

MARATHON Experiment

MeAsurement of the F_2^n/F_2^p , d/u RAtios and A=3 EMC Effect in Deep Inelastic Electron Scattering Off the Tritium and Helium MirrOr Nuclei.

Zhihong Ye

Department of Physics, Tsinghua University On behalf of the Tritium-MARATHON Collaboration

Strong QCD from Hadron Structure Experiments – VI, Nanjing University, 05/16/2024



d/u ratios at high-x

- ✤ d/u drops to zero at x=1 but not the ratio
 - Different models, diff. predictions
 - ✤ Constrain QCD models for d/u
- ✤ CTEQ-JLab (CJ15), gave small errors
 - Including tagged-DIS, charged lepton and W boson asymmetry Loose kinematic cuts (Q²>1.3GeV², W²>3GeV²)
 - New model-dependent corrections
 - ✓ New high-x DIS data are still essential



A. Accardi et. al. Phys. Rev. D 93, 114017 (2016).

• Extracted from DIS: $\frac{F_2^n}{F_2^p} = \frac{[(u + \bar{u}) + (s + \bar{s})] + 4(d + \bar{d})}{4(u + \bar{u}) + [(d + \bar{d}) + (s + \bar{s})]}$ $\frac{1}{4} \le \frac{F_2^n}{F_2^p} \le 4$

Problem: No free stable neutrons!



C. Roberts, R. Holt, S. Schmidt, PLB 727 (2013) 249-254



3/30

Motivation

Slightly "modified" nucleons_

Spectral functions (fermi-motion)

 $F_D = F_{\tilde{p}} \otimes f_p^D + F_{\tilde{n}} \otimes f_n^D$



d/u ratios at high-x

- Deuteron as an "effective" neutron target:
 - Measure DIS w/ D2
 - Obtain nDIS after subtracting pDIS
 - Model corrections to nuclear effect
- Reduce the nuclear effect by spectator tagging, e.g. :
 BoNUS/BoNUS12/EIC
 - Statistical limit, FSI, efficiencies, phase-space...
 - Medium modification effects still exist



- Target MassHigher Twists
 - EMC ...
- ✤ PVDIS is less sensitive to the nuclear effect

Offshell

Intensity hunger + large detector acceptance required

$$A_{LR}^{p} \sim -\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha} \frac{Q^{2}}{v^{2}} \left[\frac{12 g_{AV}^{eu} - 6 g_{AV}^{ed} d/u}{4 + d/u} \right]$$



PRD 107, L051506 (2023)



■ ³H & ³He

Deuteron as effective "free" neutron

 \Box Triton(³H) and ³He \rightarrow the boundary of "quasi-free" and "real" nuclei





4/30



MARATHON Experiment

- In ³H & ³He: $F_{H3} = F_{\tilde{p}} \otimes f_{p}^{H3} + 2F_{\tilde{n}} \otimes f_{n}^{H3}$ $F_{He3} = 2F_{\tilde{p}} \otimes f_{p}^{He3} + F_{\tilde{n}} \otimes f_{n}^{He3}$
- DIS cross section:

Super-Ratio in EMC (DIS)

$$R(3_{He}) = \frac{F_{3_{He}}}{2F_p + F_n}, R(3_H) = \frac{F_{3_H}}{F_p + 2F_n} \mathcal{R} = \frac{R(3_{He})}{R(3_H)}$$

$$\frac{F_2^n}{F_2^p} = \frac{2\mathcal{R} - F_2^{^{3}\text{He}}/F_2^{^{3}\text{H}}}{2F_2^{^{3}\text{He}}/F_2^{^{3}\text{H}} - \mathcal{R}}$$

E12-10-103

Spokespeople: G (Makis) Petratos, J. Gomez, A. Katramatou, R. Holt (J. Arrington), D. Meekins, R. Ransome,
PhD Students: T. Hague, M. Mycz, T. Su (Kent), J. Bane (Tennessee), Tyler Kutz (Stony Brooks), H. Liu (Columbia)



- Spectral functions in A=3 nuclei are similar & calculable
- Corrections become small (or cancelled) in ratios
- "EMC" effect *could be* similar and small at high-x (to measure)
- \mathcal{R} to be initialized by a model, iterate w/ data

Afnan, et. al. PLB 493 36 (2000), PRC 035201 (2001), M. Sargsian PRC 66 024001 (2002) Tropiano, et.al., PRC C 99, 035201 (2019), Alekhin et. al. PRC 107, L051506 (2023)



 $Q^2 = 2.313 \text{ GeV}^2$

³He

X<1

1.10 1.15 1.20 1.25 1.30 1.35 1.40 1.45 1.50 ω [GeV]

MARATHON Experiment

EMC Effect: Per-nucleon DIS cross-section ratio between a nucleus-A to the deuteron decreases linearly in 0.3<x<0.7</p>



- Nucleon must be modified
- No accepted explanation
- Isospin Dependence?



$\bigstar Medium effect in A=3$

- Fermi-motion (QE)
- Offshell effect
- High-Twist effects
- Quark modification (EMC Effect)?



^{Q² = 0.703 GeV²} N. Santiesteban, PRL 132, 162501 (2024)

0.016

0.014 0.012

0.010

0.008

0.006

0.004

0.002

0.000

do/dΩdE [nb/sr/GeV]

Tritium Target



A 10-year effort!

- Allowed quantities have been dramatically reduced
- ***** Two big heroes :



- Three Big Reviews (2010, 2015, 2016), Many tests
- Very detailed documentation of procedures of assembly, fill, transportation, storage, installation and operations
- Test the whole system during the Ar(e,e'p) Run in 2017

Lab	Year	Quantity (kCi)	Thickness (g/cm²)	Current (μΑ)	Current <i>x</i> thickness (μA-g/cm²)
Stanford	1963	25	0.8	0.5	0.4
MIT-Bates	1982	180	0.3	20	6.0
Saskatoon	1985	3	0.02	30	0.6
JLab	(2016)	1	0.08	20	1.6

Dave Meekins (JLab)

Tritium target technical reports

- Hall A Tritium Target System, D. Meekins et al, September, 2015
- A Tritium Gas Target for Jefferson Lab, R. J. Holt et al, July 13, 2015.
- Jefferson Lab Tritium Target Cell, D. Meekins, November 28, 2014
- Activation of a Tritium Target Cell, G. Kharashvili , June 25, 2014
- Thermomechanical Design of a Static Gas Target for Electron Accelerators, B. <u>Brajuskovic</u> et al., NIM A 729 (2013) 469.
- Absorption Risks for a Tritium Gas Target at Jefferson Lab, R. J. Holt, August 13, 2013.
- Beam-Induced and Tritium-Assisted Embrittlement of the Target Cell at <u>JLab</u>, R. E. Ricker (NIST),
 R. J. Holt, D. Meekins, B. <u>Somerday</u> (Sandia), March 4, 2013.
- Activation Analysis of a Tritium Target Cell for Jefferson Lab, R. J. Holt, D. Meekins, Oct. 23, 2012.
- Tritium Inhalation Risks for a Tritium Gas Target at Jefferson Lab, R. J. Holt, October 10, 2012.
- Tritium Permeability of the Al Target Cell, R. J. Holt, R. E. Ricker (NIST), D. Meekins, July 10, 2012.
- Scattering Chamber Isolation for the <u>JLab</u> Tritium Target, T. O'Connor, March 29, 2012.
- Hydrogen Getter System for the <u>JLab</u> Tritium Target, T. O'Connor, W. <u>Korsch</u>, February 16, 2012.
- Tritium Gas Target Safety Operations Algorithm for Jefferson Lab, R. J. Holt, February 2, 2012.
- Tritium Gas Target Hazard Analysis for Jefferson Lab, E. Beise et al, January 18, 2012.
- Analysis of a Tritium Target Release at Jefferson Lab, B. Napier (PNNL), R. J. Holt, January 10, 2012.
- Estimating the X-ray Dose Rate from the MARATHON Tritium Target, J. Singh, February 22, 2011.

 Task force:
 R. J. Holt, A. <u>Katramatou</u>, W. <u>Korsch</u>, D. Meekins, T. O'Connor, G. <u>Petratos</u>, R. <u>Ransome</u>, J. Singh, P. Solvignon, B. <u>Wojtsekhowki</u>

Equipment Setup and Checklists

- TGT-PROC-17-001: Hall A and C Cryotarget Lifter Test and Certification
- TGT-PROC-17-005: HATT Tritium Exhaust System Configuration Verification ☞
- TGT-PROC-17-009: HATT vacuum system exhaust verification checklist

Cell Assembly

- TGT-PROC-17-004: HATT Tritium Cell Examination, Assembly, and Testing Procedure @
- TGT-PROC-17-003: Cleaning Procedure for High Purity Fluid Service &

Hall Access Procedures

• TGT-PROC-17-007: Hall A Truck Ramp Access for Tritium Mode &

Installation/Removal

- TGT-PROC-17-002: Hall A Tritium Target Cell Installation
- TGT-PROC-17-006: Hall A Tritium Target Cell Removal
- TGT-PROC-17-015: Unpacking HATT cell from BTSP transfer to TSV ₽
- TGT-PROC-17-016: Inspection of TSV prior to use
- TGT-PROC-18-003: Unpacking HATT cell from TSV transfer to BTSP ₽

Operations

- TGT-PROC-17-010: HATT Operator Manual 🖗
- TGT-PROC-17-012: HATT commissioning beam centering and checkout, ion chamber FSD calibration &
- TGT-PROC-17-013: Hall A tritium target density study &

Hall A Technical Procedures

- A-08-039-P: Installation Of Hall A Target Chamber Window Procedure @
- A-17-001-P: Installation and Removal Of Platform On Pivot &
- A-17-001-P: Valve actuator replacement
- A-17-003-P: Removal Of Hall A Target Chamber Window Assembly 🗗
- A-17-004-P: Collimator installation and removal ₽

Operational Safety Procedures

- OSP for Cell Installation ₽
- Unpack of BTSP P
- Removal of Cell from Chamber 🗗
- Operation of the HATT

Manuals

• Lakeshore 218 manual 🖉



Tritium Target



Target Cell:

Design and layout:





Tritium Specs:

- 1099 Ci
- 200 psia at room temperature
- Cool with 40K (from 15K helium-loop)
- Max Beam Current: 22.5 (~15W heat)





Extra protection when no in-used



Tritium Target



Transportation and Installation

✤ Three-layer protection during transportation and storage



✤ Three-layer protection during installation and in-use:



Last safty device to run Tritium!

Hall-A Tritium Experiments



From MARATHON to Four Experiments:



 Spokespeople: G (Makis) Petratos, J. Gomez, A. Katramatou, R. Holt (J. Arrington), D. Meekins, R. Ransome,
 PhD Students: T. Hague, M. Mycz, T. Su (Kent), J. Bane (Tennessee) Tyler Kutz (Stony Brooks), H. Liu (Columbia)



E12-17-003 (Hypernucleus)Search for Lambda-N-N Hypernuclear

Spokespeople: F. Garibaldi, P. Markowitz, S. Nakamura, J. Reinhold, L. Tang, G. Urciuoli **PhD Student:** Bishnu Pendey (Hampton)





E12-14-009 (Exclusive SRC)

- ✤ Measure proton mom. dis. in ³H & ³He
- ♦ Verify in neutron-rich nuclei: $n_p(k) > n_n(k)$

Spokespeople: L. Weinstein, W. Boeglin, F. Hauenstein, O. Hen, S. Gilad **PhD Students:** Reynier Cruz Torres (MIT)





Experimental Setup



Thomas Jefferson Lab

Located at Newport News, Virginia; Funded by Department of Energy; First operation in 1990s





Hall-A





Experimental Running





Already Published Results





D. Abrams,¹ H. Albataineh,² B. S. Aljawrneh,³ S. Alsalmi,^{4,5} D. Androic,⁶ K. Aniol,⁷ W. Armstrong,⁸

15/30

Data Analysis





□ Beam time cut by half
 □ BigBite wasn't avaiblable
 □ New experimental design with only HRSs
 □ x → 0.82 (W²<=3.5 GeV²)
 □ Drop x ~ 0.87

¹H & ²D data

Data Analysis



Target Boiling Correction

- $\boldsymbol{\bigstar}$ Localized density fluctuation due to heat deposition from beam
- ✤ Different gas targets respond to beam variation differently
 - \rightarrow Affect measured quantities, like cross-section & ratio
- ✤ A boiling study was performed:
 - Measured normalized electron yields at 2.5uA, 5uA, 10uA, 15uA, 22.5uA $Y_{\text{norm}} = \frac{PS \cdot N}{Q \cdot \epsilon \cdot LT}$
 - Fit yields vs current quadratically

$$f(I_{\text{beam}}) = a \cdot I_{\text{beam}}^2 + b \cdot I_{\text{beam}} + c$$



- Apply boiling corrections to extracted yields and cross sections.
- S. Santiesteban, et. al., NIM (2019) 06 025





³ H Fit Parameters		³ H Correlation Factors		
a	$(1.06 \pm 0.36) \times 10^{-4}$	C(a, b)	-0.974	
b	$(-6.8 \pm 0.89) \times 10^{-3}$	C(b, c)	-0.888	
c	1. + / - 0.003	C(a, c)	0.801	
3	³ He Fit Parameters	³ He Correlation Factors		
a	$(1.04 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-4}$	C(a, b)	-0.973	
b	$(-5.1 \pm 0.64) \times 10^{-3}$	C(b, c)	-0.879	
c	1 ± 0.003	C(a, c)	0.779	

Data Analysis



Trtium Decay Evaluation

- ♦ Tritium decays into He3, w/ half-live-time: $t_{1/2} = \ln(2)\tau = (4500 \pm 8)$ days
- ✤ The contents of Tritium and He3 when filling the cell (Oct 2017) were given:

$$\eta_T^0 = (0.077 \pm 0.001) \text{ g cm}^{-2}$$
 $\eta_{H_e}^0 = (2.26 \pm 0.452) \times 10^{-5} \text{ g cm}^{-2}$

 $\clubsuit \,$ w/ known time spent at JLab, the updated densities were:

$$n_T \equiv n_T(t) = n_T^0 e^{-t/\tau} \qquad n_{H_e} \equiv n_{H_e}(t) = n_{H_e}^0 + n_T^0 (1 - e^{-t/\tau})$$



◆ Tritium measurement have to be corrected for Helium-3 contaminations

$$Y_{T} = Y_{raw} \left(\frac{Q_{tot}}{Q_{tot} - \langle f_{H\!e} \rangle} \right) - Y_{H_{\!e}} \! \left(\frac{\langle f_{H_{\!e}} \rangle}{Q_{tot} - \langle f_{H_{\!e}} \rangle} \right)$$



 Y_{He} was obtained from the He3-cell runs $\langle f_{He} \rangle \equiv \sum_{i} Q_{i} f_{He^{i}} \qquad f_{He} \equiv f_{He}(t) = \frac{n_{He}}{n_{T} + n_{He}} = \frac{n_{He}}{n_{tot}}$



Background Evaluation

- ✤ Experimental observables: cross-section ratios
- \clubsuit Lots of systematic uncertainties are cancelled in the ratios
- ✤ However, the background won't!

Major sources of background

- Misidentified "electrons" ---> PID Study
- Electrons coming from endcaps Target Vertex-Z Cuts
- Electrons coming from other reactions —> Physics Quantities Cuts
- Secondary electrons --> Optics Cuts & PID
- gamma->e⁺e⁻ conversion → "Positron" Runs

 For MARATHON, a dedicated "Positron" runs at low-x (positive HRS-L)





- ✓ Empty-Target (or Dummy Foils) runs
- ✓ An optimized Z-cuts







Ratio Extractions

• Experimental yield:

$$Y(x) = \frac{N_{e'}}{N_e(\rho/A)_t L_t} (C_{cor})$$

• Differential cross-sections:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma}{\mathrm{d}E'\mathrm{d}\Omega}(x) = Y(x)/(\Delta E\Delta\Omega)$$

 $\frac{\sigma_{A1}}{\sigma_{A2}} = \frac{Y_{A1}}{Y_{A2}}$

- Cross-section ratios→yield ratios:
 - $\checkmark\,$ Many experimental corrections cancelled
 - ✓ Boiling effect corrected w/ syst. Err [0.1%~0.5%]
 - ✓ Radiation and bin-centering corrections use KP models (model-dependent syst. Error [0.25%~0.45%])
 KP model: PRC82 054614 (2010), NPA765,126 (2006)
 - Measured proton (p) and deutron (d) cross-section ratios:

 $F_2^n/F_2^p = (F_2^d/F_2^p)/\mathcal{R}_d - 1$ KP models

Agreed with SLAC and BoNUS data (overal systmatic check!)





Results & Discussion





21/30

Results & Discussion



EMC Effect in A=3 (Preliminary):

• Identical to extract Deutron (d) yields (model-independent):

 $\frac{\sigma_h}{\sigma_d} = \frac{Y_h}{Y_d}, \frac{\sigma_t}{\sigma_d} = \frac{Y_t}{Y_d}$

- Normalized $\sigma h/\sigma_d$ ratios w/ 1.021+/-0.005 and σ_t/σ_d ratios w/ 0.996 +/- 0.005
- Isocaler EMC ratios (corrected with KP-model):

 $(\sigma_h/\sigma_d)_{\rm IS} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sigma_h/\sigma_d + \mathcal{R}_{ht}(\sigma_t/\sigma_d) \right],$ $(\sigma_t/\sigma_d)_{\rm IS} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\sigma_t/\sigma_d + (\sigma_h/\sigma_d)/\mathcal{R}_{ht} \right],$









New Efforts outside the MARATHON Collaboration

23/30

Second Tritium Run-Group



> New Tritium-Targets in Hall-B:

- ✤ Approved E12-20-005 at 6.6 GeV w/ CLAS12 (Tritium-SRC)
- ♦ New Target-System design for ²D, ³H and ³He

Material	Tritium	Al Windows	Be Window	Total
$Length(g/cm^2)$	0.085	0.21	0.037	0.33
Luminosity	3.54×10^{34}	8.42×10^{34}	1.54×10^{34}	1.35×10^{35}

maximum luminosity

- **\diamond** Lifetime opportunity \rightarrow What more we can do?
- ✤ DIS with ³H/³He Mirror Nuclei using 10.6 GeV electron beam
 - SIDIS
 - ✓ Nuclear PDF in A=3, Flavor-Dependent EMC Effect
 - ✓ Nuclear-TMD (nTMD) and Nuclear-Fragmentation Function (nFF)
 - DVCS/DVMP
 - Neutron-GPD (incoherence)
 - Nuclear-GPD (nGPD)) in A=3 (coherence)
 - More?
 - Plentiful other physics topics!





<u>C12-21-004:</u>

- Conditionally approved in PAC49
- Spokespeople: D. Dutta, D. Gaskell,
 O. Hen, D. Meekins, D. Nguyen, L.
 Weinstein, J. R. West, Z. Ye
- <u>arXiv: 2202.09696</u>



Second Tritium Run-Group



- ➢ Proposed SIDIS Measurement (C12-21-004):
- □ Same new Tritium target system
- □ Standard CLAS12
- □ 50+8 days of beam time requested
- □ Detected electrons, pions and maybe kaons w/ RICH)
 - Flip the Torus field often to minimize the different acceptance of +/- charged particles

□ SIDIS Kinematic cuts:

 $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$, $W^2 > 4 \text{ GeV}$, 0.1 < y < 0.85, 0.3 < z < 0.7

- **D** Bin the data in 4D (Q², *x*, *z*, P_T)
- □ Error budget: overall 1% point to point

	Sectors	Tracking	Vertex	Fiducial	Acceptance
Uncertainty (%)	0.34	0.13	0.16	0.41	0.1





Proposed SIDIS Measurement:

□ Observables → unpolarized SIDIS cross-sections $\frac{d\sigma^h}{dxdydz} = \frac{4\pi\alpha^2 s}{Q^4}(1-y+\frac{y^2}{2})\sum_{r}e_q^2[f_1^q(x)] \cdot D_q^h(z)]$

<u>Free or Nuclear</u> Fragmentation Function (nFF)

 $(\sigma_A^{\pi^+} \pm \sigma_A^{\pi^-})/A \propto [4(u_A \pm \bar{u}_A) \pm (d_A \pm \bar{d}_A)] \cdot [D_A^+ \pm D_A^-],$

Super-ratios of charge-sum &-difference:

$$R_{A_1/A_2}^{\pi,\pm}(x,z) \simeq \frac{(\sigma_{A_1}^{\pi^+} \pm \sigma_{A_1}^{\pi^-})/A_1}{(\sigma_{A_2}^{\pi^+} \pm \sigma_{A_2}^{\pi^-})/A_2} \simeq \frac{4(u_{A_1} \pm \bar{u}_{A_1}) \pm (d_{A_1} \pm \bar{d}_{A_1})}{4(u_{A_2} \pm \bar{u}_{A_2}) \pm (d_{A_2} \pm \bar{d}_{A_2})} \cdot B_{A_1/A_2}^{\pm}(z)$$

 $\checkmark~$ LO approximation seems effective



□ nFF parts most cancelled:

$$\begin{split} B^{\pi,\pm}_{H/T}(z) \simeq B^{\pi,\pm}_{H/D}(z) \simeq B^{\pi,\pm}_{T/D}(z) \simeq 1 \\ \text{D->}^2\text{D}, \, \text{T} \rightarrow {}^3\text{H}, \, \text{H} \rightarrow {}^3\text{He} \end{split}$$

Free or Nuclear PDF (nPDF)



- ✓ He4's nFFs have small medium effects (~ 5% at high-z), (Pia Zurita, arXiv:2101.01088)
- ✓ nFF of D, T & H have smaller medium effects and similar



> Verify "d/u" with A=3

■ Model-independently measure nuclear-effects of d/u w/ A=3 at high-x





Flavor-Dependent EMC Effect

- ✤ Gold nPDF model is flavor-dependent
 - ✓ If N>Z, u-quark is more modified
 ✓ If N<Z, d-quark is more modified



I. Cloet, et al, PRL 109, 182301 (2012); PRL 102, 252301 (2009)]

- ✤ JAM predicts strong isovector effect in A=3:
 - ✓ stronger d_p -quark modified in ³H
 - ✓ stronger u_n -quark modification in ³He



C. Cocuzza, et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 242001



arXiv: 2202.09696

- Flavor-Dependent EMC Effect
- Precisely probe u- and d-quark EMC effect!



Data-Points: SIDIS MC events with CLAS12 acceptance, standard SIDIS cuts, one z-bin (0.35 < z < 0.45). 1% point-to-point systematic + statistical errors









- d/u PDF (or F_2^n/F_2^p) ratio at x \rightarrow 1 provides constrains to QCD model predictionss
- Lack of free neutron DIS data, need tagged ²D-DIS, PVDIS
- A=3 isotope (Tritium & He3) provides a new way to measure F_2^n/F_2^p
- Precision measurements of nuclear effects in A=3
- Experiment done in 2018, F_2^n/F_2^p result published, EMC results to be submitted for publication
- New Tritium experiment w/ SIDIS measure flavor-dependent EMC effect and more





國產請

(finding)

1111111111111

Backup



Flavor-Dependent EMC Effect

Updated Projections

→ precisely probe u- and d-quark EMC effect!



<u>Data-Points:</u> SIDIS MC events with CLAS12 acceptance, standard SIDIS cuts, one z-bin ($0.35 \le z \le 0.45$). 1% point-to-point systematic + statistical errors

Model Explanation:

- SLAC: fit from SLAC data (Phys. Rev. D 49, 4348)
 - ✓ **Flavor-indep**: flavor-independent
 - ✓ <u>np-SRC</u>: toy-model; only quarks in np-SRC pairs are modified
 - ✓ <u>u(d)-only</u>: toy-model, only u-quarks (or dquark) are modified
- <u>KP Model</u>: theoretical calculation of A=3 with nuclear corrections used in MARATHON (Kulagin & Petti, Nuclear Physics A 765 (2006) 126–187)
- JAM: JAM global analysis (C. Cocuzza, et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 127, 242001)
 - \checkmark "no-nuclear": no nuclear-correction included
 - ✓ "smear": Fermi-smearing turns on
 - ✓ "smear+offshell": Fermi-smearing and offshell effect both turn on





Projected Results of A=3 in SIDIS: Kaon Data 4D Binning



