



# **Review of GPDs and TMDs**

Jianwei Qiu Brookhaven National Laboratory Stony Brook University



### Why TMDs and GPDs?

## **Transverse momentum dependent parton distribution functions** (TMDs), and generalized parton distributions (GPDs) encode rich and unique information on confined motion, and spatial distribution of quarks and gluons inside a hadron, respectively

(Gateway to hadron's 3D partonic structure!)

### How to "see" and quantify hadron structure?

#### □ Our understanding of hadron evolves



1970s

1980s/2000s

Now

Nucleon is a strongly interacting, relativistic bound state of quarks and gluons

□ Challenge:

No modern detector can see quarks and gluons in isolation!

**Question**:

How to quantify the hadron structure if we cannot see quarks and gluons? *We need the probe!* 

#### □ Answer:

**QCD** factorization! *Not exact, but, controllable approximation!* 

### **QCD** Factorization: connecting parton to hadron



### **QCD** Factorization: connecting parton to hadron



### **QCD** factorization works!





K.A. Olive et al. (Particle Data Group), Chin. Phys. C, 38, 090001 (2014)



### **QCD** factorization works!



### Our knowledge on hadron structure?

- QCD has been extremely successful in interpreting and predicting high energy experimental data!
- But, we still do NOT know much about hadron structure – work just started!



□ High energy probes "see" the **boosted** partonic structure:



Confined motion:  $1/R \sim \Lambda_{\rm QCD} \ll Q$  is too week to be relevant

#### **Two-momentum-scale observables**

 $xp_{\star}k_{\rm T}$ 

Х

#### □ Cross sections with two-momentum scales observed: $Q_1 \gg Q_2 \sim 1/R \sim \Lambda_{ m QCD}$

 $\diamond$  "Soft" scale:  $Q_2$  could be more sensitive to hadron structure, e.g., confined motion

#### Two-scale observables with the hadron broken:



A Natural observables with TWO very different scales

**TMD** factorization: partons' confined motion is encoded into TMDs

#### **Two-momentum-scale observables**

 $xp_k_T$ 

Х

#### □ Cross sections with two-momentum scales observed: $Q_1 \gg Q_2 \sim 1/R \sim \Lambda_{ m QCD}$

#### Two-scale observables with the hadron unbroken:



♦ Natural observables with TWO very different scales

 $\diamond$  GPDs: Fourier Transform of t-dependence gives spatial b<sub>T</sub>-dependence

### Unified view of nucleon structure



### **Unified view of nucleon structure**



#### □ Note:

- Partons' confined motion and their spatial distribution are unique – the consequence of QCD
- ♦ But, the TMDs and GPDs that represent them are not unique!
  - Depending on the definition of the Wigner distribution and QCD factorization to link them to physical observables

#### Position $\Gamma \times$ Momentum $\rho \rightarrow$ Orbital Motion of Partons

### **Questions/issues for TMDs**

#### □ Non-perturbative definition:

 $\diamond\,$  In terms of matrix elements of parton correlators:

$$\Phi^{[U]}(x, p_T; n) = \int \frac{d\xi^- d^2 \xi_T}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i p \cdot \xi} \langle P, S | \overline{\psi}(0) U(0, \xi) \psi(\xi) | P, S \rangle_{\xi^+ = 0}$$

 $\mathbf{A}\psi_i(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ 

P

 $\Phi(p;P)$ 

 $\psi_{j}(0)$ 

♦ Depends on the choice of the gauge link:



 $\diamond$  Decomposes into a list of TMDs:

### **Questions/issues for TMDs**

#### □ Non-perturbative definition:

♦ In terms of matrix elements of parton correlators:

$$\Phi^{[U]}(x, p_T; n) = \int \frac{d\xi^- d^2 \xi_T}{(2\pi)^3} e^{i p \cdot \xi} \langle P, S | \overline{\psi}(0) U(0, \xi) \psi(\xi) | P, S \rangle_{\xi^+ = 0}$$

 $\wedge \psi_i(\xi)$ 

P

 $\psi_i(0)$ 

 $\Phi\left(p;P
ight)$ 

♦ Depends on the choice of the gauge link:



♦ Decomposes into a list of TMDs:

IF we knew proton wave function, this definition gives "unique" TMDs!
 But, we do NOT know proton wave function (may calculate it using BSE?)
 TMDs defined in this way are NOT direct physical observables!

### **Questions/issues for TMDs**

#### Perturbative definition – in terms of TMD factorization:



#### **TMD** fragmentation



#### **Extraction of TMDs:**

TMD parton distribution

 $\sigma_{\text{SIDIS}}(Q, P_{h\perp}, x_B, z_h) = \hat{H}(Q) \otimes \Phi_f(x, k_\perp) \otimes \mathcal{D}_{f \to h}(z, p_\perp) \otimes \mathcal{S}(k_{s\perp}) + \mathcal{O}\left[\frac{P_{h\perp}}{O}\right]$ 

TMDs are extracted by fitting DATA using the factorization formula (approximation) and the perturbatively calculated  $\hat{H}(Q;\mu)$ .

Extracted TMDs are valid only when the <p2> << Q<sup>2</sup>

### TMDs: confined motion, its spin correlation

#### □ Power of spin – many more correlations:



### SIDIS is the best for probing TMDs

#### □ Naturally, two scales & two planes:

$$A_{UT}(\varphi_h^l, \varphi_S^l) = \frac{1}{P} \frac{N^{\uparrow} - N^{\downarrow}}{N^{\uparrow} + N^{\downarrow}}$$
$$= A_{UT}^{Collins} \sin(\phi_h + \phi_S) + A_{UT}^{Sivers} \sin(\phi_h - \phi_S)$$
$$+ A_{UT}^{Pretzelosity} \sin(3\phi_h - \phi_S)$$

#### □ Separation of TMDs:

#### Hard, if not impossible, to separate TMDs in hadronic collisions

Using a combination of different observables (not the same observable): jet, identified hadron, photon, ...

### Modified universality for TMDs

Definition:

$$f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}(x,\mathbf{k}_{\perp},\vec{S}) = \int \frac{dy^{-}d^{2}y_{\perp}}{(2\pi)^{3}} e^{ixp^{+}y^{-}-i\,\mathbf{k}_{\perp}\cdot\mathbf{y}_{\perp}} \langle p,\vec{S}|\overline{\psi}(0^{-},\mathbf{0}_{\perp}) \boxed{\text{Gauge link}} \frac{\gamma^{+}}{2} \psi(y^{-},\mathbf{y}_{\perp})|p,\vec{S}\rangle$$

Gauge links:



□ Process dependence:

$$f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}^{\text{SIDIS}}(x,\mathbf{k}_{\perp},\vec{S}) \neq f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}^{\text{DY}}(x,\mathbf{k}_{\perp},\vec{S})$$

**Collinear factorized PDFs are process independent** 

#### **Critical test of TMD factorization**

□ Parity – Time reversal invariance:

 $f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}^{\text{SIDIS}}(x,\mathbf{k}_{\perp},\vec{S}) = f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}^{\text{DY}}(x,\mathbf{k}_{\perp},-\vec{S})$ 

**Definition of Sivers function:** 

$$f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}(x,\mathbf{k}_{\perp},\vec{S}) \equiv f_{q/h}(x,k_{\perp}) + \frac{1}{2}\Delta^{N}f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}(x,k_{\perp})\,\vec{S}\cdot\hat{p}\times\hat{\mathbf{k}}_{\perp}$$

□ Modified universality:

$$\Delta^N f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}^{\text{SIDIS}}(x,k_{\perp}) = -\Delta^N f_{q/h^{\uparrow}}^{\text{DY}}(x,k_{\perp})$$

The spin-averaged part of this TMD is process independent, but, spin-averaged Boer-Mulder's TMD requires the sign change! Same PT symmetry examination needs for TMD gluon distributions!

### **Global QCD analysis: extraction of TMDs**

#### **QCD TMD** factorization:

- Connect cross sections, asymmetries to TMDs
- ♦ Factorization is known or expected to be valid for SIDIS, Drell-Yan (Y\*, W/Z, H<sup>0</sup>,...), 2-Jet imbalance in DIS, ...

Same level of reliability as collinear factorization for PDFs, up to the sign change

#### **QCD** evolution of TMDs:

- TMDs evolve when probed at different momentum scales
- $\diamond$  Evolution equations are for TMDs in b<sub>T</sub>-space (Fourier Conjugate of k<sub>T</sub>)

FACT: QCD evolution does NOT fully fix TMDs in momentum space, even with TMDs fixed at low Q – large  $b_T$ -input!!!

♦ Very different from DGLAP evolution of PDFs – in momentum space

FACT: QCD evolution uniquely fix PDFs at large Q, once the PDFs is determined at lower Q – linear evolution in momentum space

#### □ Challenges:

Predictive power, extraction of hadron structure, ...

### **Evolution of Sivers function**

Aybat, Collins, Qiu, Rogers, 2011

#### Up quark Sivers function:



Very significant growth in the width of transverse momentum

### **Different fits – different Q-dependence**

#### Aybat, Prokudin, Rogers, 2012:



No disagreement on evolution equations!

Issues: Extrapolation to non-perturbative large b-region Choice of the Q-dependent "form factor"

### "Predictions" for A<sub>N</sub> of W-production at RHIC?

#### □ Sivers Effect:

See also talk by Marcia Quaresma on Wed. for COMPASS

- Quantum correlation between the spin direction of colliding hadron and the preference of motion direction of its confined partons
- QCD Prediction: Sign change of Sivers function from SIDIS and DY

□ Current "prediction" and uncertainty of QCD evolution:



TMD collaboration proposal: Lattice, theory & Phenomenology RHIC is the excellent and unique facility to test this (W/Z – DY)!

### What happened?

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

Is the log(Q) dependence sufficient? Choice of  $g_2 \& b_*$  affects Q-dep. The "form factor" and  $b_*$  change perturbative results at small  $b_T$ !

### Q-dependence of the "form" factor

#### **Q**-dependence of the "form factor" :

Konychev, Nadolsky, 2006

![](_page_24_Figure_3.jpeg)

At Q ~ 1 GeV,  $\ln(Q/Q_0)$  term may not be the dominant one!  $\mathcal{F}^{NP} \approx b^2(a_1 + a_2 \ln(Q/Q_0) + a_3 \ln(x_A x_B) + ...) + ...$ Power correction? (Q<sub>0</sub>/Q)<sup>n</sup>-term? Better fits for HERMES data?

### Parton $k_T$ at the hard collision

#### $\Box$ Sources of parton $k_T$ at the hard collision:

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

 $\Box$  Large k<sub>T</sub> generated by the shower (caused by the collision):

- Q<sup>2</sup>-dependence linear evolution equation of TMDs in b-space
- $\diamond\,$  The evolution kernels are perturbative at small b, but, not large b

The nonperturbative inputs at large b could impact TMDs at all Q<sup>2</sup>

#### □ Challenge: to extract the "true" parton's confined motion:

- Separation of perturbative shower contribution from nonperturbative hadron structure – not as simple as PDFs
- ♦ Role of lattice QCD? Task of the DOE supported TMD collaboration

#### Hint of the sign change: A<sub>N</sub> of W production

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

Data from STAR collaboration on  $A_N$  for W-production are consistent with a sign change between SIDIS and DY

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

#### **Boosted 3D nucleon structure**

□ High energy probes "see" the boosted partonic structure:

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

JLab12 for large-x, EIC for medium to small-x

#### GPDs – its role in solving the spin puzzle

#### **Quark "form factor"**:

See also Hatta's talk on Tuesday

$$\begin{split} F_q(x,\xi,t,\mu^2) &= \int \frac{d\lambda}{2\pi} e^{-ix\lambda} \underbrace{P'}_{Q} \bar{\psi}_q(\lambda/2) \frac{\gamma \cdot n}{2P \cdot n} \psi_q(-\lambda/2) |P\rangle \\ &\equiv H_q(x,\xi,t,\mu^2) \left[ \bar{\mathcal{U}}(P') \gamma^{\mu} \mathcal{U}(P) \right] \frac{n_{\mu}}{2P \cdot n} \\ &+ E_q(x,\xi,t,\mu^2) \left[ \bar{\mathcal{U}}(P') \frac{i\sigma^{\mu\nu}(P'-P)_{\nu}}{2M} \mathcal{U}(P) \right] \frac{n_{\mu}}{2P \cdot n} \\ \text{with} \quad \xi = (P'-P) \cdot n/2 \text{ and } t = (P'-P)^2 \Rightarrow -\Delta_{\perp}^2 \text{ if } \xi \to 0 \\ &\tilde{H}_q(x,\xi,t,Q), \quad \tilde{E}_q(x,\xi,t,Q) \\ \text{Different quark spin projection} \\ \text{I Total quark's orbital contribution to proton's spin:} \quad \text{Ji, PRL78, 1997} \\ J_q &= \frac{1}{2} \lim_{t \to 0} \int dx \, x \left[ H_q(x,\xi,t) + E_q(x,\xi,t) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \Delta q + L_q \end{split}$$

□ Connection to normal quark distribution:

 $H_q(x,0,0,\mu^2) = q(x,\mu^2)$  The limit when  $\xi \to 0$ 

### **Exclusive DIS: Hunting for GPDs**

#### □ Experimental access to GPDs:

Mueller et al., 94; Ji, 96; Radyushkin, 96

JLab12, COMPASS-II, EIC

♦ Diffractive exclusive processes – high luminosity:

**DVCS:** Deeply virtual Compton Scattering **DVEM:** Deeply virtual exclusive meson production

![](_page_29_Figure_5.jpeg)

No factorization for hadronic diffractive processes – EIC is ideal

**D** Much more complicated – (x,  $\xi$ , t) variables:

Challenge to derive GPDs from data

Great experimental effort:

HERA, HERMES, COMPASS, JLab

#### **Deep virtual Compton scattering**

**The LO diagram**:

![](_page_30_Figure_2.jpeg)

 $\xi = Q^2 / (2\bar{P} \cdot q)$   $Y' = P + \Delta$ 

□ Scattering amplitude:

$$T^{\mu\nu}(P,q,\Delta) = -\frac{1}{2}(p^{\mu}n^{\nu} + p^{\nu}n^{\mu} - g^{\mu\nu})\int dx \left(\frac{1}{x - \xi/2 + i\epsilon} + \frac{1}{x + \xi/2 + i\epsilon}\right)$$

$$\times \left[H(x,\Delta^{2},\Delta\cdot n)\bar{U}(P')\not\#U(P) + E(x,\Delta^{2},\Delta\cdot n)\bar{U}(P')\frac{i\sigma^{\alpha\beta}n_{\alpha}\Delta_{\beta}}{2M}U(P)\right]$$

$$-\frac{i}{2}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}p_{\alpha}n_{\beta}\int dx \left(\frac{1}{x - \xi/2 + i\epsilon} - \frac{1}{x + \xi/2 + i\epsilon}\right)$$

$$\times \left[\tilde{H}(x,\Delta^{2},\Delta\cdot n)\bar{U}(P')\not\#\gamma_{5}U(P) + \tilde{E}(x,\Delta^{2},\Delta\cdot n)\frac{\Delta\cdot n}{2M}\bar{U}(P')\gamma_{5}U(P)\right]$$

$$\int \frac{d\lambda}{2\pi}e^{i\lambda x}\langle P'|\bar{\psi}(-\lambda n/2)\gamma^{\mu}\psi(\lambda n/2)|P\rangle = H(x,\Delta^{2},\Delta\cdot n)\bar{U}(P')\gamma^{\mu}U(P)$$

$$+E(x,\Delta^{2},\Delta\cdot n)\bar{U}(P')\frac{i\sigma^{\mu\nu}\Delta_{\nu}}{2M}U(P) + \dots$$

$$\int \frac{d\lambda}{2\pi}e^{i\lambda x}\langle P'|\bar{\psi}(-\lambda n/2)\gamma^{\mu}\gamma_{5}\psi(\lambda n/2)|P\rangle = \tilde{H}(x,\Delta^{2},\Delta\cdot n)\bar{U}(P')\gamma^{\mu}\gamma_{5}U(P)$$

$$+\tilde{E}(x,\Delta^{2},\Delta\cdot n)\bar{U}(P')\frac{\gamma_{5}\Delta^{\mu}}{2M}U(P) + \dots$$

#### **GPDs: just the beginning**

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

### **DVCS @ EIC**

**Cross Sections:** γ\*+p→γ+p  $\gamma^* + p \rightarrow \gamma + p$ 10 20 GeV on 250 GeV 5 GeV on 100 GeV 103 dr<sub>DVCS</sub>/dt (pb/GeV<sup>2</sup>) ∫Ldt = 10 fb<sup>-1</sup> do<sub>ovcs</sub>/dt (pb/GeV<sup>2</sup>) 102 10 0.1 0.2 0.4 1.2 1.6 0.2 0.6 0.8 1.4 0.4 0.8 1.2 1.4 1.6 0 0 0.6 Itl (GeV<sup>2</sup>) Itl (GeV<sup>2</sup>) □ Spatial distributions: 0.6 0.01 0.02 0.5 0.8 X<sub>6</sub> F(x<sub>6</sub>, b<sub>7</sub>) (fm<sup>-2</sup>) (s F(x<sub>6</sub>, b<sub>7</sub>) (fm<sup>-2</sup>) 0.01 0.005 0.4 0.6 0.3 0.4 Ó 1.4 1.8 1.8 1.4 1.6 1.8 0.2 0.2 0.004 < x<sub>B</sub> < 0.0063  $0.1 < x_B < 0.16$ 0.1 10 < Q<sup>2</sup>/GeV<sup>2</sup> < 17.8 O<sup>2</sup>/GeV<sup>2</sup> < 17.8 0 0 0.8 1.2 1.6 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.2 -1.6 0.2 0.6 14 4 0 0.4 0 br (fm) br (fm) Radius of quark density (x)!

### **Spatial distribution of gluons**

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

### **Spatial distribution of gluons**

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

*Model dependence – parameterization?* 

**EIC** simulation

#### Unified view of nucleon structure

![](_page_35_Figure_1.jpeg)

Position  $\Gamma \times$  Momentum  $\rho \rightarrow$  Orbital Motion of Partons

### PDFs, TMDs, GPDs, and hadron structure

□ What do we need to know for full hadron structure?

 $\Rightarrow$  In theory:  $\langle P, S | \mathcal{O}(\overline{\psi}, \psi, A^{\mu}) | P, S \rangle$  – Hadronic matrix elements

with ALL possible operators  ${\cal O}(\overline{\psi},\psi,A^{\mu})$ 

![](_page_36_Picture_4.jpeg)

- In fact: None of these matrix elements is a direct physical observable in QCD color confinement! need probes!!!
- In practice: Accessible hadron structure
   = hadron matrix elements of quarks and gluons, which
  - 1) can be related to physical cross sections of hadrons and leptons with controllable approximation factorization;
  - 2) can be calculated in lattice QCD

Multi-parton correlations – beyond single parton distributions:

![](_page_36_Figure_10.jpeg)

### Summary

TMDs and GPDs are NOT direct physical observables
 – could be defined differently

□ Knowledge of nonperturbative inputs at large b<sub>T</sub> is crucial in determining the TMDs from fitting the data

QCD factorization is necessary for any controllable "probe" for hadron's quark-gluon structure!

□ Jlab12, COMPASS, ... will provide rich information on hadron structure via TMDs and/or GPDs in years to come!

EIC is a ultimate QCD machine, and will provide answers to many of our questions on hadron structure, in particular, the confined transverse motions (TMDs), spatial distributions (GPDs), and multi-parton correlations, ...

### Thank you!

### **Backup slides**

### **Evolution equations for TMDs**

□ TMDs in the b-space:

J.C. Collins, in his book on QCD

#### □ Collins-Soper equation:

 $\tilde{K}(b_T;\mu) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_s} \ln\left(\frac{\tilde{S}(b_T;y_s,-\infty)}{\tilde{S}(b_T;+\infty,y_s)}\right)$ 

#### **Renormalization of the soft-factor**

$$\zeta_F = M_P^2 x^2 e^{2(y_P - y_s)}$$

Introduced to regulate the rapidity divergence of TMDs

□ RG equations:

$$\frac{d\tilde{K}(b_T;\mu)}{d\ln\mu} = -\gamma_K(g(\mu))$$

**Wave function Renormalization** 

Evolution equations are only valid when  $b_T << 1/\Lambda_{QCD}$ !

Need information at large  $b_{T}$ 

$$\frac{d\tilde{F}_{f/P^{\uparrow}}(x,\mathbf{b}_{\mathrm{T}},S;\mu;\zeta_{F})}{d\ln\mu} = \gamma_{F}(g(\mu);\zeta_{F}/\mu^{2})\tilde{F}_{f/P^{\uparrow}}(x,\mathbf{b}_{\mathrm{T}},S;\mu;\zeta_{F})$$

 $\frac{\partial F_{f/P^{\uparrow}}(x, \mathbf{b}_{\mathrm{T}}, S; \mu; \zeta_F)}{\partial \ln \sqrt{\zeta_F}} = \tilde{K}(b_T; \mu) \tilde{F}_{f/P^{\uparrow}}(x, \mathbf{b}_{\mathrm{T}}, S; \mu; \zeta_F)$ 

□ Momentum space TMDs:

$$F_{f/P^{\uparrow}}(x, \mathbf{k}_{\mathrm{T}}, S; \mu, \zeta_F) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2} \int d^2 \mathbf{b}_T \, e^{i\mathbf{k}_T \cdot \mathbf{b}_T} \, \tilde{F}_{f/P^{\uparrow}}(x, \mathbf{b}_{\mathrm{T}}, S; \mu, \zeta_F)$$

### **Evolution equations for Sivers function**

Sivers function:

Aybat, Collins, Qiu, Rogers, 2011

$$F_{f/P^{\uparrow}}(x,k_T,S;\mu,\zeta_F) = F_{f/P}(x,k_T;\mu,\zeta_F) - F_{1T}^{\perp f}(x,k_T;\mu,\zeta_F) \frac{\epsilon_{ij}k_T^i S^j}{M_p}$$

□ Collins-Soper equation:

$$\frac{\delta \ln \tilde{F}_{1T}^{\prime \perp f}(x, b_T; \mu, \zeta_F)}{\partial \ln \sqrt{\zeta_F}} = \tilde{K}(b_T; \mu)$$

□ RG equations:

 $-\tilde{-}i + f_{i}$ 

Its derivative obeys the CS equation

$$\tilde{F}_{1T}^{\prime \perp f}(x, b_T; \mu, \zeta_F) \equiv \frac{\partial \tilde{F}_{1T}^{\perp f}(x, b_T; \mu, \zeta_F)}{\partial b_T}$$

#### □ Sivers function in momentum space:

$$F_{1T}^{\perp f}(x, k_T; \mu, \zeta_F) = \frac{-1}{2\pi k_T} \int_0^\infty db_T \, b_T J_1(k_T b_T) \tilde{F}_{1T}^{\prime \perp f}(x, b_T; \mu, \zeta_F)$$

JI, Ma, Yuan, 2004 Idilbi, et al, 2004, Boer, 2001, 2009, Kang, Xiao, Yuan, 2011 Aybat, Prokudin, Rogers, 2012 Idilbi, et al, 2012, Sun, Yuan 2013, ...

### Extrapolation to large $b_T$

![](_page_41_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Nonperturbative fitting functions

Various fits correspond to different choices for  $g_{f/P}(x, b_T)$  and  $g_K(b_T)$  e.g.  $g_{f/P}(x, b_T) + g_K(b_T) \ln \frac{Q}{Q_0} \equiv -\left[g_1 + g_2 \ln \frac{Q}{2Q_0} + g_1 g_3 \ln(10x)\right] b_T^2$ 

Different choice of g<sub>2</sub> & b<sub>\*</sub> could lead to different over all Q-dependence!