Short-Range Correlation Results from Inclusive Electron Scattering

NOTE: Modern interpretation of the inclusive Results Lean Heavily On Other Reactions This Does Not Lesson The Importance Of The Inclusive, Just Whole Is Greater Then the Sum Of Parts

> Presented by Douglas Higinbotham Jefferson Lab

Important Acknowledgement:

Several key people who have been working on this topic that couldn't make it to this meeting and sent me slides and/or had useful discussions with me:

Dr. Burcu Duran Prof. Nadia Fomin Dr. Shujie Li Dr. Dien Nguyen Dr. Dave Gaskell Dr. John Arrington and almost Dr. Casey Morean

My apologies to anyone I forgot to list!



(e,e'p) Electron Scattering Kinematics



Four-momentum transfer: $Q^2 \equiv -q_{\mu}q^{\mu} = q^2 - \omega^2$

 $Q^{-} = -q_{\mu}q^{\mu} = q^{-} - c$

Missing momentum:

Energy Transfer:

Bjorken x:

$$\boldsymbol{p}_{m} = \boldsymbol{q} - \boldsymbol{p} = \boldsymbol{p}_{A-1}$$

$$\omega = e - e'$$

 $x_{\rm B} = Q^2/2m\omega$ (determined by kinematics)

Douglas Higinbotham

Jefferson Lab

(e,e') Electron Scattering Kinematics

e′ scattering plane e

Four-momentum transfer: $Q^2 \equiv -q_{\mu}q^{\mu} = q^2 - \omega^2$

Energy Transfer: $\omega = e - e'$ Bjorken x: $x_B = Q^2/2m\omega$ (determined by kinematics)

Douglas Higinbotham



A(e,e') at Fixed Q^2 vs. ω



Real Electron Scattering Data

Data from the BONUS Experiment in CLAS / Hall B at Jefferson Lab



Nuclear Charge Distributions

In '70s large data set was acquired on elastic electron scattering (mainly here at Saclay) over large Q²-range and for variety of nuclei.







Realistic Momentum Distribution

Benhar et al., Phys. Lett. B 177 (1986) 135.



Douglas Higinbotham



Momentum Distributions

C. Ciofi degli Att and S. Simula, Phys. Rev. C 53 (1996) 1689.



Douglas Higinbotham



A Toy Model Momentum Distribution



By Uncertainty Principle High Momentum Region Dominated by Short Distance Phenomena



Modern AV18 and Urbana-X Results

R. Wiringa, R. Schiavilla, S. Pieper, and J. Carlson, Phys. Rev. C89 (2014) 024305.





Example of Nuclear Scaling Plateaus

K. Sh. Egiyan *et al.,* Phys. Rev. C **68** (2003) 014313.

Originally done with SLAC data by D.B. Day *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C 48 (1993) 2451-2461.



These two papers are highlighted as <u>Physical Review C 50th Anniversary Milestones</u>

Douglas Higinbotham



6 GeV Jlab Results From Hall-C

N. Fomin et. al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108 (2012) 092502.



Douglas Higinbotham



Measurement of ⁴⁰Ca and ⁴⁸Ca

D. Nguyen et al., Phys. Rev. C 102 (2020) 064004



NOTE: It was noted in this work that of the 3H/3He ratio would be 0.75 for isospin independence and 1 for np dominance.



Hall A Tritium Gas Target System





Plateaus in A/D ratios



E02-019 data from N. Fomin et. al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108 (2012) 092502.

16



Extract np/pp SRC Fraction From 3H/3He Ratio

S. Li et al., Nature 609 (2022) 41–45.



This result implies a complex structure in the high-momentum wavefunction of 3H & 3He.



Three Nucleon Correlations (not yet)

DH and Or Hen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 114 (2015) 16, 169201.



New High Q2, x>2 data being taken in Hall C right now.

Donal B. Day, Leonid L. Frankfurt, **Misak M. Sargsian, Mark I. Strikman**, Phys.Rev.C 107 (2023) 014319 Shows we should use alpha 3N instead of x_B and predicts the new data should see 3N plateaus.





The EMC Effect

- EMC effect is simply the fact the ratio of DIS *inclusive* cross sections is not one
 - J.J. Aubert et al. PLB 123 (1983) 275.
 - Simple Parton Counting Expects One
 - MANY Explanations
- SLAC E139
 - J. Gomez et al., PRD 49 (1994) 4348.
 - Precise large-x data
 - Nuclei from A=4 to 197
- Conclusions from SLAC data
 - Q²-independent
 - Universal x-dependence (shape)
 - Magnitude varies with A
 - Average Nuclear Density Effect





New Jefferson Lab EMC Effect Data

J. Seely et al., Phys, Rev. Lett. 103 (2009) 202301.



Jefferson Lab

х

New Jefferson Lab EMC Effect Data

J. Seely et al., Phys, Rev. Lett. 103 (2009) 202301.



- Plot shows slope of ratio σ_A/σ_D at EMC region.
- EMC effect correlated with **local densit**y not average density.



Holistic View of the EMC & SRC Data

D. Higinbotham *et al.*, arXiv:1003.4497.



Scaling plateaus (a_{2N}) are due to proton-nucleon local density correlations

R. Subedi et al., Science 320 (2008) 1476-1478.

• So are the EMC slopes ($x_B < 0.7$) and a_{2N} ($x_B > 1.5$) correlated?!



But "Nuclear" x_B > 1 Results Having Nothing To Do With "Deep Inelastic" x_B < 1 EMC Effect Results; that would be like comparing ducks and beavers!!







"When the explore returned from Australia, the good people of England, having seen all the animals in the world, demanded to know if it was a duck or a beaver. They were asking the wrong question!" — Rolf G. Winter, Introduction to Quantum Physics



SRC and EMC Correlation

L. Weinstein et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 106 (2011) 052301.



EMC Slopes & SRC Plateaus



Douglas Higinbotham

Jefferson Lab

The EMC effect still puzzles after 30 years (*now 40 years*) DH, Gerald A Miller, Or Hen, and Klaus Rith, CERN Cour. 53N4 (2013), 24



More Data Being Taken Right Now!

EMC, E12-10-008 and x>1, E12-06-105)



With thanks to Dave Meekins for his new solid target ladder!





Summary

- Inclusive Election Scattering Data Having Provided Both Valuable Insights As Well As Amazing Puzzles
- As I Think Will Become Very Clear, True Insight Comes From Making Use Of Multiple Reactions To Truly Gain Insights Into The Nucleus
- New Inclusive EMC (x<1) and SRC (x>1) Experiments Running RIGHT NOW with 12GeV Jefferson Lab
- In the future, we 2nd generation ³H & ³He with CLAS12
- Looking to further future (discussions on Thursday):
 - Upgrade the dump in Hall A and/or C to 2 MW instead of 1 MW
 - Upgrade the energy reach of JLab to 22 GeV (circa 2040)





So the good experimentalists and theorists finally agreed it wasn't just protons and a neutrons. It was a nucleus!



