s}(\mu_{b})}{4\pi} \frac{\pi^{2}}{6} \right) f_{1T;q\leftarrow h}^{\perp}(x,b) - \frac{\alpha_{s}(\mu_{b})}{4\pi^{2}} \int_{x}^{1} \frac{dy}{y} \left[ \frac{\bar{y}}{N_{c}} f_{1T;q\leftarrow h}^{\perp} \left( \frac{x}{y}, b \right) + \frac{3y^{2}\bar{y}}{2x} G^{(+)} \left( -\frac{x}{y}, 0, \frac{x}{y}; \mu_{b} \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(a_{s}^{2}, b^{2})$$

Choose the scale to eliminate logs  $\mu_b = \frac{2e^{-\gamma_E}}{b}$ We choose  $b = 0.11 \text{ (GeV}^{-1}), \ \mu_b = 10 \text{ (GeV)}$ and estimate gluon contribution  $G^{(+)} = \pm (|T_u| + |T_d|)$ 

Exact model independent relation!

#### THE QIU-STERMAN MATRIX ELEMENT

Bury, Prokudin, Vladimirov (2020)



## **PROCESS DEPENDENCE**



### **SIGN CHANGE**

Bury, AP, Vladimirov (2021)

 $0.88^{+0.16}_{+0.06}$ 

0.74

[0.60, 0.34]

[0.67, 0.42]

[0.56, 0.17]

 $f_{1T\,[DY]}^{\perp} = +f_{1T\,[SIDIS]}^{\perp}$ 

 $1.00^{+0.22}_{+0.08}$ 

0.44

[0.28, 0.08]

[0.53, 0.11]

[0.68, 0.02]



Large contribution from antiquark Sivers functions to DY makes it possible to describe data without the sign change

$$f_{1T}^{\perp sea} \rightarrow -f_{1T}^{\perp sea}$$
  
SpinQuest data may prove important to constraint sea-quark functions

#### CONCLUSIONS

- We have extracted Sivers function from the first global fit of SIDIS, pion-induced Drell-Yan and W±/Z production experimental data at N3LO precision
- Conservative data cuts are used to ensure validity of factorization and unbiased parametrization
- Good agreement between SIDIS and DY data in an analysis with TMD evolution is achieved for the first time
- The Qiu-Sterman functions are extracted in a model independent way
- Our results set a new benchmark and the standard of precision for studies of TMD polarized functions



. . . . . . . . . . .

. .

. . . . . . .

#### POSITIVITY

 $\frac{k_T^2}{M^2} \left( g_{1T}(x, k_T)^2 + f_{1T}^{\perp}(x, k_T)^2 \right) \leqslant f_1(x, k_T)^2,$ 



#### **ERROR PROPAGATION**



- Uncertainties estimated by replica method
  - ▶ Fitting 300 replicas of pseudo data
- Large and (often) asymmetric uncertainties
- Uncertainty due to unpol.TMD are non-negligible but much smaller then due to data