F_L and F_2 - theory model comparison with HERA data

Matthew A. C. Lamont
BNL

BROOKHAVEN
NATIONAL LABORATORY

Non-linear QCD - Saturation



Non-linear QCD - Saturation

- BFKL: evolution in x
  - ➡ linear
    - explosion in colour field at low-x





Non-linear QCD - Saturation

- BFKL: evolution in x

  ➡ linear

  - explosion in colour field at low-x



- Non-linear BK/JIMWLK equations

  ➡ non-linearity ⇒ saturation

  - Allows for the recombination of gluons in a dense gluonic medium

  ➡ characterised by the saturation scale, $Q_S(x,A)$



Explanation of what's on the plots..

- Theory
  - ➡ Leading-Twist Shadowing
    - **FGS10** provided by Vadim Guzey
      - Evolved with a DGLAP evolution
  - ➡ Saturation, dipole models
    - **IPSat** provided by Tuomas Lappi (work by Henri Kowalski, Graeme Watt)
      - Evolved with a DGLAP evolution
      - Fit to ZEUS 96 data - χ^2/d.o.f. ~ 1.2
    - **bCGC** provided by Tuomas Lappi (work by Henri Kowalski, Graeme Watt)
      - "ad-hoc" approach to evolution but based on BK
      - Fit to ZEUS 96 data - χ^2/d.o.f = 1.62
    - **rcBK** provided by Javier Albacete (AAQMS model)
      - Evolution along x with BK equation
      - Fit to H1+ZEUS combined 2006 data
- Experimental Data
  - ➡ F_2: H1&ZEUS combined data from: http://www-h1.desy.de/psfiles/papers/desy09-158.pdf
  - ➡ F_L: H1&ZEUS combined data from: http://www-h1.desy.de/psfiles/papers/desy10-228.pdf

Hatched region - our x-Q^2 acceptance for F_L and F_2



Study by Elke

$F_2(p,D)$ - $0.8 < Q^2 < 6$


F_2/A
Q^2_{Data} = 0.85 GeV^2
H1: p
Q^2_{Theory} = 0.84 GeV^2
Saturation:
bCGC: p
IPSAT: p
rcBK: p
Q^2_{Data} = 1.2 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 1.25 GeV^2
LT Shadowing:
FGS10: D
Q^2_{Data} = 2.0 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 1.85 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 2.7 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 2.7 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 3.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 3.9 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 6.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 5.7 GeV^2
x

$F_2(p,D)$ - $8 < Q^2 < 60$


F_2/A
Q^2_{Data} = 8.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 8.4 GeV^2
H1: p
Saturation:
bCGC: p
IPSAT: p
rcBK: p
Q^2_{Data} = 12 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 12.5 GeV^2
LT Shadowing:
FGS10: D
Q^2_{Data} = 18 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 18.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 27 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 27 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 35 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 39 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 60 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 57 GeV^2
x

$F_L(p,D)$ - $0.8 < Q^2 < 6$


F_L/A
Q^2_{Theory} = 0.84 GeV^2
Saturation:
bCGC: p
IPSAT: p
rcBK: p
Q^2_{Data} = 1.5 GeV^2
H1: p (Average)
Q^2_{Theory} = 1.25 GeV^2
LT Shadowing:
FGS10: D
Q^2_{Data} = 2.0 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 1.85 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 2.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 2.7 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 3.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 3.9 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 5.0 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 5.7 GeV^2
x

Input PDFs in FGS10 model



BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY

$F_L(p,D)$ - $8 < Q^2 < 60$


F_L/A
Q^2_{Data} = 8.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 8.4 GeV^2
H1: p (Average)
Saturation:
bCGC: p
IPSAT: p
rcBK: p
Q^2_{Data} = 12 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 12.5 GeV^2
LT Shadowing:
FGS10: D
Q^2_{Data} = 20 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 18.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 25 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 27 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 35 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 39 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 45 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 57 GeV^2
x

$F_2(A)/A$ - $0.8 < Q^2 < 6$


F_2/A
Q^2_{Data} = 0.85 GeV^2
H1: p
Q^2_{Theory} = 0.84 GeV^2
Saturation:
bCGC: Au
IPSAT: Au
rcBK (1): Pb
rcBK (2): Pb
Q^2_{Data} = 1.2 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 1.25 GeV^2
LT Shadowing:
FGS10: Pb
Q^2_{Data} = 2.0 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 1.85 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 2.7 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 2.7 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 3.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 3.9 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 6.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 5.7 GeV^2
x

$F_2(A)/A$ - $8 < Q^2 < 60$


F_2/A
Q^2_{Data} = 8.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 8.4 GeV^2
H1: p
Saturation:
bCGC: Au
IPSAT: Au
rcBK (1): Pb
rcBK (2): Pb
Q^2_{Data} = 12 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 12.5 GeV^2
LT Shadowing:
FGS10: Pb
Q^2_{Data} = 18 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 18.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 27 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 27 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 35 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 39 GeV^2
Graph
Q^2_{Data} = 60 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 57 GeV^2
x

$F_L(A)/A$ - $0.8 < Q^2 < 6$


F_L/A
$Q^2_{Theory} = 0.84$ GeV^2
Saturation:
bCGC: Au
IPSAT: Au
rcBK (1): Pb
rcBK (2): Pb
$Q^2_{Data} = 1.5$ GeV^2
H1: p (Average)
$Q^2_{Theory} = 1.25$ GeV^2
LT Shadowing:
FGS10: Pb
$Q^2_{Data} = 2.0$ GeV^2
$Q^2_{Theory} = 1.85$ GeV^2
$Q^2_{Data} = 2.5$ GeV^2
$Q^2_{Theory} = 2.7$ GeV^2
$Q^2_{Data} = 3.5$ GeV^2
$Q^2_{Theory} = 3.9$ GeV^2
$Q^2_{Data} = 5.0$ GeV^2
$Q^2_{Theory} = 5.7$ GeV^2
x

$F_L(A)/A$ - $8 < Q^2 < 60$


F_L/A
Q^2_{Data} = 8.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 8.4 GeV^2
H1: p (Average)
Saturation:
bCGC: Au
IPSAT: Au
rcBK (1): Pb
rcBK (2): Pb
Q^2_{Data} = 12 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 12.5 GeV^2
LT Shadowing:
FGS10: Pb
Q^2_{Data} = 20 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 18.5 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 25 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 27 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 35 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 39 GeV^2
Q^2_{Data} = 45 GeV^2
Q^2_{Theory} = 57 GeV^2
x

$F_2(A)/AF_2(p)$ - $0.8 < Q^2 < 6$



$F_2(A)/AF_2(p)$ - $8 < Q^2 < 60$



$F_L(A)/AF_L(p)$ - $0.8 < Q^2 < 6$



$F_L(A)/AF_L(p)$ - $8 < Q^2 < 60$



BRO NATIONAL LABORATORY

$F_L(A)/AF_L(p)$: $F_2(A)/AF_2(p)$ - $0.8 < Q^2 < 6$



$F_L(A)/AF_L(p)$: $F_2(A)/AF_2(p)$ - $8 < Q^2 < 60$



Some Questions, Points, Thoughts

- The bCGC and IPSat models are different for $F_2(p)$ and rcBK and bCGC are on top of each other
  - ➡ bCGC and rcBK are based on BK - IPSat on eikonalised DGLAP…. Was the bCGC re-fit to the combined H1&ZEUS data?
- There are 10% differences between IPSat and the F2(p) HERA data
  - ➡ If IPSat was re-fit (not a small effort, who would do it?), would this have any significant affect on the F_L data?
- What do we make of the difference in evolutions of $F_2(A)/AF_2(p)$ and $F_2(A)/AF2(p)$ in the saturation models?
  - ➡ Must be dependent on what order the saturation is implemented in the model
- The double ratios are hard to interpret, can we use this though to constrain the normalisations in the rcBK model?
- Vadim is currently updating his code to use CTEQ6/10 instead of CTEQ5
  - ➡ How will this affect the plots?
  - ➡ Will the ratios be unchanged (or at least minor changes)?
- Finally, we want some clean plots for the white paper, what do we want to show?