

Dijet azimuthal correlations in p-p and p-Pb collisions at forward LHC calorimeters

M. Abdullah Al-Mashad ^a A. van Hameren ^c H. Kakkad ^d P. Kotko ^d
K. Kutak ^{c,e} P. van Mechelen ^b S. Sapeta ^c

^a *Fayoum University, Center for High Energy Physics (CHEP-FU),
Department of Physics, Faculty of Science,
Fayoum 63514, Egypt*

^b *Antwerp University, Particle Physics group
Groenenborgerlaan 171, 2020 Antwerpen, Belgium*

^c *Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences
Radzikowskiego 152, 31-342 Kraków, Poland*

^d *AGH University Of Science and Technology,
Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science,
al. Mickiewicza 30, 30-059 Kraków, Poland*

^e *Brookhaven National Laboratory,
Physics Department, Bldg. 510A,
20 Pennsylvania Street, 30-059 Upton, NY 11973 USA*

Abstract

We present a state-of-the-art computation for the production of forward dijets in proton-proton and proton-lead collisions at the LHC, in rapidity domains covered by the ATLAS calorimeter and the planned FoCal extension of the ALICE detector. We use the small- x improved TMD (iTMD) formalism, together with collinearly improved TMD gluon distributions and full b -space Sudakov resummation, and discuss nonperturbative corrections due to hadronization and showers using the PYTHIA event generator. We observe that forward dijets in proton-nucleus collisions at moderately low p_T are excellent probes of saturation effects, as the Sudakov resummation does not alter the suppression of the cross section.

1 Introduction

One of the current experimental challenges in Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) are searches for clean signals of gluon saturation, i.e. a signature of gluon recombination in a dense nuclear system. Gluon saturation has been predicted from QCD long time ago [1] and has been systematically studied over the years, in particular using the Color Glass Condensate (CGC) effective theory (see e.g. [2]). Although there is no doubt that the growth of gluon distributions has to be tamed at some point due to the unitarity of a scattering matrix, and while there are strong hints for occurrence of saturation in data [3–10] (see [11] for a review), there is no complete consensus on how the very small x limit is reached. Moreover, it is expected to see the onset of Balitsky-Fadin-Kuraev-Lipatov (BFKL) dynamics [12,13], even before saturation dynamics. One example is Mueller-Navalet jet production [14–16] in the k_T factorization formalism [17] (see also [18] for recent

developments) [19] for BFKL resummation in collinear factorization or central-forward inclusive jets at the LHC [20–22].

However, there is an important difference between BFKL and saturation physics, which could potentially allow for saturation to be seen more directly. Saturation phenomena manifest themselves through the high energy evolution equations, similar to BFKL, but nonlinear (the Balitsky-Kovchegov (BK) equation [23, 24] and the B-JIMWLK equations [23, 25–31]). The strength of the nonlinearity taming the growth of gluon distributions strongly depends on the target size – for large systems with A nuclei it is expected to be enhanced by roughly $A^{1/3}$. Therefore, comparing observables computable within the high energy QCD limit for a proton and for large nuclear targets is potentially the best way to find evidence for saturation. Such dependence of the cross section for production of forward π^0 in p+A was recently reported in [32], providing strong signs of saturation. It is important to mention that there might be other mechanisms giving suppression of nuclear parton distribution functions (PDFs), notably the so-called leading twist nuclear shadowing [33] which is used within collinear factorization. However, at present its connection to saturation is unclear, although one has to keep in mind that the saturation for dijet production is also the leading power effect.

In our work we are interested in dijet production as a probe of saturation (see [34–38] for earlier works on this subject) in hadro-production. We thus require the final state partons to have rather large transverse momenta P_T . Naturally, the scale set by the jets is larger than the saturation scale Q_s , but not asymptotically larger, so that the saturation effects are not neglected. Such limit is well defined within the CGC theory, and is precisely the leading power limit $k_T/P_T \ll 1$, where k_T is the dijet imbalance [39]. In our computations we go beyond the leading power, by including the kinematic twists – such approach gives more precise predictions for the dijet correlation spectra. The adequate formalism is known as the small- x improved Transverse Momentum Dependent (ITMD) factorization [40, 41] (for further developments of both the ITMD and the leading power limit see [42–52]).

For dijet imbalance observables it is necessary to perform a suitable resummation of the Sudakov logs. This can be done in at least two ways. First method relies on including the Sudakov form factor as a source of the hard scale evolution, similar to what is being done in parton shower algorithms. Such approach has been used for instance in [38, 53–55]. Another approach relies on the soft gluon resummation technique in b -space [56, 57], which in general provides resummation beyond simple double Sudakov logs (see e.g. [9, 58, 59]). In the present work, we shall apply the full b -space resummation approach, as a current state-of-the-art result.

Forward jets have been already measured at LHC, with inconclusive result regarding the saturation signal. For example, the CMS-CASTOR calorimeter [60] measured single inclusive jets [61] in proton-lead collision, but the lack of the proton-proton study makes it very difficult to assess if saturation is present. This is mainly due to the fact that at present all saturation-based calculations are parton-level and thus the comparison with data is burdened with large uncertainties [62–64]. Further, the ATLAS collaboration measured forward-forward and forward-central dijets [65] for both proton-proton and proton-lead, but no cross section measurement has been done, and thus no nuclear modification ratio was provided. The visible nuclear broadening has been claimed to be negligible within the error bars, despite being consistent with saturation and Sudakov resummation [55]. Finally, the CMS collaboration recently measured exclusive dijet production [66] in ultra-peripheral collisions, where, again, only the photon-lead sample is studied, without a photon-proton reference. Interestingly, a comparison with a Monte Carlo describing the photoproduction on proton targets seems to imply strong nuclear broadening.

In the present work we provide predictions for a potential new study of forward dijets with ATLAS FCal kinematics, as well as for the planned FoCal upgrade of ALICE [67], assuming that both proton-proton and proton-lead cross sections will be measured. Our paper is organized as follows. In the next Section we briefly review the ITMD framework and modify it accordingly to include the Sudakov resummation. Next, in Section 3 we specify our kinematic cuts in detail and present our results. We delegate the discussion of the results to Section 4.

2 Small- x Improved TMD Factorization

The ITMD factorization formula for the production of two jets with momenta p_1 and p_2 , and rapidities y_1 and y_2 , reads

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\text{pA} \rightarrow j_1 j_2 + X}}{d^2 P_T d^2 k_T dy_1 dy_2} = \sum_{a,c,d} x_p f_{a/p}(x_p, \mu) \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{K}_{ag^* \rightarrow cd}(P_T, k_T; \mu) \Phi_{ag \rightarrow cd}^{(i)}(x_A, k_T), \quad (1)$$

where for jets with transverse momenta \vec{p}_{T1} and \vec{p}_{T2} we defined $\vec{P}_T = \vec{p}_{T1} - \vec{p}_{T2}$ and the dijet transverse momentum imbalance $\vec{k}_T = \vec{p}_{T1} + \vec{p}_{T2}$. The longitudinal fractions of partons extracted from proton and nucleus are, respectively, x_p and x_A , with a restriction that $x_A \ll x_p$. Furthermore, $f_{a/p}$ are collinear PDFs, $\mathcal{K}_{ag^* \rightarrow cd}$ are off-shell gauge invariant hard factors and $\Phi_{ag \rightarrow cd}^{(i)}$ are the TMD gluon distributions that correspond to distinct color flows for each partonic channel. The hard factors and the TMD gluon distributions were computed in [40].

The resummation of the Sudakov logarithms is performed following the perturbative calculation presented in [56], where the calculations have been done in the impact parameter space (here, the impact parameter b_T is the Fourier conjugate to the gluon k_T). The derivation has been done in the back-to-back regime, that is to leading power. Since the Sudakov factors are negligible for $k_T \sim P_T$, it can be straightforwardly extended to the ITMD formula (1).

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma^{\text{pA} \rightarrow j_1 j_2 + X}}{d^2 P_T d^2 k_T dy_1 dy_2} &= \sum_{a,c,d} x_p \sum_{i=1}^2 \mathcal{K}_{ag^* \rightarrow cd}^{(i)}(P_T, k_T; \mu) \\ &\times \int db_T b_T J_0(b_T k_T) f_{a/p}(x_p, \mu_b) \tilde{\Phi}_{ag \rightarrow cd}^{(i)}(x_A, b_T) e^{-S^{ag \rightarrow cd}(\mu, b_\perp)}, \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}_{ag \rightarrow cd}^{(i)}$ is the Fourier transform of the TMD gluon distributions and $S^{ag \rightarrow cd}$ are the Sudakov factors defined below. The scale μ_b is essentially the inverse of the impact parameter:

$$\mu_b = 2e^{-\gamma_E}/b_* \quad (3)$$

with

$$b_* = b_T / \sqrt{1 + b_T^2/b_{\text{max}}^2}. \quad (4)$$

With such a choice, the scale μ_b freezes in the limit of large b_T , where it takes the value $2e^{-\gamma_E}/b_{\text{max}} \gg \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$. Following Ref. [68], in our calculation we shall use the value $b_{\text{max}} = 0.5 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$.

For each channel, the Sudakov factors can be written as

$$S^{ab \rightarrow cd}(\mu, b_\perp) = \sum_{i=a,b,c,d} S_p^i(\mu, b_\perp) + \sum_{i=a,c,d} S_{np}^i(\mu, b_\perp), \quad (5)$$

where S_p^i and S_{np}^i are the perturbative and non-perturbative contributions. It was argued in Ref. [59], that the non-perturbative Sudakov should not be included for a small- x parton b . The perturbative Sudakov factors, including double and single logarithms, are given by [56, 57]

$$S_p^{qg \rightarrow qg}(\mu, b_\perp) = \int_{\mu_b^2}^{\mu^2} \frac{dq_T^2}{q_T^2} \left[2(C_F + C_A) \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \ln \left(\frac{\mu^2}{q_T^2} \right) - \left(\frac{3}{2} C_F + C_A \beta_0 \right) \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right], \quad (6)$$

$$S_p^{gg \rightarrow gg}(\mu, b_\perp) = \int_{\mu_b^2}^{\mu^2} \frac{dq_T^2}{q_T^2} \left[4C_A \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \ln \left(\frac{\mu^2}{q_T^2} \right) - 3C_A \beta_0 \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right], \quad (7)$$

where $\beta_0 = (11 - 2n_f/N_c)/12$. The $gg \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ channel is negligible for the kinematic domain of this study¹.

Let us notice, that in (2) the collinear PDF depends on the impact parameter. This complicates the Monte Carlo implementation of the factorization approach. Therefore we investigate a choice

¹The single logarithm accuracy terms have been recently obtained at leading power within the small- x CGC formalism for di-jet production in e-A at NLO accuracy [69].

of the factorization scale, which is independent on b_T . As argued for example in [70] this formally introduces a threshold-type logarithmic term. The real impact of this term in the kinematic domain under study is however difficult to judge, without concrete computations. Setting $\mu_b = \mu$, the collinear PDF factorizes outside the b -space integral and we can define the hard scale-dependent TMD gluon distribution as

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{ag \rightarrow cd}^{(i)}(x, k_\perp, \mu) &= \int db_\perp \int dk'_\perp b_\perp k'_\perp J_0(b_\perp k'_\perp) J_0(b_\perp k_\perp) \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{F}_{g^*/B}(x, k'_\perp) e^{-S^{ag \rightarrow cd}(\mu, b_\perp)}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The above TMD gluon distribution can then be straightforwardly used in the factorization formula (1). The hard scale μ in the dijet production process is provided by the jet transverse momentum. Specifically, in our computations we shall use the the average p_T of the two leading jets.

In order to compare the above approach to the full b -space resummation, we apply the following procedure, that can be relatively easily implemented in a Monte Carlo program. First one generates events in the simplified approach with $\mu_b = \mu$. Then, just for the generated space phase points, one calculates the following quantity:

$$\begin{aligned} (f_{a/p} \otimes \Phi_{ag \rightarrow cd}^{(i)})(x_p, x, k_\perp, \mu) &= \int db_\perp \int dk'_\perp b_\perp k'_\perp J_0(b_\perp k'_\perp) J_0(b_\perp k_\perp) \\ &\quad \times f_{a/p}(x_p, \mu_b) \mathcal{F}_{g^*/B}(x, k'_\perp) e^{-S^{ag \rightarrow cd}(\mu, b_\perp)}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Finally, in order to obtain the full b -space resummation, one reweighs the events with a ratio

$$\frac{(f_{a/p} \otimes \Phi_{ag \rightarrow cd}^{(i)})(x_p, x, k_\perp, \mu)}{f_{a/p}(x_p, \mu) \Phi_{ag \rightarrow cd}^{(i)}(x, k_\perp, \mu)}. \quad (10)$$

As we shall see in the next Section, both approaches give very similar results, validating the simplified approach for forward dijet production processes.

3 Numerical results

In this section we present our results for:

- differential cross sections as a function of the azimuthal angle $\Delta\Phi$ between the leading and sub-leading jets, both for p-p and p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8.16$ TeV,
- nuclear modification ratios, necessary to quantify saturation effects, defined as:

$$R_{p\text{-Pb}} = \frac{d\sigma^{p+Pb}}{A \frac{d\sigma^{p+p}}{d\mathcal{O}}}. \quad (11)$$

The partonic cross sections were calculated using the KATIE Monte Carlo program [71] within the ITMD factorization scheme introduced above, for the following set of cuts on the transverse momenta p_{T1}, p_{T2} of the two leading jets:

- i)* $28 \text{ GeV} < p_{T1}, p_{T2} < 35 \text{ GeV}$,
- ii)* $35 \text{ GeV} < p_{T1}, p_{T2} < 45 \text{ GeV}$,
- iii)* $35 \text{ GeV} < p_{T1} < 45 \text{ GeV}$ and $28 \text{ GeV} < p_{T2} < 35 \text{ GeV}$,
- iv)* $p_{T1}, p_{T2} > 10 \text{ GeV}$.

The first three cuts are tailored to the FCal calorimeter of the ATLAS detector for which jets were considered in the rapidity range $2.7 < y_1^*, y_2^* < 4.0$ in both the proton-proton and the proton-nucleon center of mass frame. The last set of cuts is for the planned ALICE upgrade FoCal and are used in the rapidity range $3.8 < y_1^*, y_2^* < 5.1$. The positive rapidity windows correspond to

a positive z -component for the proton momentum in p-Pb collisions. The jets were defined using the anti- k_T jet clustering algorithm [72] with a radius parameter $R = 0.4$. The factorization and renormalization scales have been set to $(p_{T1} + p_{T2})/2$. The shaded bands in Fig. 3 represent the error due to the variation of this value by a factor of 1/2 and 2.

In our computation within the ITMD framework, we included the following partonic channels, for five quark flavors:

$$qg^* \longrightarrow qg, \quad gg^* \longrightarrow gg, \quad (12)$$

where the $*$ represents the off-shell gluon. The channel $gg^* \longrightarrow \bar{q}q$ was neglected as the contribution of this channel is small in considered kinematics [36, 42]. The gluon distributions necessary for the ITMD framework calculated in [42] were based on the Kutak-Sapeta (KS) fit of the dipole gluon density [36]. For the collinear PDFs in the ITMD framework, we used CTEQ10NLO set [73] from LHAPDF6 [74].

The cross sections computed in the ITMD framework are obtained at the parton level. In order to estimate the effects due to the final state shower as well as hadronization, we use the PYTHIA Monte Carlo event generator [75, 76] version 8.307 with the default tunes. We used the NNPDF23NLO set [77] to describe the proton structure, and nCTEQ15WZ set [78] for the nuclear PDF necessary for the simulation of p-Pb collisions. The detailed procedure as follows:

1. we simulate p-p collisions at parton level with the Initial State (IS) shower only using PYTHIA; such setup is supposed to include similar physics to the KATIE simulation, because the TMD gluon distributions mimic the IS showers,
2. we turn on the Final State (FS) shower, hadronization and MPI effects; by comparing this with the previous calculation we estimate the correction factor,
3. we apply similar procedure to p-Pb process,
4. we superimpose the correction factors to the KATIE results, to obtain hadron-level cross sections.

In Fig. 1 we show the results of the calculations, both for the ATLAS and ALICE kinematic region, using the ITMD factorisation formula with the Sudakov resummation in the simplified scheme of Eq. (1), as compared to calculations based on the full b -space resummation Eq. (2). The calculations are done both for p-p and p-Pb systems. We see that, overall, the results are similar. However, the full b -space resummation gives slightly less decorrelation than the factorized approach. Within the accuracy of our LO predictions, both approaches can be treated on equal footing. This is evident from Fig. 3, where we see that within the uncertainties obtained by varying the factorization/renormalization scales, the difference between full b -space and the factorized Sudakov form factor washes out. In addition, the difference between both Sudakov resummation schemes cancels to large extent in the ratio of p-Pb and p-p cross sections.

In Fig. 2 we compare results obtained within the ITMD approach to PYTHIA calculations. We use only the factorized Sudakov resummation for simplicity. We observe that parton-level PYTHIA results, with only the initial-state shower applied, are above the ITMD results, and attribute this to the difference between linear and nonlinear evolutions. One can also see that the ITMD results for the p-p and p-Pb spectra approach each other at small $\Delta\Phi$, while the PYTHIA results are shifted by a constant value for all values of $\Delta\Phi$. The behavior of the ITMD result is an expected manifestation of saturation effects. They are larger at large $\Delta\Phi$, leading to a more pronounced difference between the p-p and p-Pb curves at larger values of $\Delta\Phi$. The final state shower, hadronization and MPI, essentially decrease the cross section, not changing the distribution shape too much, especially for larger transverse momenta.

The extracted correction factors are applied to the KATIE results, see Fig. 3 (see also comparison with PYTHIA results in Fig. 2). The error bands for calculations with the correction factor are combinations of the scale variation error and the statistical error from PYTHIA.

In Fig. 4 we show the results for nuclear modification ratio R_{pA} which determines the strength of suppression due to the saturation effects as one goes from a proton to a nuclear target. First of all we see that the suppression is quite large, about 20%, for the FoCal upgrade of ALICE. The saturation signal persists even after including the correction due to the hadronization and other




Figure 1: The differential cross sections in the azimuthal angle between the two hardest jets, $\Delta\Phi$, for p-p and p-Pb collisions computed from KATIE using the ITMD factorisation formula with: the simplified Sudakov resummation Eq. (1) (solid lines), the full b -space resummation Eq. (2) (dotted lines). The top two and the bottom left plots correspond to FCal ATLAS kinematics, while the bottom right plot corresponds to the FoCal upgrade of ALICE.

effects, which is an important result. The second important observation is that the difference between the full b -space Sudakov resummation and the simplified approach cancels out to large degree in the nuclear modification ratio. Thus, the saturation signal is not much affected by the details of the Sudakov suppression of the back-to-back peak. For ATLAS kinematics, which is restricted to a slightly more central region, we see similar trends as for ALICE kinematics but the suppression due to saturation is smaller.

4 Summary

We provided state-of-the-art predictions for the cross-sections and the nuclear modification ratio R_{pA} for di-jet production in forward-forward jets in kinematic domains covered by the FCal ATLAS detector and the planned FoCal upgrade of the ALICE experiment. The calculation is based on application of the ITMD factorization approach implementing the saturation and the kinematic twist corrections, together with the Sudakov resummation necessary for realistic description of azimuthal observables in jet production processes. The Sudakov form factor was implemented using two approaches, a simplified approach, where the collinear PDF describing the dilute projectile is factorized and the full b -space resummation affecting also the latter. Both frameworks give results that are close to each other for the considered kinematics with the ITMD result being below the PYTHIA result. As the ITMD calculation is a parton level calculation, we used PYTHIA in order to estimate corrections for hadronization, FSR shower and MPI effects. For nuclear targets, we




Figure 2: The differential cross sections in the azimuthal angle between the two hardest jets, $\Delta\Phi$, for p-p and p-Pb collisions computed using KATIE with the ITMD approach (solid lines), PYTHIA with various components (points) and the KATIE with the non-perturbative correction factor extracted from PYTHIA (dotted lines). The top two and the bottom left plots correspond to the FCal ATLAS kinematics, the bottom right plot corresponds to the FoCal upgrade of the ALICE.




Figure 3: The solid lines represent the differential cross sections in the azimuthal angle between the two hardest jets, $\Delta\Phi$, for p-p and p-Pb collisions computed using KATIE and the ITMD approach. The error bands represents uncertainty due to scale variation from $(p_{T1} + p_{T2})/2$ by a factor of 1/2 and 2. The dotted lines represent the differential cross sections taking into account the non-perturbative correction factors from PYTHIA. Similarly, the lower band represent uncertainty due to scale variation multiplied by the correction factor, taking into account statistical errors from PYTHIA. The top two and the bottom left plots correspond to the FCal ATLAS kinematics, the bottom right plot corresponds to the FoCal upgrade of the ALICE.




Figure 4: Nuclear modification ratio R_{p-Pb} as a function of the azimuthal angle between the jets $\Delta\Phi$ for the FCal ATLAS and ALICE FoCal kinematics. The error bands represents uncertainty associated with the KATIE ITMD results due to the variation of the factorization scale from $(p_{T1} + p_{T2})/2$ by a factor of $1/2$ and 2 . The ∇ points represent R_{p-Pb} obtained from KATIE multiplied by the non-perturbative correction factors from PYTHIA. The error bars associated with these account for both the error in KATIE via the variation of factorization scale plus the statistical uncertainties associated with the correction factors.

used the nuclear PDFs in PYTHIA to simulate the correction factor. The correction factor is not much sensitive to the actual PDF used. Therefore using the correction factor extracted from nuclear PDFs that do not – at least explicitly – have saturation effects on the top of the ITMD saturation framework is a rough but realistic estimate. We conclude that, taking into the account all the uncertainties, the measurement of the nuclear modification ratio will allow to determine the suppression due to saturation effects.

5 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Jacek Otwinowski, Anne Sickless, Peter Steinberg, Marco Van Leeuwen for stimulating discussions and Riccardo Longo, Farid Salazar and Bowen Xiao for useful correspondence.

KK acknowledges the hospitality of the Nuclear Theory group at the BNL where part of the project was realized.

This work is supported partially by grant V03319N from the common FWO-PAS exchange program. MAA is supported by Science, Technology & Innovation Funding Authority (STDF), Egypt under Project ID: 30163. AvH acknowledges the Polish National Science Centre grant no. 2019/35/B/ST2/03531. HK is supported by the National Science Centre, Poland grant no. 2021/41/N/ST2/02956. PK is supported by the Polish National Science Centre, grant no. DEC-2020/39/O/ST2/03011. KK acknowledges the Polish National Science Centre grant no. DEC-2017/27/B/ST2/01985.

References

- [1] L.V. Gribov, E.M. Levin, and M.G. Ryskin. Semihard Processes in QCD. *Phys. Rept.*, 100:1–150, 1983.
- [2] Francois Gelis, Edmond Iancu, Jamal Jalilian-Marian, and Raju Venugopalan. The Color Glass Condensate. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, 60:463–489, 2010.
- [3] Krzysztof J. Golec-Biernat and M. Wusthoff. Saturation effects in deep inelastic scattering at low Q^2 and its implications on diffraction. *Phys. Rev. D*, 59:014017, 1998.
- [4] A. M. Stasto, Krzysztof J. Golec-Biernat, and J. Kwiecinski. Geometric scaling for the total $\gamma^* p$ cross-section in the low x region. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 86:596–599, 2001.
- [5] Javier L. Albacete and Cyrille Marquet. Azimuthal correlations of forward di-hadrons in d+Au collisions at RHIC in the Color Glass Condensate. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105:162301, 2010.
- [6] K. Dusling and D. Teaney. Simulating elliptic flow with viscous hydrodynamics. *Phys. Rev. C*, 77:034905, 2008.
- [7] B. Ducloué, T. Lappi, and H. Mäntysaari. Forward J/ψ production in proton-nucleus collisions at high energy. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91(11):114005, 2015.
- [8] A. Arroyo Garcia, M. Hentschinski, and K. Kutak. QCD evolution based evidence for the onset of gluon saturation in exclusive photo-production of vector mesons. *Phys. Lett. B*, 795:569–575, 2019.
- [9] Sanjin Benić, Oscar Garcia-Montero, and Anton Perkov. Isolated photon-hadron production in high energy pp and pA collisions at RHIC and LHC. *Phys. Rev. D*, 105(11):114052, 2022.
- [10] Nestor Armesto, Tuomas Lappi, Heikki Mäntysaari, Hannu Paukkunen, and Mirja Tevio. Signatures of gluon saturation from structure-function measurements. *Phys. Rev. D*, 105(11):114017, 2022.
- [11] Astrid Morreale and Farid Salazar. Mining for Gluon Saturation at Colliders. *Universe*, 7(8):312, 2021.

- [12] E. A. Kuraev, L. N. Lipatov, and Victor S. Fadin. The Pomeranchuk Singularity in Nonabelian Gauge Theories. *Sov. Phys. JETP*, 45:199–204, 1977.
- [13] I.I. Balitsky and L.N. Lipatov. The Pomeranchuk Singularity in Quantum Chromodynamics. *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.*, 28:822–829, 1978.
- [14] D. Colferai, F. Schwennsen, L. Szymanowski, and S. Wallon. Mueller Navelet jets at LHC - complete NLL BFKL calculation. *JHEP*, 12:026, 2010.
- [15] B. Ducloue, L. Szymanowski, and S. Wallon. Confronting Mueller-Navelet jets in NLL BFKL with LHC experiments at 7 TeV. *JHEP*, 05:096, 2013.
- [16] B. Ducloué, L. Szymanowski, and S. Wallon. Evidence for high-energy resummation effects in Mueller-Navelet jets at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 112:082003, 2014.
- [17] S. Catani, M. Ciafaloni, and F. Hautmann. High-energy factorization and small x heavy flavor production. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 366:135–188, 1991.
- [18] Francesco Giovanni Celiberto. Hunting BFKL in semi-hard reactions at the LHC. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 81(8):691, 2021.
- [19] Richard D. Ball, Valerio Bertone, Marco Bonvini, Simone Marzani, Juan Rojo, and Luca Rottoli. Parton distributions with small-x resummation: evidence for BFKL dynamics in HERA data. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 78(4):321, 2018.
- [20] M. Deak, F. Hautmann, H. Jung, and K. Kutak. Forward Jet Production at the Large Hadron Collider. *JHEP*, 09:121, 2009.
- [21] M. Deak, F. Hautmann, H. Jung, and K. Kutak. Forward-Central Jet Correlations at the Large Hadron Collider. 12 2010.
- [22] M. Deak, F. Hautmann, H. Jung, and K. Kutak. Forward Jets and Energy Flow in Hadronic Collisions. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 72:1982, 2012.
- [23] I. Balitsky. Operator expansion for high-energy scattering. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 463:99–160, 1996.
- [24] Yuri V. Kovchegov. Small x F(2) structure function of a nucleus including multiple pomeron exchanges. *Phys. Rev. D*, 60:034008, 1999.
- [25] Jamal Jalilian-Marian, Alex Kovner, Andrei Leonidov, and Heribert Weigert. The BFKL equation from the Wilson renormalization group. *Nucl. Phys.*, B504:415–431, 1997.
- [26] Jamal Jalilian-Marian, Alex Kovner, Andrei Leonidov, and Heribert Weigert. The Wilson renormalization group for low x physics: Towards the high density regime. *Phys. Rev.*, D59:014014, 1998.
- [27] Jamal Jalilian-Marian, Alex Kovner, and Heribert Weigert. The Wilson renormalization group for low x physics: Gluon evolution at finite parton density. *Phys. Rev.*, D59:014015, 1998.
- [28] Alex Kovner, J. Guilherme Milhano, and Heribert Weigert. Relating different approaches to nonlinear QCD evolution at finite gluon density. *Phys. Rev.*, D62:114005, 2000.
- [29] Alex Kovner and J. Guilherme Milhano. Vector potential versus color charge density in low x evolution. *Phys. Rev.*, D61:014012, 2000.
- [30] Heribert Weigert. Unitarity at small Bjorken x. *Nucl. Phys.*, A703:823–860, 2002.
- [31] Edmond Iancu, Andrei Leonidov, and Larry D. McLerran. Nonlinear gluon evolution in the color glass condensate. 1. *Nucl. Phys.*, A692:583–645, 2001.
- [32] M. S. Abdallah et al. Evidence for Nonlinear Gluon Effects in QCD and Their Mass Number Dependence at STAR. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 129:092501, 2022.

- [33] L. Frankfurt, V. Guzey, and M. Strikman. Leading Twist Nuclear Shadowing Phenomena in Hard Processes with Nuclei. *Phys. Rept.*, 512:255–393, 2012.
- [34] Dmitri Kharzeev, Eugene Levin, and Larry McLerran. Jet azimuthal correlations and parton saturation in the color glass condensate. *Nucl. Phys. A*, 748:627–640, 2005.
- [35] Cyrille Marquet. Forward inclusive dijet production and azimuthal correlations in p(A) collisions. *Nucl. Phys. A*, 796:41–60, 2007.
- [36] Krzysztof Kutak and Sebastian Sapeta. Gluon saturation in dijet production in p-Pb collisions at Large Hadron Collider. *Phys. Rev. D*, 86:094043, 2012.
- [37] A. van Hameren, P. Kotko, K. Kutak, C. Marquet, and S. Sapeta. Saturation effects in forward-forward dijet production in p+Pb collisions. *Phys. Rev. D*, 89(9):094014, 2014.
- [38] Krzysztof Kutak. Hard scale dependent gluon density, saturation and forward-forward dijet production at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. D*, 91(3):034021, 2015.
- [39] Fabio Dominguez, Cyrille Marquet, Bo-Wen Xiao, and Feng Yuan. Universality of Unintegrated Gluon Distributions at small x . *Phys. Rev. D*, 83:105005, 2011.
- [40] P. Kotko, K. Kutak, C. Marquet, E. Petreska, S. Sapeta, and A. van Hameren. Improved TMD factorization for forward dijet production in dilute-dense hadronic collisions. *JHEP*, 09:106, 2015.
- [41] Tolga Altinoluk, Renaud Boussarie, and Piotr Kotko. Interplay of the CGC and TMD frameworks to all orders in kinematic twist. *JHEP*, 05:156, 2019.
- [42] A. van Hameren, P. Kotko, K. Kutak, C. Marquet, E. Petreska, and S. Sapeta. Forward di-jet production in p+Pb collisions in the small- x improved TMD factorization framework. *JHEP*, 12:034, 2016. [Erratum: *JHEP* 02, 158 (2019)].
- [43] C. Marquet, E. Petreska, and C. Roiesnel. Transverse-momentum-dependent gluon distributions from JIMWLK evolution. *JHEP*, 10:065, 2016.
- [44] Cyrille Marquet, Claude Roiesnel, and Pieter Taels. Linearly polarized small- x gluons in forward heavy-quark pair production. *Phys. Rev. D*, 97(1):014004, 2018.
- [45] Marcin Bury, Piotr Kotko, and Krzysztof Kutak. TMD gluon distributions for multiparton processes. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 79(2):152, 2019.
- [46] Tolga Altinoluk and Renaud Boussarie. Low x physics as an infinite twist (G)TMD framework: unravelling the origins of saturation. *JHEP*, 10:208, 2019.
- [47] Tolga Altinoluk, Renaud Boussarie, Cyrille Marquet, and Pieter Taels. TMD factorization for dijets + photon production from the dilute-dense CGC framework. *JHEP*, 07:079, 2019.
- [48] Tolga Altinoluk, Renaud Boussarie, Cyrille Marquet, and Pieter Taels. Photoproduction of three jets in the CGC: gluon TMDs and dilute limit. *JHEP*, 07:143, 2020.
- [49] Hirotsugu Fujii, Cyrille Marquet, and Kazuhiro Watanabe. Comparison of improved TMD and CGC frameworks in forward quark dijet production. *JHEP*, 12:181, 2020.
- [50] Tolga Altinoluk, Cyrille Marquet, and Pieter Taels. Low- x improved TMD approach to the lepto- and hadroproduction of a heavy-quark pair. *JHEP*, 06:085, 2021.
- [51] Renaud Boussarie, Heikki Mäntysaari, Farid Salazar, and Björn Schenke. The importance of kinematic twists and genuine saturation effects in dijet production at the Electron-Ion Collider. *JHEP*, 09:178, 2021.
- [52] Pieter Taels, Tolga Altinoluk, Guillaume Beuf, and Cyrille Marquet. Dijet photoproduction at low x at next-to-leading order and its back-to-back limit. 4 2022.

- [53] A. van Hameren, P. Kotko, K. Kutak, and S. Sapeta. Small- x dynamics in forward-central dijet decorrelations at the LHC. *Phys. Lett. B*, 737:335–340, 2014.
- [54] A. van Hameren, P. Kotko, and K. Kutak. Resummation effects in the forward production of Z_0 +jet at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. D*, 92(5):054007, 2015.
- [55] Andreas van Hameren, Piotr Kotko, Krzysztof Kutak, and Sebastian Sapeta. Broadening and saturation effects in dijet azimuthal correlations in p-p and p-Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B*, 795:511–515, 2019.
- [56] A.H. Mueller, Bo-Wen Xiao, and Feng Yuan. Sudakov double logarithms resummation in hard processes in the small- x saturation formalism. *Phys. Rev. D*, 88(11):114010, 2013.
- [57] A.H. Mueller, Bo-Wen Xiao, and Feng Yuan. Sudakov Resummation in Small- x Saturation Formalism. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110(8):082301, 2013.
- [58] L. Zheng, E. C. Aschenauer, J. H. Lee, and Bo-Wen Xiao. Probing Gluon Saturation through Dihadron Correlations at an Electron-Ion Collider. *Phys. Rev. D*, 89(7):074037, 2014.
- [59] Anna Stasto, Shu-Yi Wei, Bo-Wen Xiao, and Feng Yuan. On the Dihadron Angular Correlations in Forward pA collisions. *Phys. Lett. B*, 784:301–306, 2018.
- [60] Vardan Khachatryan et al. The very forward CASTOR calorimeter of the CMS experiment. *JINST*, 16(02):P02010, 2021.
- [61] Albert M Sirunyan et al. Measurement of inclusive very forward jet cross sections in proton-lead collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV. *JHEP*, 05:043, 2019.
- [62] Krzysztof Kutak, Hans Van Haeveermaet, and Pierre Van Mechelen. Single inclusive jet transverse momentum and energy spectra at very forward rapidity in proton-proton collisions with $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 13 TeV. *Phys. Lett. B*, 770:412–417, 2017.
- [63] Marcin Bury, Hans Van Haeveermaet, Andreas Van Hameren, Pierre Van Mechelen, Krzysztof Kutak, and Mirko Serino. Single inclusive jet production and the nuclear modification ratio at very forward rapidity in proton-lead collisions with $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV. *Phys. Lett. B*, 780:185–190, 2018.
- [64] Heikki Mäntysaari and Hannu Paukkunen. Saturation and forward jets in proton-lead collisions at the LHC. *Phys. Rev. D*, 100(11):114029, 2019.
- [65] Morad Aaboud et al. Dijet azimuthal correlations and conditional yields in pp and p+Pb collisions at $s_{NN}=5.02$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. *Phys. Rev. C*, 100(3):034903, 2019.
- [66] Azimuthal correlations within exclusive dijets with large momentum transfer in photon-lead collisions. 4 2022.
- [67] CERN ALICE Collaboration. Letter of Intent: A Forward Calorimeter (FoCal) in the ALICE experiment. Technical report, CERN, Geneva, Jun 2020.
- [68] Cyrille Marquet, Shu-Yi Wei, and Bo-Wen Xiao. Probing parton saturation with forward Z^0 -boson production at small transverse momentum in p+p and p+A collisions. *Phys. Lett. B*, 802:135253, 2020.
- [69] P. Caucal, F. Salazar, B. Schenke and R. Venugopalan, Back-to-back inclusive dijets in DIS at small x : Sudakov suppression and gluon saturation at NLO. [[arXiv:2208.13872](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.13872) [hep-ph]].
- [70] Bo-Wen Xiao and Feng Yuan. On the Threshold Resummation in Forward pA Collisions. *Phys. Lett. B*, 788:261–269, 2019.
- [71] A. van Hameren. KaTie : For parton-level event generation with k_T -dependent initial states. *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 224:371–380, 2018.

- [72] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez. The anti- k_t jet clustering algorithm. *JHEP*, (063), 04 2008.
- [73] Hung-Liang Lai, Marco Guzzi, Joey Huston, Zhao Li, Pavel M. Nadolsky, Jon Pumplin, and C.-P. Yuan. New parton distributions for collider physics. *Physical Review D*, 82(7), oct 2010.
- [74] Andy Buckley, James Ferrando, Stephen Lloyd, Karl Nordström, Ben Page, Martin Rüfenacht, Marek Schönherr, and Graeme Watt. LHAPDF6: parton density access in the LHC precision era. *The European Physical Journal C*, 75(3), mar 2015.
- [75] Torbjörn Sjöstrand, Stephen Mrenna, and Peter Z. Skands. PYTHIA 6.4 Physics and Manual. *JHEP*, 05:026, 2006.
- [76] Torbjörn Sjöstrand, Stefan Ask, Jesper R. Christiansen, et al. An Introduction to PYTHIA 8.2. *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 191:159–177, 2015.
- [77] R.D. Ball et al. Parton distributions with LHC data. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 867:244–289, 2013.
- [78] A. Kusina et al. Impact of LHC vector boson production in heavy ion collisions on strange PDFs. *Eur. Phys. J. C*, 80(968), 2020.