

Electron-lon Collider NNPSS Lectures 2017 (Day1) Rik Yoshida, Jefferson

NNPSS 2017





PROLOGUE:

Nuclear Science Long-Range Planning



October 2015 ->Latest Report Finalized (Including cost review of EIC)

USDOE (NP) is acting based on this planning National Academy Science Review being commissioned (Larger science case must be endorsed)

- Every 5-7 years the US Nuclear Science community produces a Long-Range Planning (LRP) Document
- The final document includes a *small* set of recommendations for the field of Nuclear Science for the next decade



Recommendations - shorthand

- 1. The progress achieved under the guidance of the 2007 Long Range Plan has reinforced U.S. world leadership in nuclear science. The highest priority in this 2015 Plan is to capitalize on the investments made.
 - 12 GeV unfold quark & gluon structure of hadrons and nuclei
 - FRIB understanding of nuclei and their role in the cosmos
 - Fundamental Symmetries Initiative physics beyond the SM
 - **RHIC** properties and phases of quark and gluon matter

The ordering of these four bullets follows the priority ordering of the 2007 plan

- 2. We recommend the timely development and deployment of a U.S.-led tonscale neutrinoless double beta decay experiment.
- 3. We recommend a high-energy high-luminosity polarized Electron lon Collider as the highest priority for new facility construction following the completion of FRIB.
- 4. We recommend increasing investment in small and mid-scale projects and initiatives that enable forefront research at universities and laboratories.

US EIC Parameters and Realization Plans

- US EIC Machine design aims from the <u>EIC</u> <u>Whitepaper</u>
 - Highly polarized (~70%) electron and nucleon beams.
 - Ion beams from deuterons to the heaviest nuclei (uranium or lead).
 - Variable center of mass energies from ~20 ~ 100 GeV, upgradable to ~140 GeV.
 - High luminosity: ~10 ³³⁻³⁴ cm⁻² s⁻¹
 - Possibility of having more than one interaction region.
- Two proposed realization plans
 - Jefferson Lab: building on the existing 12 GeV CEBAF. <u>JLEIC Design</u>.
 - BNL: building on the existing RHIC. <u>eRHIC</u> <u>Design</u>.
 - Recent review of acc. R&D
- Similar performances, cost according to LRP assessment.
- US EIC will likely be down-selected from one of these proposals.





EIC Realization Imagined

With a formal NSAC/LRP recommendation, what can we speculate about any EIC timeline?

• A National Academy of Sciences study has been initiated and the committee is now formed. Charge: "assess the scientific justification for a U.S. domestic electron ion collider facility, " (Wider Science Community) Likely to take until end 2017.

• DOE project "CD0" (Establish Mission Need) will be after the NAS study: i.e end 2017, early 2018.

- EIC construction has to start **after FRIB completion**, with FRIB construction anticipated to start ramping down near or in FY20.
- → <u>Most optimistic</u> scenario would have EIC construction start (CD3) in FY20, perhaps more realistic FY22-23 timeframe
- → Best guess for EIC completion assuming formal NSAC/LRP recommendation would be 2025-2030 timeframe

Electron Ion Collider (EIC)

- Electron Ion Collider (EIC)
 - It is a Deep Inelastic Scattering Collider
 - Point-like probe interacts with p/A
 - So why is EIC the highest priority

for new construction for

US Nuclear Physics?

[Won't get to answers until Day 2..]



PLAN FOR THE LECTURES

Day 1:

- Prologue
- Some History
- Deep Inelastic Scattering and Parton Distributions (I)

Day 2:

- DIS and PDF (II)
- Beyond parton distributions.

Day 3:

- EIC accelerator and detector realizations
- Other facilities and EIC physics topics.
- EIC and physics topic at other facilities.
- EIC and the future of Nuclear Physics.
- Epilogue

A lot of stolen material from Enrico Tassi, Allen Caldwell, Mark Thomson

SOME HISTORY

Ernest Rutherford (1911): Discovery of the Nucleus

- Beginning of learning about structure of matter through scattering.
- Geiger and Marsden observed that a particles were sometimes scattered through very large angles.
- Rutherford interpreted these results as due to the Coulomb scattering of a particles with the point like heavy "center" with charge Z..

$$\sigma(\theta) = \frac{z^2 Z^2 e^4}{16E^2} \frac{1}{\sin^4 \frac{1}{2}\theta}$$

July 2017





α-Au Scattering Experiment





Ernest Rutherford (1917): Discovery of the Proton

- van den Broek/Moseley (1913) the place of each element in the periodic table is equal to its nuclear charge.
- An old idea: all atoms are made up of hydrogen atoms (William Prout: 1815)
- Rutherford shows that "hydrogen atoms" can be produced from a particles (1917). Later named protons (1920).
- Reconciling masses of nuclei vs. charge remains a mystery.—Are electrons inside nuclei? (No)





Prout



Cloud Chamber picture (much later than Rutherford)

$$^{14}N + \alpha \rightarrow ^{17}O + p$$

James Chadwick (1930): Discovery of the Neutron

- Chadwick deduces the existence of neutrons from alpha scattering.
- From kinematics deduced the mass of the neutron.
- 1930: Three elementary particles. The electron, the proton and the neutron. The proton and the neutron make up the nucleus.



 α + ⁹Be \rightarrow ¹²C + n



Determined mass

938 ± 1.8 MeV compare to present 939.57 MeV



Beginnings of Nuclear Structure Theory

- How do the properties of the nuclei emerge from the protons and neutrons that make them up?
- Liquid Drop model (Weizsacker 1935)
- Nuclear Shell model (Wigner, Mayer, Jensen 1949)



(semi-classical fluid made of p and n)



Highly successful description of nuclei

Nuclear Structure Theory





- Building up the understanding of nuclei through models of effective NN interactions.
- Modeling two and three body interactions to approximate many-body interactions.
- Advent of QCD in the 60's.
- Connection to cosmology:
 - Neutron Stars
 - Genesis of Elements
- Latest facility in US: Facility for Rare Isotope Beams (FRIB) in construction at Michigan State University. (One of the last high priority construction items before EIC)

More on this topic from other lectures: Our story goes a bit different way

Elastic ep Scattering: Rosenbluth

- Quantum Mechanics develops rapidly after 1924
- QED becomes fully mature by late 1940's
- 1950, Rosenbluth writes down the general crosssection for *elastic* electron-proton scattering.

PHYSICAL REVIEW

VOLUME 79, NUMBER 4

AUGUST 15, 1950

High Energy Elastic Scattering of Electrons on Protons

M. N. ROSENBLUTH Stanford University, Stanford, California (Received March 28, 1950)

FIG. 1. Diagram for the elastic scattering of a physical proton and a physical electron. (The letter "q" with the bar through it in this figure is the same as the German letter, q, used in the text.)



5-

$$\sigma_{p}(\theta) = \sigma_{NS} \left\{ 1 + \frac{q^{2}}{4M^{2}} \left[2(1+\mu)^{2} \tan^{2}\frac{1}{2}\theta + \mu^{2} \right] \right\}$$
where

$$\sigma_{NS} = \frac{e^{4}}{4E^{2}} \frac{\cos^{2}\frac{1}{2}\theta}{\sin^{4}\frac{1}{2}\theta} \frac{1}{1+(2E/M)\sin^{2}\frac{1}{2}\theta}$$
and

$$q = \frac{2}{\lambda} \frac{\sin^{\frac{1}{2}}\theta}{\left[1+(2E/M)\sin^{2}\frac{1}{2}\theta\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$
NNPS 2017

$$16$$

eP Elastic Cross-Section



Scattering of a relativistic electron from a spin ½ point-like "proton"



Taking the extended size of the proton into account

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma}{\mathrm{d}\Omega} = \frac{\alpha^2}{4E_1^2 \sin^4 \theta/2} \frac{E_3}{E_1} \left(\frac{G_E^2 + \tau G_M^2}{(1+\tau)} \cos^2 \frac{\theta}{2} + 2\tau G_M^2 \sin^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \qquad \tau = -\frac{q^2}{4M^2} > 0$$

Note Nfor fixed θ , E₃ (scattered e energy) fixed ¹⁷

First evidence of elastic electron-Nucleus scattering



R. Hofstadter: ep and eA elastic scattering (1953->)





R. Hofstadter: e-d elastic scattering



First determinations of the proton's form factors

325

"As we have seen, the proton and neutron, which were once thought to be elementary particles are now seen to be highly complex bodies. It is almost certain that physicists will subsequentely investigate the constituent parts of the proton and neutron - the mesons of one sort or another. What will happen from that point on ? One can only guess at future problems and future progress, but my personal convinction is that the search for ever-smaller and ever-more-fundamental particles will go on as Man retain the curiosity he has always demonstrated"

from the Nobel lecture, 1961

Meanwhile: Particle Zoo (1950-60's)





CERN Conference (1962)

22

SU(3) and Discovery of the $\Omega^{\scriptscriptstyle -}$

1961: SU(3) symmetry (Gell-Man, Ne'eman)

Predicts the existence, mass and decay products of the Omega particle.







Brookhaven AGS: 33 GeV protons in 1960 (Now serves as injector for RHIC)

1964: Omega-minus Baryon discovered at Brookhaven National Laboratory July 2017

The Quark Model

Gell-Mann and Zweig (1964)

SU(3) symmetry can be expressed as hadrons being constituted out of quarks.

Flavor	B	J	Ι	I3	S	Q
u	1/3	1⁄2	1/2	+1/2	0	2/3
d	1/3	1⁄2	1⁄2	-1/2	0	-1/3
S	1/3	1/2	0	0	-1	-1/3





Idea of color leads to QCD (1970's)

NNPSS 2017



SLAC and "Project M"

On april 10, 1956, Stanford staff met in Prof. W. Panofsky's home to discuss Hofstadter's suggestion to build a linear accelerator that was at least 10 times as powerful as the Mark III. This idea was called "The M(onster)-project" because the accelerator would need to be 2 miles long!!

- 1957 A detailed proposal was presented
- 1959 Eisenhower said yes
- 1961 The Congress approved the project (\$114 Million dollars)

One year later construction started





While excavating for SLAC the workers discovered a nearly complete skeleton of a 10-foot mammal, *Paleoparadoxia*, which roamed earth 14 millions years ago... 0 0



July 2017

"Project M" becomes the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center





The SLAC-MIT Experiment (1969)

Under the leadership of Taylor, Friedman, Kendall









SLAC-MIT results: ep inelastic collisions





 $\sigma/\sigma_{\text{point-like}}$ = Independent of q²

Very weak dependence on W

Deep Inelastic Scattering



29

Feynman's Parton Model (1969)

- What if proton (or any other hadron) was made up of point-like constituents—call them partons.
- If the proton is moving very fast, then the partons are frozen transversely because of time-dilation.
- Each parton, does carry a part of the longitudinal momentum of the proton.
- If two such protons (or hadrons) collide then, it can be thought of as a collision between two such partons which are not related to the behavior of other partons.
- The fact that partons must be interacting each other in the proton matters only "after" the collision happens.





Bjorken Scaling (1969)

In the parton model:

x = fraction of longitudinal momentum of the proton carried by the parton

Point-like parton p has some distribution in x: i.e. p(x)

Then the structure function $F_2(x, Q^2)$ is simply

$$F_2(x, Q^2) = x \sum_p e_p p(x) = F_2(x)$$

i.e. No dependence on Q^2

In other words, if F_2 "scales", protons are consistent with being made up of partons.





Quantum Chromodynamics (1970's)



Photons couple to electric charge.



Fritzsch, Leutweyler and Gell-Mann (1973)

For QCD: electrons \rightarrow quarks photons \rightarrow gluons electric charge \rightarrow color

gluons (unlike photons) carry charge and thus couple to gluons.

Is this a viable theory? Interactions at short distances are infinitely strong??

32

Asymptotic Freedom and Confinement

Gross, Politzer and Wilcek (1973)

Nobel Prize 2004





In high-energy interactions, quarks are weakly bound.

- QCD is a viable theory of quark interactions.
- partons = quarks is a viable hypothesis.

Also implies quark-gluon plasma



Quarks are Partons!

1990 Nobel Prize

FRIEDMAN, KENDALL AND TAYLOR WIN NOBEL PRIZE FOR FIRST QUARK EVIDENCE

The 1990 Nobel Prize in Physics has been awarded to herome Friedman and Henry Kendall of MIT and Richand Taylor of SLAC "for their pioneer ing investigations concerning deep inclusive scattering of electrons on protons and brend neutrons, which have been of encertial importance for the development of the quark model in particle physics." The prize of \$720000, which the three recipients shared equally, was awarded in Stockholm on 10 December

Friedman, Kendall and Taylor ware honored for a series of experiments lives 1967 and 1973 that used the then new two mile electron linear accelerator at Stanford to study deep inclustic scattering of electrons from pertons and neutroins. The SLAC experiments were somewhat analogoes to the experiment by Ernest Ratherland that gave evidence list a hard core within the atom: Fast as Ratherford's advantation of harpy numbers of alpha particles being scatterred at large angles led how to proteilate a nucleus within the store. the SLAC finding of unexpectedly large numbers of electrons being acattered at large angles provided clear evidence for possibile constituents within andross. These constituents are new understood to be quarks.

Quarks had been predicted in 1964 by Marray Cell Mann and independeathy by George Zweig at Callech. Until the SLAC-MET experiments no one had produced convincing dynamical evidence from experiment for the uarks disco or newtron. Quar kee said at the Nobel commony when

(on-behall of the Nobel committee for experimental areas. Around the physics) she presented the winners to the king of Sweden. "the quark hy-pethesis was not alone. There was, for example, a model called 'anchear donoctacy' where no-particle had the right to call itself elementary. All particles were equally fundamental

D 1911 American Indiate of Physics



The 1990 Nobel laureates join hands is a 51.42 for following the announcement of the award. From left: Rahard Taylor, Henry Keishill and Jorome Friedman.

and consisted of each other."

SLAC and its detectors

and "was a circular machine, with all In 1952 construction began on the that that limitation means," Kendall large Standord linac, which had a recalls. But at Stanford there was to proposed energy of 10-20 GeV, evenhe a 29-GeV machine going on line tually it reached 50 GeV over a series with an "abuilately lenseious beam." of many steps. Two years later SLAC high current density and external director Wolfgang Panelsky enlisted beam, and immediate availability for the help of several young physicists experimental use. A group from Calhe had worked with when he was tech led by Barry Barreb, Jerome Pote existence of quarks inside the proton director of the Stanford High-Energy and Charles Peck joined the collaborative but concentrated in vere

linked the accelerator proper with the name time the laboratory cotablished a number of experimental teams, one of which was headed by Taylor.

Soon he was joined by Friedman. and Kendall, who were by then on the MIT faculty. They had been doing electron scattering experiments at SLAC, MIT and Caltech decided to build two spectrometers. Stanford experimenters included Panelsky Taylor and their collaborators, who were interested in election scattering. Burton Richter and his collaborators. who were interested in photoproduc-tion; and David Ritson, who eventual By built a third spectrometer at 2.8

and in the

Pertics Today Jesually 1941 17

the 5-GeV Cambridge Electron Accel-

crator, which had limited capacity





NNPSS 2017

Deep Inelastic Scattering II

ep collision



proton in " ∞ " momentum frame



$$\frac{Q^2}{2M_p v} \quad \boxed{0 \le x \le 1}$$

x = fractional longitudinal momentum carried by the struck parton

√s = ep cms energy

Q²=-q²= 4-momentum transfer squared (or virtuality of the "photon")



Virtuality (4-momentum transfer) Q gives the distance scale r at which the proton is probed.

r≈ħc/Q = 0.2fm/Q[GeV] e.g. HERA ep collider DIS: r_{min}≈ 1/1000 proton dia.
QCD and the Parton Picture





But...



Fixed-target DIS experiments (example: CCFR)



Fixed targets results: An overview (PDG)

F₂: $1 < Q^2 < 200 \text{ GeV}^2$ 1< Q² < 200 GeV² F₃: 3.5 2 $F_2(x,Q^2)+\,c(x)$ **↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ×**=0.140 (i_{*}=10) x=0.0009 Deuteron x=0.00125 x=0.110 BCDMS x=0.180 x=0.00175 E665 x=0.090 x=0.0025 x=0.225 NMC 3 x=0.004 x=0.005 SLAC x=0.070 x=0.275 1.25 x=0.007 x=0.050 x=0.350 1 $c(x)=0.1i_{x}$ x=0.0350 2.5 x=0.008 x=0.009 0.75 x=0.450 x=0.0250 x=0.0125 x=0.0175 x=0.0175 x=0.025 0.5 x=0.550 x=0.035 2 x=0.05 x=0.0125 0.25 x=0.650 x=0.07 c) $(i_x = 1)$ x=0.0075 x=0.09 000 0 0 0000000000000 x=0.750 0 x = 0.1010² 1.5 10 1 x = 0.111 Q^2 (GeV²) x=0.14 x=0.18 0 00 00 °0.75 1 x=0.225 . . . $Q^2 = 2.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ $Q^2 = 4.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ x=0.275 с Ц 0.5 1 x=0.35 0.25 °₀₀ x=0.45 1 8 0 1 x=0.50 0.75 Q²⊨12 GeV² $Q^2 = 15 \text{ GeV}^2$ x=0.55 0.5 0.5 x=0.65 0.25 x=0.75 0 0 $(i_x=1) x=0.85$ 0000000000000 1 0 10 -1 $Q^2 = 25 \text{ GeV}^2$ $Q^2 = 35 \text{ GeV}^2$ 10² 0.75 1 10 0.5 $Q^2 (GeV^2)$ 0.25 0 10 -2 10 -4 1 10 4 10 -2 July 2017 **NNPSS 2017**

40

 F_1

Nucleon

• CCFR

(i_x=8)

(i.=

102

 Q^2 (GeV²)

10

 $Q^2 = 7.5 \text{ GeV}^2$

 $Q^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$

BCDMS NMC SLAC H1 (model dep. anal.)

1+

х

 $c(x)=0.12(i_x-1)$

HERA Electron-Proton Collider (1992-2007)



•920 GeV protons (820 before1998)
•27.5 GeV e[±]
•300/318 GeV c.o.m. energy
•220 bunches, 96ns. crossing time
•90 mA protons,40 mA positrons
•Instantaneous luminosity: 1.8x10³¹cm²s⁻¹



2 collider experiments → ZEUS and H1

2 fixed target experiments → HERMES and HERA-b

HERA Data taking 1991-2007

Mission: Explore QCD at highest scale (Q²). Search for new phenomena.



In the early 90's, HERA was about to push the proton structure function measurements by 2 orders of magnitude in x and Q².

Clearly, the first measurements would be in relatively low Q² and would extend to low x.

What were the expectations? What would be the proton structure at low x?



Why such different predictions?

Two ways to think about the problem



Quarks are asymptotically free!

Proton is a beam of partons whose behavior can be understood using perturbative QCD!

OR

Hadronic



Protons are hadrons—whose constituents are confined. The behavior of hadrons is not understood from the first principles of QCD: however we have relatively good phenomenology to describe them.

pQCD view of F₂



Before HERA: hadronic view of the proton and F₂





W: γ*P cms energy

- F_2 at low x is simply related to the total γ^*P cross-section.
- $x \approx Q^2/W^2$ so as x falls W rises
- small x limit of DIS is a large energy limit of the γ*p crosssection.
- at HERA W goes up to ~300 GeV.
- Large energy limit of total cross-sections is where the Pomeron trajectory dominates in Regge phenomenology: slow rise of the cross-section.

Hadronic view of F₂

- We do not understand how hadrons are formed and behave from first principles.
- We do, however, have a phenomenology that describes most of the properties of hadron-hadron collisions. (Regge) This is somehow the result of QCD in the strong coupling limit.
- Virtual-photon proton cross section (or F₂ at low x) is yet another total cross-section which should be dominated by the properties of the proton as a hadron → governed by the same
 Pomeron trajectory as other hadronic cross-sections: slow power rise with W (or 1/x).



Donnachie and Landshoff (1993)

against x. If the HERA experiments find results for νW_2 significantly larger at small x than our extrapolations, we claim that this will be a clear signal that they have discovered new physics. Of course, the hope is that they will response the Lipatov pomeron. In relation

Measurements at HERA



NNPSS 2017

Triumph of perturbative QCD



A part of Wilczek's comments upon the Nobel Prize announcement

proposed specific experimental tests of our ideas. In the fourth paper some technical objections to the theory were cleared up, and in the fifth and sixth papers further experimental consequences, regarding the pointwise evolution of structure functions, were derived. The most dramatic of these, that protons viewed at ever higher resolution would appear more and more field energy (soft glue), was prody advantly verified at HERA twenty years later.

Using pQCD to understand protons: so far

- Protons at high momentum can be treated as a beam of partons— now identified as free quarks and gluons: (Asymptotic freedom!)
- You can measure DIS (and other) cross-sections -> extract pdfs -> predict cross-sections for another process. (Factorization!)

Jet cross-sections at the LHC predicted and measured





This is great if you are interested in studying the hard interaction (LHC physics)

What about the proton?



NNPSS 2017

DEEP INELASTIC SCATTERING AND PARTON DISTRIBUTIONS (I)

Partons in the proton

Feynman's parton model: the nucleon is made up of pointlike constituents (later identified with quarks and gluons) which behave incoherently.

The probability f(x) for the parton f to carry the fraction x of the proton momentum is an intrinsic property of the nucleon and is process independent.

-Protons are just a "beam of partons" (incoherent)
-The f(x)s, the "beam parameters", could be measured in some other process. (process independent)



Quarks and Gluons as partons

u(x): up quark distribution
ū(x): up anti-quark distribution
etc.

Momentum has to add up to 1 ("momentum sum rule")

 $\int x[u(x) + \bar{u}(x) + d(x) + \bar{d}(x) + s(x) + \bar{s}(x) +] dx = 1$

Quantum numbers of the nucleon has to be right So for a proton: ∫[u(x)-ū(x)]dx=2 ∫[d(x)-d(x)]dx=1

```
\int [s(x)-\overline{s}(x)+....]dx=0
```

NNPSS 2017

DIS kinematics





x = fractional longitudinal momentum carried by the struck parton

 \sqrt{s} = ep cms energy

Q²=-q²= 4-momentum transfer squared (or virtuality of the "photon")

DIS kinematics



Everything we need can be reconstructed from the measurement of E'_{e} and Θ_{e} . (in principle)

Deep Inelastic Scattering experiments



Fixed target DIS at SLAC, FNAL and CERN

e⁻p Neutral Current (NC) cross-section:



$$\frac{d^{2}\sigma}{dxdQ^{2}} = \frac{2\pi\alpha^{2}}{xQ^{4}} Y_{+}F_{2}(x,Q^{2})$$
quark charge
$$F_{2} = x\sum(q + \overline{q}) e_{q}^{2} + Z$$
-exchange

^{July} ²quark and anti-quark distributions

IF, proton was made of 3 quarks each with 1/3 of proton's momentum:



The partons are point-like and incoherent then Q² shouldn't matter. \rightarrow Bjorken scaling: F₂ has no Q² dependence. Let's look at some data \rightarrow

Proton Structure Function F₂



So what does this mean..?

QCD, of course: q q q -000000000 q -000000009 toooooo

quarks radiate gluons

gluons can produce qq pairs

gluons can radiate gluons!



Virtuality (4-momentum transfer) Q gives the distance scale r at which the proton is probed. r≈ hc/Q = 0.2fm/Q[GeV]





So what do we expect F_2 as a function of x at a fixed Q^2 to look like?



Х

1/3

NNPSS 2017

Proton Structure Function F₂

How this change with Q² happens quantitatively described by the:

Dokshitzer-Gribov-Lipatov-Altarelli-Parisi (DGLAP) equations



DGLAP equations are easy to "understand" intuitively

First we have the four "splitting functions"



P_{ab}(z) : the probability that parton a will radiate a parton b with the fraction z of the original momentum carried by a.



Change of quark distribution q with Q² is given by the probability that q and g radiate q. Same for gluons:

$$\frac{dg(x,Q^2)}{d \ln Q^2} = \alpha_s \left[\sum q_f \otimes P_{qg} + g \otimes P_{gg} \right]$$

DGLAP fit (or QCD fit) extracts the parton distributions from measurements.

Here's a 1 min description:

Step 1: parametrise the parton momentum desity f(x) at some Q². e.g. $f(x)=p_1x^{p_2}(1-x)^{p_3}(1+p_4\sqrt{x+p_5}x)$

u_v(x) u-valence d_v(x) d-valence } "The orginal three quarks" g(x) gluon S(x) sum of all "sea" (i.e. non valence) quarks

Step 2: find the parameters by fitting to DIS (and other) data using DGLAP equations to evolve f(x) in Q².

At x<<1/3, quarks and (antiquarks) are all "sea". Since F2 = $e_q^2 \sum x(q + \overline{q})$, xS is very much like F₂

Sea PDF

xS $Q^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ 20 10 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0.5 0.25 Fractional 0 uncertainty -0.25 -0.5 10 ⁻¹ 10⁻³ 10⁻² 10 Х

— ZEUS NLO QCD fit



tot. error (α_s free) tot. error (α_s fixed) uncorr. error (α_s fixed) Gluons, on the other hand, are determined from the scaling violations $dF_2/dlnQ^2$ via the DGLAP equations.

Gluon PDF



So far:

$F_2 \sim \sum(q+\overline{q}) \approx S$ (sea quarks) measured directly in NC DIS

Scaling violations

 $dF_2/dlnQ^2 \sim \alpha_s \cdot g$ Scaling violations gives gluons (times α_s). DGLAP equations.

What about valence quarks?

 $\sum(q-q) = u_v + d_v$ can we determine them separately?

Can we decouple α_s and g?

End of Day 1

- Tomorrow we'll carry on with DIS and PDF.
- Ask what is beyond PDF.. and begin to answer the question "why EIC".