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• Experiment Setup

• Analysis and Preliminary Results
Important kinematics variables:

- \( \nu = E - E' \)
- \( Q^2 \): Momentum transfer squared
- \( \mathcal{W} \): Invariant mass of residual hadronic system
- \( x = \frac{Q^2}{2M\nu} \): Bjorken variable: fraction momentum of struck quark
Electron Scattering

• Inclusive unpolarized cross section:

\[
\frac{d^2 \sigma}{d\Omega dE'} = \sigma_{\text{Mott}} \left[ \frac{1}{\nu} F_2(x, Q^2) + \frac{2}{M} F_1(x, Q^2) \tan^2 \frac{\theta}{2} \right]
\]

Structure Function which indicates the parton distribution
If the beam and target are polarized, the asymmetric part of the lepton and hadron tensor will not vanish, which leads to 2 additional structure functions $g_1$ and $g_2$.

\[
\frac{d^2\sigma}{d\Omega dE'} = \sigma_{\text{Mott}} \left[ \frac{1}{\nu} F_2(x, Q^2) + \frac{2}{M} F_1(x, Q^2) \tan^2 \frac{\theta}{2} + \gamma g_1(x, Q^2) + \delta g_2(x, Q^2) \right]
\]

2 addition Structure Function which related to the polarized parton distribution.
Spin Structure Function

- At Bjorken limit, $g_1$ related to the polarized parton distribution functions

\[ g_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i e_i^2 \Delta q_i(x) \quad \Delta q_i(x) = q_i^\uparrow(x) - q_i^\downarrow(x) \]

- $g_2$ is zero in the naive parton model: non-zero value carries information of quark-gluon interaction

- Concept of "twist":
  - Leading twist: related to amplitude for scattering off asymptotically free quarks
  - Higher twists: quark-gluon interaction and the quark mass effects
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Spin Structure Function

• \( g_{2}^{WW} \) is the leading twist part of the \( g_{2} \):

\[
g_{2}(x, Q^{2}) = g_{2}^{WW}(x, Q^{2}) + \bar{g}_{2}(x, Q^{2})
\]

• which can be calculated from \( g_{1} \) with the Wandzura-Wilczek relation

\[
g_{2}^{WW} = -g_{1}(x, Q^{2}) + \int_{x}^{1} \frac{dy}{y} g_{1}(y, Q^{2})
\]

• Higher twist components can be expressed as:

\[
\bar{g}_{2}(x, Q^{2}) = - \int_{x}^{1} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \left[ \frac{m_{q}}{M} h_{T}(y, Q^{2}) + \zeta(y, Q^{2}) \right] \frac{dy}{y}
\]

quark transverse momentum contribution

\[\text{twist-3 part which arises from quark-gluon interactions}\]

• Will get information about higher twist effect when measuring \( g_{2} \)
How to get $g_2$

$$\Delta \sigma_{\parallel} = \frac{d^2 \sigma^{\uparrow \uparrow}}{d\Omega dE'} - \frac{d^2 \sigma^{\downarrow \uparrow}}{d\Omega dE'}$$

$$= \frac{4\alpha^2 E'}{M \nu Q^2 E} \left[ (E + E' \cos \theta) g_1 - 2M x g_2 \right]$$

$\Delta \sigma_{\perp} = \frac{d^2 \sigma^{\uparrow \Rightarrow}}{d\Omega dE'} - \frac{d^2 \sigma^{\downarrow \Rightarrow}}{d\Omega dE'}$

$$= \frac{4\alpha^2 E'^2}{M \nu Q^2 E} \sin \theta \left[ g_1 + \frac{2E}{\nu} g_2 \right]$$

JLab Hall B experiment EG4 measured this quantity.

$g_2^p$ experiment will measure this, combing the EG4 data to get $g_2^p$ at low $Q^2$. 
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Physics Motivation

- Measure the proton structure function $g_2$ in the low $Q^2$ region ($0.02-0.2\text{GeV}^2$) for the first time
  - Extract the generalized longitudinal-transverse spin polarizability $\delta_{LT}$ as a test of Chiral Perturbation Theory ($\chi$PT) calculations
  - Test the Burkhardt-Cottingham (BC) sum rule
  - Crucial inputs for Hydrogen hyperfine splitting calculation
Existing Data

- SLAC experiment E143, E155, E155x and JLab experiment RSS and SANE have measured proton $g_2$ on a wide $Q^2$ range.
- However lack low $Q^2$ data.
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Generalized Longitudinal-Transverse Polarizability

- From the dispersion relation of the doubly-virtual Compton scattering amplitude, one could derive generalized spin polarizability

\[ \gamma_0(Q^2) = \frac{16\alpha M^2}{Q^6} \int_0^{x_0} x^2 \left[ g_1 - \frac{4M^2}{Q^2} x^2 g_2 \right] dx \]

\[ \delta_{LT}(Q^2) = \frac{16\alpha M^2}{Q^6} \int_0^{x_0} x^2 \left[ g_1 + g_2 \right] dx \]

- Can be expressed as structure functions
- Can be calculated via Chiral Perturbation Theory

Neutron data shows large deviation between data and \( \chi \)PT prediction

Generalized Longitudinal-Transverse Polarizability

• At low $Q^2$, the generalized polarizabilities have been evaluated with NLO $\chi$PT calculations:
  
  

• One issue in the calculation is how to properly include the nucleon resonance contributions, especially the $\Delta$ resonance
  
  • $\gamma_0$ is sensitive to resonances
  
  • $\delta_{LT}$ is insensitive to the $\Delta$ resonance
  
  • $\delta_{LT}$ should be more suitable than $\gamma_0$ to serve as a testing ground for the chiral dynamics of QCD
Generalized Longitudinal-Transverse Polarizability

- Improved calculation result with Relativistic Baryon $\chi$PT:

The neutron data point are from E94-010

- Red solid line: LO
- Blue band: NLO
- Black dashed line: MAID model
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Generalized Longitudinal-Transverse Polarizability

- Improved calculation result with Relativistic Baryon $\chi$PT:

Proton

$\delta_{LT} \left( 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^4 \right)$

Neutron

$Q^2 \text{ (GeV}^2\text{)}$

- It was claimed that the $\delta_{LT}$ puzzle is solved with this new calculation, however it should be test with proton data

BC Sum Rule

- **BC Sum Rule:**
  \[ \int_0^1 g_2(x, Q^2) \, dx = 0 \]

- Violation suggested for proton at large \( Q^2 \)
- But found satisfied for the neutron
- Mostly unmeasured for proton
- To experiment test BC sum rule, one need to combine measured \( g_2 \) data with some low \( x \) model and elastic contribution

---

**Proton**

- Mostly unmeasured

**Neutron**

- **SLAC E155x**
- **Hall C RSS**
- **Hall A E94-010**
- **Hall A E97-110 (preliminary)**
- **Hall A E01-012 (preliminary)**
Proton Radius Puzzle

- The finite size of the nucleus plays a small but significant role in atomic energy levels
- Simplest: proton
- 2 ways to measure:
  - energy splitting of the $2S_{1/2}-2P_{1/2}$ level (Lamb shift)
  - scattering experiment
- The result do not match when using muonic hydrogen
  - $<R_p> = 0.84184 \pm 0.00067 \text{fm}$ by Lamb shift in muonic hydrogen
  - $<R_p> = 0.87680 \pm 0.0069 \text{fm}$ CODATA world average

Hydrogen Hyperfine Structure

- Hydrogen hyperfine splitting in the ground state has been measured to a relative high accuracy of $10^{-15}$

\[ \Delta E = 1420.4057517667(9) \text{MHz} = (1 + \delta) E_F \]
\[ \delta = (\delta_{\text{QED}} + \delta_R + \delta_{\text{small}}) + \Delta S \]

- $\Delta S$ is the proton structure correction and has the largest uncertainty

\[ \Delta S = \Delta Z + \Delta_{\text{pol}} \]
- $\Delta Z$ can be determined from elastic scattering, which is $-41.0 \pm 0.5 \times 10^{-6}$
- $\Delta_{\text{pol}}$ involves contributions of the inelastic part (excited state), and can be extracted to 2 terms corresponding to 2 different spin-dependent structure function of proton
Hydrogen Hyperfine Structure

\[ \Delta_{\text{pol}} = \frac{\alpha m_e}{\pi g_p m_p} (\Delta_1 + \Delta_2) \]

Integrand of \( \Delta_2 \)

\[ \Delta_2 = -24m_p^2 \int_0^\infty \frac{dQ^2}{Q^4} B_2(Q^2) \]

\[ B_2(Q^2) = \int_0^{x_{\text{th}}} dx \beta_2(\tau) g_2(x, Q^2) \]

\[ \beta_2(\tau) = 1 + 2\tau - 2\sqrt{\tau(\tau + 1)} \]

- \( B_2 \) is dominated by low \( Q^2 \) part
- \( g_2^p \) is unknown in this region, so there may be huge error when calculating \( \Delta_2 \)
- This experiment will provide a constraint
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g2p experiment ran in Jefferson Lab Hall A from Feb 29th to May 18th, 2012
Experiment Setup

- Major new installed instruments in Hall A
  - Polarized NH$_3$ target
  - Low current beam diagnostics
  - Septa magnets
Polarized Target

- Polarized NH$_3$ Target
  - 2.5T/5.0T field generated by a pair of Helmholtz coils for polarizing solid NH$_3$ target material
  - Outgoing beam will be tilted by the large target field
Kinematics Coverage

\[ M_p < W < 2 \text{ GeV} \]
\[ 0.02 < Q^2 < 0.2 \text{ GeV}^2 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beam Energy (GeV)</th>
<th>Target Field (T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.352</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

\[ A_{\text{phy}} = \frac{A_{\text{raw}}}{DP_b P_t} \]

Dilution factor (finished)

Beam and target polarization (finished)

\[ A_{\text{raw}} = \frac{N^+}{Q^+} - \frac{N^-}{Q^-} \]

Charge and yield in different beam helicity state (finished)

\[ \sigma_0^{\text{phy}} = \sigma_0^{\text{raw}} \times D \]

Total Charge (finished)

\[ \sigma_0^{\text{raw}} = \frac{N}{N_{\text{in}} \rho \epsilon_{\text{det}}} \times \frac{1}{A} \]

Target Density

Detector Efficiency (finished)

Acceptance (on-going)

Subjects as input:

- Beam position
- Spectrometer optics
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Optics Study

- HRS has a series of magnets
  - 3 quadrupoles to focus and 1 dipole to disperse on momentums
  - Optics study will provide a matrix to transform VDC readouts to kinematics variables which represents the effects of these magnets

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\delta \\
\theta \\
y \\
\phi \\
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\langle \delta | x \rangle \\
\langle \delta | \theta \rangle \\
\langle \theta | x \rangle \\
\langle \theta | \theta \rangle \\
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
x \\
\theta \\
y \\
\phi \\
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Jixie Zhang, UVA

SPIN2016
Optics Study

- Optics study for g2p: the most important part is how to treat the transverse target field

- Idea: separate reconstruction process to 2 parts:
  - Use the normal optics matrix to reconstruct from the VDC to sieve slit
  - Use the field map to do ray tracing of the scattered electrons from sieve slit to target
Initial scattering angle

• Run simulation to decide the effective theta and phi
• Use the BPM readout to set the beam position
• Beam energy 1.706 GeV, target field 2.5T

Effective angle to do the fitting
Optics Calibration: Angle

LHRS

Before Calibration

After Calibration

Resolution: 1.6mrad (RMS)
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Optics Study

• The performance summary of the optics with target field: the table shows a summary of the RMS values of each kinematic variables after calibration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HRS</th>
<th>Beam Energy (GeV)</th>
<th>Filed Strength (T)</th>
<th>Filed Angle (deg)</th>
<th>δ</th>
<th>θ</th>
<th>φ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.2x10^{-4}</td>
<td>1.8 mrad</td>
<td>1.8 mrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.4x10^{-4}</td>
<td>2.4 mrad</td>
<td>1.5 mrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.2x10^{-4}</td>
<td>2.1 mrad</td>
<td>1.3 mrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.2x10^{-4}</td>
<td>1.6 mrad</td>
<td>1.2 mrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.5x10^{-4}</td>
<td>2.2 mrad</td>
<td>1.8 mrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.3x10^{-4}</td>
<td>2.7 mrad</td>
<td>1.7 mrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.4x10^{-4}</td>
<td>1.9 mrad</td>
<td>1.5 mrad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The optics with target field works well

Thanks to Chao Gu, Min Huang
Preliminary Results

2.254GeV 5T Longitudinal Asymmetry

\[ A_\parallel = \frac{\sigma^{\uparrow\uparrow} - \sigma^{\downarrow\uparrow}}{\sigma^{\uparrow\uparrow} + \sigma^{\downarrow\uparrow}} \]

2.254GeV 5T Transverse Asymmetry

\[ A_\perp = \frac{\sigma^{\uparrow\Rightarrow} - \sigma^{\downarrow\Rightarrow}}{\sigma^{\uparrow\Rightarrow} + \sigma^{\downarrow\Rightarrow}} \]

- Fully radiated asymmetries (red curve)
- Cross section models: P. Bosted's fit (unpolarized) and MAID 2007 (polarized)
- Include Unpolarized and polarized elastic tail
- Radiating methods: Mo/Tsai (unpolarized) and Akushevich/Ilyichev/Shumeiko (polarized)
Preliminary Results

Preliminary cross section differences

\[ \Delta \sigma_\perp = A_\perp \times \sigma_0 \]

\[ A_\perp = \frac{\sigma^{\uparrow \Rightarrow} - \sigma^{\downarrow \Rightarrow}}{\sigma^{\uparrow \Rightarrow} + \sigma^{\downarrow \Rightarrow}} \]

- Preliminary results for 2.254GeV, 5T trans configuration
- The unpolarized cross section is from P. Bosted's fit
- Compared with radiated MAID model prediction
Preliminary Results

- Preliminary results for 2.254 GeV, 5.0 T trans configuration
- $Q^2 \sim 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2$ for this setting
- The integral is from $x=0$ to the pion threshold
- We measured $x$ as low as 0.04 and the unmeasured region will be evaluated with $g_2$
Preliminary Results

• Low $x$ contribution is suppressed due to the $x^2$ weight in the integral.

• Once the analysis is done, we should be able to provide the results at four different $Q^2$ as shown in the plot.

\[
\delta_{LT}(Q^2) = \frac{16\alpha M^2}{Q^6} \int_0^{x_0} x^2 g_1 + g_2 \, dx
\]
Summary

- The g2p experiment ran in spring 2012 and took data covering $0.02 < Q^2 < 0.20 \text{ GeV}^2$
- Will provide an accurate measurement of $g_2$ in low $Q^2$ region for the first time
  - Extract the fundamental quantities $\delta_{LT}$ to provide a test of $\chi$PT calculations
  - Test the Burkhardt-Cottingham (BC) Sum Rule
- New instruments are demonstrated working well during the experiment (1 NIM paper published and 1 NIM paper in preparation)
- Data analysis is currently underway
g2p Collaboration
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Analysis

• To reduce uncertainty, polarized cross section difference is derived from asymmetry and unpolarized cross section

• For asymmetry, most of the systematic uncertainties cancelled, all data can be included to minimize the statistic error

• For cross section, the statistic uncertainty is less important, so only the data with small systematic uncertainty is selected

\[ \Delta \sigma_\perp = A_\perp \times \sigma_0 \]

\[ A_{\perp}^{\text{phy}} = \frac{A_{\perp}^{\text{raw}}}{DP_b P_t} \quad A_{\perp}^{\text{raw}} = \frac{N_+^+ - N_-^-}{N_+^+ + N_-^-} \]

\[ \sigma_0^{\text{phy}} = \sigma_0^{\text{raw}} \times D \quad \sigma_0^{\text{raw}} = \frac{N}{N_{\text{in}} \rho \epsilon_{\text{det}}} \times \frac{1}{A} \]
Projections

LT Spin Polarizability

BC Sum Integral

\[ \delta_{LT}(Q^2) = \frac{16\alpha M^2}{Q^6} \int_0^{x_0} x^2 [g_1 + g_2] dx \]

\[ \int_0^1 g_2(x, Q^2) dx = 0 \]
Optics Goal

- The g2p experiment will measure the proton structure function $g_2$ in the low $Q^2$ region (0.02-0.2 GeV$^2$) for the first time.

- Goal: 5% systematic uncertainty when measuring cross section.

- Optics Goal:
  - $<1.0\%$ systematic uncertainty of scattering angle, which will contribute $<4.0\%$ to the uncertainty of cross section.

  $\sigma \sim 1/\sin^4(\theta/2)$

  - Momentum uncertainty is not as sensitive, but it is not hard to reach $10^{-4}$ level.
Angle Calibration

- Determine the center scattering angle
  - Survey: ~1 mrad
  - Idea: Use elastic scattering on different target materials
    \[ \Delta E' = \frac{E}{1 + \frac{E}{M_1}(1 - \cos \theta)} - \frac{E}{1 + \frac{E}{M_2}(1 - \cos \theta)} \]
  - Data taking: Carbon foil in LHe, or CH\textsubscript{2} foil
  - Two elastic peak took at the same time
  - The accuracy to determine this difference is <50 KeV -> <0.5 mrad
Matrix Calibration

- Calibrate the angle and momentum matrix elements:
  - Use carbon foil target and point beam
  - Use sieve slit to get the real scattering angle from geometry
  - Angle: Fit with data which we already know the real scattering angle
  - Momentum: Use the real scattering angle to calculate elastic scattering momentum of carbon target

![Diagram of target, sieve slit, and septa with circular patterns on the right side.]
Matrix Calibration: Angle

LHRS Before Calibration

Resolution: 1.6mrad (RMS)
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Matrix Calibration: Momentum

LHRS

Before Calibration

RMS: $1.5 \times 10^{-4}$

After Calibration
Matrix Calibration: Angle

RHRS

Before Calibration

After Calibration

Resolution: 1.6mrad (RMS)
Matrix Calibration: Momentum

Before Calibration

After Calibration

RMS: $1.7 \times 10^{-4}$
Optics Study with Target Field

- Recalibrate the angle matrix elements:
  - Start with the matrix without target field
  - To fit the matrix element, need to know the effective theta and phi angle
    - What we know is reaction point and the coordinate of the sieve hole
  - Trace the scattered electrons with different initial angles and select out the trajectory which goes through the sieve hole

![Diagram of beam, reaction point, sieve, and scattered electrons]
Optics Study with Target Field

- Reconstruct the scattering angle:
  - Use the HRS matrix to get the effective target variables
  - Project the effective target variables to sieve slit (red dot line)
  - Use the simulation package to calculate the trajectory of the scattered electron (red solid line), which will tell us the real scattering angle