Status, challenges, and prospects in nuclear PDF fits

QCD@LHC

Emanuele R. Nocera

Università degli Studi di Torino and INFN — Torino

Durham University - 6 September 2023

Why nuclear parton distribution functions?





nuclei do not behave as a simple incoherent superposition of protons and neutrons

nPDFs enter theoretical predictions of signal and background events at high-energy neutrino observatories such as KM3NET and IceCube



search for exotic forms of QCD matter, such as the gluon-dominated Color Glass Condensate

interplay with proton PDFs, given the data used

Determining nuclear PDFs from experimental data

Assumption:
fundamental interactions are the same in the vacuum and in the medium, but PDFs are different, *i.e.* nuclear effects are reabsorbed into nPDFs

Keep standard QCD framework and assume factorisation also for nuclei

Use the same DGLAP equations and coefficient functions as for proton PDFs

Require the same theoretical constraints (*e.g.* sum rules, positivity, ...)

$$\sigma_{\rm DIS}^{\ell+A} = \sum_i \underbrace{f_i^{(A,Z)}(x,\mu^2)}_{\text{nuclear PDFs, obey usual DGLAP}} \otimes \underbrace{\hat{\sigma}_{\rm DIS}^{\ell+i}(x,\mu^2)}_{\text{usual QCD coefficient functions}} + \text{p.s. corrections}$$

Nuclear PDFs are linear combinations of bound proton and neutron ($f_i^{(p,n),A}$) PDFs

$$f_i^{(A,Z)}(x,\mu^2) = \frac{Z}{A} f_i^{p,A}(x,\mu^2) + \frac{Z-A}{A} f_i^{n,A}(x,\mu^2)$$

A relationship between the bound proton PDFs and the nucleon PDFs is assumed

$$f_i^{p,A}(x,\mu^2) = R_i^A(x,\mu^2) f_i^p(x,\mu^2)$$

Restrictive framework, but it allows for making testable predictions for many hard probes
In principle interactions could be different in the medium or factorisation could not hold
Additional complication: nuclear modifications of final-state hadrons

1. Status of nuclear PDF fits

Proton and nuclear PDFs *vis-à-vis*



[Figure adapted from Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci. 70 (2020) 43]

Overview of experimental data



[Figure taken from EPJ C82 (2022) 413]

Overview of nuclear PDF determinations

	KSASG20	TUJU21	EPPS21	nNNPDF3.0	nCTEQ15HQ
Order in α_s	NLO & NNLO	NLO & NNLO	NLO	NLO	NLO
lA NC DIS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
νA CC DIS	✓	✓	✓	✓	
pA DY	✓		✓	✓	✓
πA DY			✓		
RHIC dAu π^0,$\pi^\pm$			✓		✓
LHC pPb π^0,$\pi^\pm$,$K^\pm$					✓
LHC pPb dijets			✓	✓	
LHC pPb HQ			✓	✓ reweight	✓ ME fitting
LHC pPb W,Z		✓	✓	✓	✓
LHC pPb γ				✓	
Q, W cut in DIS	1.3, 0.0 GeV	1.87, 3.5 GeV	1.3, 1.8 GeV	1.87, 3.5 GeV	2.0, 3.5 GeV
p_{T} cut in HQ,inc.-h	N/A	N/A	3.0 GeV	0.0 GeV	3.0 GeV
Data points	4353	2410	2077	2188	1496
Free parameters	9	16	24	256	19
Error analysis	Hessian	Hessian	Hessian	Monte Carlo	Hessian
Free-proton PDFs	CT18	own fit	CT18A	~NNPDF4.0	~CTEQ6M
Free-proton corr.	no	no	yes	yes	no
HQ treatment	FONLL	FONLL	S-ACOT	FONLL	S-ACOT
Indep. flavours	3	4	6	6	5

KSAG20 [PRD 104 (2021) 034010] TUJU21 [PRD 105 (2022) 094031] EPPS21 [EPJ C82 (2022) 413]
nNNPDF3.0 [EPJ,C82 (2022) 507] nCTEQ15HQ [PRD 105 (2022) 114043]

Current PDF sets differ in three respects:
the data set, the perturbative accuracy, and the fitting methodology

[Slide adapted from P. Paakkinen]

Comparison of nuclear PDF sets



Evidence of shadowing and anti-shadowing in all partons

Evidence of EMC effect in EPPS21 for u and d
(though it may be a parametrisation effect)

Overall qualitative agreement across PDF sets, except for nCTEQ strange
(remember that nCTEQ do not fit neutrino DIS data)

Difference in uncertainties depends on differences in methodologies and in data sets
(a benchmark across groups is perhaps needed)

Impact of data

W bosons in pPb at 8.16 TeV

CMS, Run II [PLB 800 (2020) 135048]



sensitivity to quark flavour separation and to the gluon through quark-gluon correlations at small x and high Q

nCTEQ15WZSIH, TUJU21 and nNNPDF3.0 fit absolute cross section, EPPS21 fit nuclear modification ratios

Good description of the data set by all groups

Z bosons in pPb at 8.16 TeV

CMS, Run II [JHEP 05 (2021) 182]



nNNPDF3.0 include both low-mass and on-peak data pp/pPb studied in EPPS21 but not included

Both EPPS21 and nNNPDF3.0 observe data/theory tensions: shift over rapidity range

NNLO to cure for the low-mass data?

Impact of data

Dijets in pPb/pp at 5.02 TeV

CMS [PRL 121 (2018) 062002]



Drastic reduction of nPDF uncertainties
Important constraint for the gluon nPDF

Both EPPS21 and nNNPDF3.0
do not fit the most forward data points
missing data correlations?
NNLO? Nonperturbative effects?

D^0 mesons in pPb/pp at 5.02 TeV

LHCb [JHEP 10 (2017) 090]



Drastic reduction of nPDF uncertainties
Important constraint for the gluon nPDF

nNNPDF3.0: POWHEG+PYTHIA
large scale uncertainty, only forward data
EPPS21: S-ACOT-M_T GM-VFNS
large scale uncertainties not seen

Impact of higher-order corrections







TUJU21: $\chi^2/N_{\rm dat} = 0.94$ (NLO) $\chi^2/N_{\rm dat} = 0.84$ (NNLO) $N_{\rm dat} = 2410$

[PRD 105 (2022) 094031]

Impact of proton baseline fit

What's the impact of varying the proton baseline fit in the nPDF determination?



Case 1: remove the deuteron data from the proton baseline

(NMC, SLAC, BCDMS, E866, E906)

Impact of proton baseline fit

What's the impact of varying the proton baseline fit in the nPDF determination?



Case 2: remove the heavy nuclei data from the proton baseline

(CHORUS, NuTeV, E605)

2. Challenges and prospects in nuclear PDF fits

Challenge: nuclear data in proton PDF fits



Nuclear data sets have a significant impact on proton PDFs

This despite nuclear data sets are a (limited) subset of the global data set (in NNDPF4.0, 1417 out of 4618 data points)

on deuteron (NC DIS): SLAC, BCDMS, NMC
on heavy nuclei (CC DIS): CHORUS, NuTeV
on both (FT DY): E866, E906, E605





Nuclear uncertainty in PDF determination





Effect of nuclear uncertainties relevant at large x
to reconcile FT DIS with LHC DY data

$$\chi^2_{\rm tot} = 1.17 \rightarrow \chi^2_{\rm tot} = 1.26 \text{ (no nucl. uncs.)}$$
$$\chi^2_{\rm LHCb} = 1.54 \rightarrow \chi^2_{\rm tot} = 1.76 \text{ (no nucl. uncs.)}$$

The bulk of the effect is due to nuclear uncertainties for heavy nuclei
deuteron uncertainties have a comparatively smaller effect at intermediate values of x



[EPJ C79 (2019) 282; EPJ C81 (2021) 37]

Prospect: *integrated* proton and nuclear PDF fits

Idea: deploy the NNPDF4.0 methodology
to a simultaneous determination of proton and nuclear PDFs

Proton PDF ($A = 1$ boundary) automatically reflected in nuclear PDFs

Nuclear DIS data contribute consistently to both proton and nuclear PDFs

Take advantage of automated generation of theoretical observables [arXiv: 2302.12124]

Playground to optimise GPU parallelisation (Netherlands eScience Centre)



Methodology Improvements NNPDF4.0

- **Stochastic Gradient Descent** (SGD) for NN training using Tensorflow (easily changeable)
- **Automated Optimisation of Hyperparameters** (scanning of the parameter space)
- Methodology Validation using **Closure Tests**, **Future Tests**, and **Parametrisation Basis Independence**
- Proton, Deuteron, and heavy Nuclear PDFs are **fitted simultaneously** in a Self-Consistent Way ⇔ **Fitting Smoothly the** A**-dependence**

$$\chi^2_{\text{tot}} = \sum_A \chi^2_{t_0}(A)$$

Dataset	NNPDF4.0	Integrated
NMC	1.63	1.62
HERACOMB	1.18	1.16
CDF	1.29	1.24
ATLAS	1.57	1.38
CMS	1.44	1.53
LHCb	1.54	1.46

Dataset	nNNPDF3.0	Integrated
NMC	0.88	1.61
SLAC	1.09	1.38
EMC	0.78	1.80
FNAL	1.01	0.50
BCDMS	0.82	1.35
LHC	1.09	1.15

[NNPDF, in preparation; slide by courtesy of T.R. Rabemananjara]

Prospect: *integrated* proton and nuclear PDF fits



$A = 1$: generally good agreement, although further optimisation is still needed

Prospect: *integrated* proton and nuclear PDF fits



$A > 1$: generally good agreement, although better for Lead than for Iron

Challenge: nuclear data sets are somewhat limited



About 50% of the data are for Pb

Good coverage of DIS measurements for different A (but only fixed-target)
DY data on nuclear targets are more scarce, but the A coverage is fair
Hadronic observables are available only for heavy nuclei

For example, nPDFs are a major source of uncertainty in testing small-system energy loss with OO [PRL 126 (2021) 192301; PRD 105 (2022) 074040]

Light-ion runs at the LHC could:
complement other light-nuclei DY data with W and Z production (strangeness)
give first direct constraint (dijets, D-mesons) on light-nuclei (small-x) distributions

Example: pO dijet production at 9.9 TeV (CMS), however, there are two problems
absolute cross sections very sensisitve to the used free-proton PDF
a pp reference is not expected at 9.9 TeV, therefore no cancellations occur

Prospect: two new experimental facilities are on sight

The Electron-Ion Collider (EIC)



NC $e^- N$ DIS

in a wide kinematic region



variety of nuclear targets (He, Cu, Au)

The Forward Physics Facility (FPF)



CC νN DIS

in a restricted kinematic region



single nuclear target envisioned (W)

Nuclear PDFs at the EIC (nNNPDF2.0)







Impact from pseudodata [PRD 103 (2021) 096005]

e^-N CC DIS, N=^{4}He, ^{12}C, ^{40}Ca, ^{64}Cu, ^{197}Au

$E_\ell \times E_p$ [GeV]: 18× 100; 10× 110; 5× 41

$\mathcal{L} = 10$ fb^{-1}; $\sigma_u = 1.5/2.3\%$; $\sigma_c = 2.5/4.3\%$

Nuclear PDFs at the FPF (EPPS21)



Impact from pseudodata

$\nu/\bar{\nu}$N CC DIS, N=^{74}W

Statistical uncertainties only

FASERν setup

$E_\ell > 100$ GeV ($\delta E_\ell = 30\%$)

$\tan\theta < 0.5$ ($\delta\theta = 1$ mrad)

Hessian profiling of EPPS21

[The FPF Collaboration, in progress, slide by courtesy of J. Rojo]

3. Conclusions

Summary

Ample progress in incorporating new data in global nPDF fits
LHCb pPb/pp D^0-meson production data puts unprecedented constraints on the gluon nPDF
which shows evidence of shadowing and antishadowing

Work in progress towards more global NNLO fits
this requires developments in Monte Carlo generators to handle asymmetric pN collisions

Ongoing work to understand correlations between proton and nuclear PDF analyses
promising integrated QCD fits are ongoing

The future will possibly bring a wealth of precise new measurements
LHC Run III, sPHENIX, SMOG@LHCb, FoCal@ALICE, EIC, FPF

Summary

Ample progress in incorporating new data in global nPDF fits
LHCb pPb/pp D^0-meson production data puts unprecedented constraints on the gluon nPDF which shows evidence of shadowing and antishadowing

Work in progress towards more global NNLO fits
this requires developments in Monte Carlo generators to handle asymmetric pN collisions

Ongoing work to understand correlations between proton and nuclear PDF analyses
promising integrated QCD fits are ongoing

The future will possibly bring a wealth of precise new measurements
LHC Run III, sPHENIX, SMOG@LHCb, FoCal@ALICE, EIC, FPF

Thank you