

Probing gluon TMDs with reconstructed and tagged heavy flavor hadron pairs at the EIC

Xin Dong,¹ Yuanjing Ji,¹ Matthew Kelsey,^{2,1} Sooraj Radhakrishnan,^{3,1,*} Ernst Sichtermann,¹ and Yuxiang Zhao^{4,5,6}

¹*Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

²*Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202, USA*

³*Kent State University, Kent, OH 44242, USA*

⁴*Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou, Gansu Province 730000, China*

⁵*University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

⁶*Key Laboratory of Quark and Lepton Physics (MOE) and Institute of Particle Physics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China*

Study of the transverse structure of the proton is one of the major physics goals of the upcoming Electron Ion Collider (EIC). The gluon transverse momentum dependent distributions (TMDs) form an essential part in understanding the angular momentum contribution to proton spin as well as QCD factorization. However, very limited experimental constraints on the gluon TMDs exist currently. As the heavy quark production in lepton-nucleon DIS gets a dominant contribution from the photon-gluon-fusion process, heavy quark production makes an attractive tool to probe gluon distributions in nucleons. In this paper we present a study of heavy flavor hadron pair reconstruction at a future EIC detector with MAPS based inner tracking and vertexing subsystems to constrain gluon TMDs. We utilize the excellent track pointing resolution provided by the detector to exclusively reconstruct heavy flavor hadron pairs via their hadronic decay channels and also to develop a heavy flavor hadron tagging algorithm. Statistical uncertainty projections on azimuthal asymmetries corresponding to gluon TMDs at the EIC is evaluated. The heavy flavor tagging is found to substantially enhance the purity of heavy flavor hadron pair selection, and the statistical precision of the measurement compared to that from exclusive reconstruction. The correlation between the azimuthal angle of the transverse momentum of the gluon initiating the process and that of the corresponding heavy flavor hadron pair was also studied and found to be well correlated. This study opens up heavy flavor hadron pair measurements as an attractive channel to access gluon TMDs at the EIC.

I. INTRODUCTION

The quarks and gluons inside hadrons have a non-trivial distribution in transverse momentum. In polarized or unpolarized hadrons they can be spin polarized with the direction and magnitude of the polarization depending on their transverse momentum, flavor and in case of polarized hadrons, the hadron polarization. These spin-orbit couplings provide for a rich transverse structure of the hadrons and also challenge our fundamental understanding of Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) in many ways [1–3]. Experimentally, they are known to contribute to the transverse single spin asymmetries (SSAs) measured in inclusive hadron production in hadron-hadron collisions and SIDIS processes [4–6]. The upcoming Electron Ion Collider (EIC), has the study of these correlations and the transverse structure of the proton as one of the major scientific goals [7, 8].

These transverse spin asymmetries can be studied within the framework of Transverse Momentum Dependent parton distribution functions (TMD PDFs) [1, 9]. However, unlike the collinear PDFs, the TMDs can be process dependent from the initial and final state processes required to preserve color gauge invariance, thus breaking universality and factorization [10, 11]. QCD

scale evolution of the TMDs although much explored theoretically is still missing an unambiguous treatment [12–15]. TMDs are thus fundamentally interesting quantities to study in non-perturbative QCD. One of the most well known and studied TMD is the Sivers asymmetry [2, 16]. The Sivers asymmetry quantifies the left-right asymmetry in the distribution of partons, with respect to the plane formed by the momentum and spin directions of the proton, in a transversely polarized proton. The Sivers asymmetry therefore plays an important role in understanding the angular momentum contribution to nucleon spin. Measurements and experimental constraints on TMDs are mostly limited to quarks [17–19]. Gluon TMDs on the other hand are poorly constrained from experimental data currently [16, 20]. The spin - orbit coupling for gluons and the gluon angular momentum contribution to proton spin as well as the gauge links and color flow associated with the gluon TMDs make them fundamentally interesting quantities to study at the EIC.

Early estimates of gluon Sivers asymmetry, normalized to the unpolarized gluon TMD, using π^0 production data in $p^\uparrow p$ collisions produced large values for momentum fractions $x > 0.001$, with the values even satisfying the positivity bound at large x [21]. Positivity bound is a trivial theoretical bound (equal to two times the unpolarized TMD), satisfied by polarized TMDs. Later estimates, however, from both hadron-hadron collision and SIDIS data gives much smaller values. Fits to SIDIS data on transverse SSA in pion and kaon production from

* skradhakrishnan@lbl.gov

HERMES [22] and COMPASS [23] experiments using quark Sivers asymmetries were found to nearly satisfy the Burkardt's sum rule, which requires that the total transverse momentum of all partons in a transversely polarized nucleon vanishes [18, 24]. This leaves little room for a gluon Sivers asymmetry, but allows for a gluon Sivers asymmetry $\sim 1/N_c$ ($N_c = 3$ being the number of colors) times the valance quark Sivers asymmetries within uncertainties [20]. The SIDIS measurements are at small negative squared momentum transfer (Q^2) values and moderately large x ($0.01 < x < 0.4$), and therefore does not allow to draw any conclusions on the gluon Sivers asymmetry values at large Q^2 and small x . The more recent COMPASS measurement for protons on the transverse SSA $A_{\text{UT}}^{\text{PGF}}$ from the photon gluon fusion (PGF) processes, which directly probes the gluon distributions, gives a large value around 0.26, with more than 2σ significance, at large x ($x \sim 0.1$) [25]. Estimates of gluon Sivers asymmetry using SSA measurements in π^0 production from most recent PHENIX measurements [26] in polarized pp collisions, using the SIDIS fits for quark asymmetries, give small values of the gluon Sivers asymmetry [16]. In the large x region, $0.05 < x < 0.3$, it estimates the normalized gluon Sivers asymmetry to be $< 0.5\%$ of the positivity bound. Here also, the caveat that for inclusive processes in proton proton collisions factorization has not been proven, remains. It should be noted that the estimates using pp data are not fits with statistical uncertainty bounds, and also do not constrain the gluon Sivers asymmetry in the lower x or high Q^2 regions.

The most promising process to study gluon Sivers asymmetry in electron-proton scattering is the heavy flavor pair-production process, $ep^\uparrow \rightarrow e'c\bar{c}X$ [20]. Selecting on the heavy (charm or bottom) quarks allows to tag the PGF process and minimize contributions from other subprocesses. Also, TMD factorization might be easier to prove for the process and is proven to hold for SIDIS processes where the hadron transverse momentum, $q_t^2 \ll Q^2$, Q^2 being the virtual mass of the proton [27]. The EIC would allow probing the process over a large range in the $x - Q^2$ space, at much smaller x and larger Q^2 values. The observation of a transverse SSA in $ep^\uparrow \rightarrow e'c\bar{c}X$ process would be a smoking gun for gluon Sivers asymmetry at the EIC [20].

Experimental constraints on gluon TMDs other than the Sivers asymmetry and the unpolarized gluon TMD are practically non-existent. However, recent theoretical studies on gluon polarization in unpolarized ep collisions, where the spin-orbit coupling can give rise to a linear polarization of the gluons, showed sizable values for the azimuthal anisotropy observables associated with the linearly polarized gluon TMDs [3, 28]. Here also, the process $ep \rightarrow e'c\bar{c}X$ is presented as providing the ideal opportunity to study the linearly polarized gluon TMDs. The magnitude of the azimuthal anisotropy in the transverse momentum distribution of the heavy flavor pair was predicted to be of the order of 10% in the

kinematic regions accessible at the EIC. These, and the fact that $ep \rightarrow e'c\bar{c}X$ provides the clean way to tag the PGF process and thus to probe the gluon distributions, makes the heavy flavor hadron pair measurements of particular interest at the EIC in the study of gluon TMDs.

The gluon Sivers asymmetry can be studied using transverse single spin asymmetry (A_{UT}) measurements in polarized ep collisions. $A_{\text{UT}}(x, Q^2)$ is defined in the standard way as [29],

$$A_{\text{UT}}(x, Q^2) = \frac{\sigma_{\text{L}}(x, Q^2) - \sigma_{\text{R}}(x, Q^2)}{\sigma_{\text{L}}(x, Q^2) + \sigma_{\text{R}}(x, Q^2)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma_{\text{L(R)}}$ are the cross sections for particle-of-interest production with spin polarized in the direction opposite to (same as) the spin of the proton, and x is the momentum fraction of the parton. The SSA is directly related to the gluon Sivers effect, $A_{\text{UT}}(x, Q^2) \propto f_{1,\text{T}}^{\perp,\text{g}}(x, Q^2)/f_1^{\text{g}}(x, Q^2)$, where $f_{1,\text{T}}^{\perp,\text{g}}$ and f_1^{g} are the gluon Sivers function and the unpolarized gluon TMD, respectively. The TMD of linearly polarized gluons can be probed through the measurements of the azimuthal anisotropy of the produced heavy flavor hadron pair momentum, $\langle \cos(2\phi_{\text{T}}) \rangle$, where ϕ_{T} is the azimuthal angle corresponding to the summed momenta of the two heavy flavor hadrons in the pair. The asymmetry is related to the linearly polarized TMD as [28],

$$\langle \cos(2\phi_{\text{T}}) \rangle|_{x,Q^2,k_{\text{T}}} \propto \frac{q_{\text{T}}^2}{2M_{\text{p}}^2} \frac{h_1^{\perp,\text{g}}(x, Q^2, k_{\text{T}})}{f_1^{\text{g}}(x, Q^2, k_{\text{T}})}, \quad (2)$$

where q_{T} is the sum of the momenta of the heavy flavor hadrons in the pair, M_{p} is the proton mass and k_{T} is the gluon transverse momentum.

In this study we present a detailed simulation study, using a realistic detector performance for an EIC detector, of using heavy flavor hadron pairs to study gluon TMDs at the EIC. Previous simulation studies have looked at heavy flavor hadron pair measurements at the EIC [29]. However, these were without including detector effects and for the heavy flavor channel, limited to explicit reconstruction of heavy flavor hadrons. We use a detector design and detector resolution parameters corresponding to a silicon tracker with vertexing and inner tracking layers using MAPS sensors [30]. We also take advantage of the excellent track pointing resolution provided by the detector to develop a heavy flavor tagging algorithm to tag heavy flavor hadrons through their displaced decay tracks. The tagging algorithm is found to have good efficiency and purity and significantly improves the precision the heavy flavor hadron pair A_{UT} measurements. The tagging algorithm developed is hadron blind utilizing only the track pointing capabilities. The paper is organized as follows. The simulation setup and detector specifications and performance are discussed in section II. The details of heavy flavor hadron pair reconstruction and tagging studies are presented in section III and detailed statistical uncertainty projections for the gluon TMD observables are provided in section IV.

II. SIMULATION SETUP

Heavy flavor hadrons have very short decay lengths, $\sim 100\mu\text{m}$. The major factor that enhances the performance of the detector in explicit reconstruction or tagging of the heavy flavor hadron decays is the track pointing resolution provided by the detector, quantified usually by the variance of the Distance of Closest Approach (DCA) of tracks to the vertex. Monolithic Active Pixel Sensors (MAPS) based tracking and vertexing systems have been employed with great success in attaining excellent track pointing resolutions and reconstruction performance for heavy flavor hadrons [31, 32]. We have studied a detector design with an all silicon MAPS based tracking system for an EIC detector [30]. It consists of a barrel detector with 3×2 layers of MAPS based silicon pixels, covering $|\eta| < 1$, and five MAPS based silicon pixel planes each in the forward and backward regions covering approximately $1 < |\eta| < 3$. The detector proposal from the ECCE collaboration [33] (and also the ATHENA proposal [34]) has a very similar tracking system as the all silicon design for the vertexing layers and inner tracking layers and disks, with some variations on the technology choice for the outer tracking layers and number of disks on forward and backward directions.

The performance of charm hadron reconstruction and utilizing heavy flavor hadron pairs for studying asymmetries corresponding to TMDs are done using a fast simulation setup. The particle level momentum and vertex position from the event generator are smeared using parameterized single track momentum and pointing resolutions corresponding to those generated using full GEANT4 [35] simulations of the all silicon detector. Such a procedure is chosen to save computing power, as the heavy flavor measurements are statistics hungry. The procedure has been used for impact projection studies on gluon nuclear PDFs and gluon helicity distributions using heavy flavor hadrons with the all silicon tracker at the EIC [36, 37]. A closure test was performed to validate the fast simulation procedure, comparing charm hadron reconstruction performance using the fast simulation with single track momentum and track pointing resolution parameters from GEANT4 simulation of the all-silicon tracker and the full reconstruction of the charm hadrons directly from the GEANT4 simulation of tracker. Good agreement has been found between the overall reconstruction efficiency of charm hadrons and also for the distribution of the different topological variables characterizing the charm hadron decay [36]. The detailed single particle momentum and track pointing resolutions as well as particle identification (PID) capabilities used in the fast-simulation study are provided in Table.1 of the article [36]. The momentum and track pointing resolutions and particle identification (PID) capabilities utilized are similar to those in the EIC Yellow Report [8]. The primary vertex (PV) resolution is determined by the GEANT4 simulation of the tracker and is evaluated as a function of event multiplicity, and then utilized for smear-

ing the PV in the fast simulation.

Events are generated for ep collisions using PYTHIA 6.4 event generator [38] that describes well the charm cross-section measurements at HERA, and was used for previous simulation studies at the EIC [29, 36]. The simulation studies are done with electron beams with energy 18 GeV and proton beams with 275 GeV. The kinematic variables used are defined in the conventional way. In the one-photon-exchange approximation, the incoming electron of four momentum e emits a virtual photon of momentum $q = e - e'$, with e' being the four momentum of the outgoing electron. The virtual photon then interacts with the hadron beam with four momentum p . The hadron momentum is taken to be along the positive z direction in the simulation. The Bjorken scaling variable is $x_B = Q^2/(2p \cdot q)$ and $Q^2 \equiv -q^2$ is negative of the square of the four momentum transfer. The inelasticity $y = pq/(pe)$. The events generated are required to have $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $0.005 < y < 0.95$. For the purposes of these studies we do not include any radiative corrections to the incoming/scattered lepton. The details of the event generation set up are same as those used in the previous study [36]. The coordinates in the study are kept in lab frame.

An example of D^0 meson reconstruction using the detector simulation is shown in Fig 1. D^0 mesons are reconstructed through the $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ channel and its charge conjugate. The D^0 mesons have a $c\tau$ of approximately $120 \mu\text{m}$ [39]. The excellent track pointing resolution offered by the tracking detector allows to place selection cuts on variables characterizing the decay topology to improve the signal to background ratio and the signal significance. The track pointing resolution utilized in the fast-simulation is better in the transverse ($r - \phi$) plane than the z -direction, and for these studies the topological variables used for selection cuts are in the transverse plane. Future studies could be conducted with more mature detector design parametrizations, combining the selections in both $r - \phi$ and z directions to improve the performance. Cuts on the transverse distance between the PV and the reconstructed vertex of the $K\pi$ pair (decaylength), the distance of closest approach (DCA) between the $K\pi$ pairs (pairDCA) and the cosine of the angle between the D^0 candidate momentum and the vector joining the PV and D^0 candidate vertex in the transverse plane ($\cos \theta$) are utilized. Fig1 shows the $K\pi$ pair invariant mass distribution without any cuts on the decay topology and with the cuts. The background is from random $K\pi$ pair combinations from tracks in the event which include all stable charged particle tracks from the PYTHIA event, within the detector acceptance. The cuts employed for D^0 reconstruction are decaylength $> 40 \mu\text{m}$, pairDCA $< 150 \mu\text{m}$, $\cos \theta > 0.98$. The topological selection cuts improves the S/B ratio and the signal significance considerably, particularly for D^0 higher transverse momentum p_T . This provides a data sample with higher signal significance and reduces systematic uncertainties associated with the signal extraction.




FIG. 1. The D^0 invariant mass distributions in two p_T bins without (left) and with (right) cuts on topological variable distributions characterizing the D^0 decay vertex.

III. HEAVY FLAVOR PAIR RECONSTRUCTION AND TAGGING

The explicit reconstruction of heavy flavor hadron pairs is studied by correlating the reconstructed D^0 and \overline{D}^0 candidates in the event. Figure 2 shows the azimuthal angle difference $\Delta\phi$ between the reconstructed momenta of D^0 and \overline{D}^0 candidates in the same event. The signal distribution is from D^0 and \overline{D}^0 candidate pairs within 3σ mass window of the nominal D^0 mass. The background is constructed using D^0 and \overline{D}^0 candidate pairs that are within 6σ and 12σ on either side of the mass window, normalized to the same mass window width and averaged between the different pair combinations for combining candidate pairs on the two sides of the mass window. The same topological variable selection cuts for D^0 and \overline{D}^0 candidate selection described in the previous section are applied in the reconstruction. The explicit reconstruction gives a clean signal with small background and allows an exact subtraction of the background. However, it relies on having good PID capabilities both in the forward and backward regions. The signal significance (σ_N) corresponding to the generated luminosity is also indicated in the figure.

The explicit reconstruction of heavy flavor hadrons suffer from small branching ratios to the hadronic channels, for e.g. the $D^0 \rightarrow K^-\pi^+$ branching ratio is only 3.89% [39]. A possible way to overcome this loss of statistics from the poor branching ratio is to tag the heavy flavor hadron decays utilizing the features of their decay topology. The tracker with excellent track pointing resolution allows tagging of their decay vertices. The downside is that tagging won't give pure signals like in the case of explicit reconstruction, and the selection cuts need to be optimized to attain the best purity and signal significance.

In order to perform tagging, pseudojets are defined using the anti- k_T clustering algorithm [40] provided by




FIG. 2. The azimuthal angle difference between D^0 and \overline{D}^0 candidate pairs in an event for candidates within a 3σ mass window around the D^0 mass peak (Signal) and for candidates between 6σ and 12σ outside the mass peak on either side (Background) for e + p collisions at beam energies 18 x 275 GeV.

FASTJET package [41]. The track candidates going into the clustering algorithm are required to have a minimum p_T of 0.2 GeV/c and to be within detector acceptance $|\eta| < 3.0$. A pseudojet radius $\Delta R = 1.0$ is chosen for clustering. All clusters in an event returned by the clustering algorithm are taken as pseudojets in the analysis, and the momentum of the cluster is taken as the pseudojet momentum. To better isolate heavy flavor pseudojets, we utilize a few variables characterizing their decay topology features. The sum of absolute values of DCA of all tracks associated with pseudojet (sumDCA), the number of tracks associated with the pseudojet with a minimum displacement of 100 μm (nTracks) from the PV and the minimum DCA between displaced (minimum DCA of 100 μm from the PV) track pairs within the pseudojet are found to have good differentiation between heavy flavor and light flavor pseudojets. The sumDCA is evaluated with a maximum DCA cut of $|DCA| < 750$ μm for tracks to reduce contribution from strange hadron decays. The first two variables give the best separation and are shown in the top panels of Fig 3. The signal are pseudojets matched to heavy flavor (includes both charm and bottom) hadrons and background are those matched to light flavor hadrons. The truth matching is done by associating a pseudojet to a heavy flavor hadron, if the parent hadron momentum vector falls within the pseudojet cone. If more than one heavy flavor hadrons do so, the one closest to the jet axis is taken. Pseudojets without heavy flavor hadrons are tagged light flavor pseudojets. The different variables are combined using a Boosted Decision Tree (BDT) algorithm provided by the TMVA package [42] to give a single response that can be utilized for discriminating heavy flavor and light flavor

pseudojets. The BDT is trained using an independent signal sample of heavy flavor hadron pseudojets and a background sample of light flavor pseudojets produced using the same simulation setup as used for the analysis. Before the BDT selection and training a simple cut of $\text{sumDCA} > 50 \mu\text{m}$ is applied without much loss of signal efficiency.




FIG. 3. The normalized distributions of summed $|DCA_{XY}|$ of tracks within a tagged pseudojet (top left), number of tracks with a $|DCA_{XY}|$ of at least $100 \mu\text{m}$ from the primary vertex within a tagged pseudojet (top right), the signal purity for and background (light flavor) efficiency for heavy flavor tagging for reconstructed pseudojets with $p_T > 2 \text{ GeV}/c$, and (bottom right) correlation between p_T of parent heavy-flavor hadron and the reconstructed tagged pseudojet matched to the heavy-flavor hadron.

The heavy flavor tagging performance is shown in the lower left panel of Fig 3. The purity and background selection efficiencies are shown as a function of the signal efficiency. The different points shown are with different selection cuts on the BDT response variable. The signal purity without any selection cuts is 2% (not shown on the plot). With topological selection, a signal purity of about 50% can be achieved with signal efficiency of $\sim 10\%$ and a purity of about 60% with close to tightest cuts on signal efficiency. The bottom right panel shows the correlation between the p_T of the parent heavy flavor hadron and that of the matched pseudojet. Good correlation is seen between the two, with some smearing. This shows the kinematics of the parent hadron can still be accessed even without the full explicit reconstruction.

Tagged heavy flavor pair pairs are constructed using the correlation between psuedojets in the same event, similar to that for explicit reconstruction. Figure 4 shows the $\Delta\phi$ distributions between the azimuthal angle of the momenta of the pseudojets in an event for the case without any selection on the decay topology and with two different selections. The number of signal pairs as well as the signal purity for the generated luminosity are also shown on the plots. The topological selection allows to improve the signal purity to 70% (from 2%) at a reason-

able signal efficiency.




FIG. 4. The azimuthal angle difference between tagged pseudojet pairs in an event for light flavor (solid circles) and heavy flavor (solid squares) pseudojets without the topological selection (left) and with the selection (middle, right) for $e + p$ collisions at beam energies $18 \times 275 \text{ GeV}$. Pseudojets with $p_T > 2 \text{ GeV}/c$ are used in constructing the pairs. The purity, evaluated in $2.0 < |\Delta\phi| < 4.2$, for heavy flavor selection indicated in the panels.

We have also evaluated the correlations between the asymmetry at the gluon level and the corresponding asymmetries at the reconstructed levels, for both the explicit reconstruction of $D^0\bar{D}^0$ pair and also tagged heavy flavor hadron pairs. The decorrelation of the signal at the gluon level at different stages of the scattering and reconstruction are shown in Figure 5. The evaluation is done using events generated with PYTHIA 6.4. The input asymmetry at parton level is input by hand by modulation the azimuthal distribution of generated events, and then evaluated after scattering and reconstruction. The signal reduces by about 30% at hadronization, the tagging reduces the signal bit more, reducing to about 50% of the parton level signal. Much of the signal and correlation is still retained in either case and can serve as probes to study the gluon TMDs.

IV. PROJECTIONS FOR ASYMMETRY MEASUREMENTS

Statistical uncertainty projection for a measurement of the single spin asymmetry A_{UT} can be made in straight forward way. From Eq. 1, the uncertainty is evaluated as $\delta A_{UT} = \sqrt{(\frac{1}{P^2 N} - A_{UT}^2/N)}$, where A_{UT} is the magnitude of the signal, N is the number of $D^0\bar{D}^0$ pairs in the sample which is evaluated from the signal significance σ_N as $N = \sigma_N^2$ and P is proton beam polarization. The second term is much smaller compared to the first, even if a relatively large value for A_{UT} , corresponding to that from a gluon Sivers asymmetry equal to 10% of the positivity bound is assumed. With a proton beam polarization of 70%, and a projected integrated luminosity for polarized $p + e$ collisions at the EIC of 100 fb^{-1} , the absolute statistical uncertainty on A_{UT} is 0.58% for $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$. The statistical uncertainty projection in different Q^2 and x_T bins are shown in Fig 6. A similar calculation holds for the case of the $\langle \cos(2\phi_T) \rangle$ observ-




FIG. 5. The transverse asymmetry A_{UT} input at the parton level (solid squares), reconstructed from the $c-\bar{c}$ pair after the hard-scattering (solid circles), reconstructed from the $D^0-\bar{D}^0$ pair (solid triangles) and from the tagged heavy flavor pairs (open circles) evaluated using events generated with PYTHIA 6.4, shown as a function of the relative angle between the proton spin and the gluon/heavy quark/heavy hadron pair momentum (ϕ_{KS}). The photon momentum is subtracted in evaluating the heavy quark/hadron pair momentum. The error bars are not scaled to luminosity.

able corresponding to the linearly polarized gluon TMDs, except that the reduction in precision from beam polarization won't be there, as these can be measured in unpolarized ep collisions, giving an absolute uncertainty of 0.4% for $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$. Compared to the predicted magnitudes of $\langle \cos(2\phi_T) \rangle$, these uncertainties are small, allowing for good precision measurements. For the gluon Sivvers asymmetry, the uncertainties are comparable to the sub-percent values of A_{UT} corresponding to the existing gluon Sivvers estimates at high x , but would still be providing a more direct constraint to the gluon Sivvers asymmetry than the inclusive measurements.

The A_{UT} signal from tagged pseudojet pairs is a weighted sum of both heavy flavor and light flavor A_{UT} values, $A_{UT}^{meas} = p_h A_{UT}^h + p_l A_{UT}^l$. Here p_h (p_l) denote the purity, defined as the fraction of heavy (light) flavor pseudojets in the sample. With and without the topological selection, the purities can be altered significantly, and without going into the exact values of the purities, just from their general magnitudes as shown in Fig 4, it can be shown that $A_{UT}^h = (A_{UT}^{meas,s} - p_l^s A_{UT}^{meas,0})/p_h^s$. The superscripts s and 0 denote the samples with and without the topological selections. Since $A_{UT}^{meas,0}$ has far higher precision, and taking into account the finite beam polarization P , we have $A_{UT}^h = A_{UT}^{meas,s}/p_h^s/P$. This expression holds in general as long as A_{UT}^h can be evaluated at a better precision than the measured A_{UT}^{meas} . The statistical uncertainty on A_{UT}^h is then $\delta A_{UT}^{meas,s}/p_h^s/P$, where $\delta A_{UT}^{meas,s}$ is the uncertainty on the measured A_{UT} with tagged pseudojets. The tagging improves the uncertainties on A_{UT}^h measurements significantly. The uncertainty for $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ reduces to 0.08%, by about a factor of 7. The tagging also offers the advantage that changes in momentum resolution (from the choice of the mag-

net field for the experiment) does not directly reduce the performance, unlike in the case of explicit reconstruction where the mass peak broadens. The tagging algorithm studied here is solely utilizing the track pointing resolution capabilities of the detector and does not depend on PID requirements on the forward or backward directions. However, incorporating PID into tagging, could help improve the performance. So too would utilizing the track pointing capabilities in the z direction. These are left for future studies that can be explored with the detector designs and specifications at a more mature stage.

Figure 6 shows the statistical uncertainty projections in different Q^2 and x_T bins from explicit reconstruction and tagged pseudojets. The tagged case provides far improved statistical uncertainties for the A_{UT} measurements compared to that with explicit reconstruction. Projection for A_{UT} values with a gluon asymmetry corresponding to 10% of the positivity bound for the gluon Sivvers asymmetry and from the SIDIS fit for quark Sivvers asymmetries generated using PYTHIA 6.4 is also shown. The existing estimates are in the high x region, mostly corresponding to large x_T values, where the heavy flavor channel does not offer an improved precision. At lower x_T values, in the range $10^{-4} < x_B < 10^{-2}$, the tagged heavy flavor measurements offer far better precision. This can be important for gluon TMD measurements as many of the gluon TMDs are predicted to show the $1/x$ growth with low x , and thus could show considerable values for the asymmetries at low x_T [20, 28]. Since the projections for $\langle \cos(2\phi_T) \rangle$ observable follows exactly the projections in Fig 6, but without the dilution from beam polarization P , they are not shown separately. The heavy flavor pair channel offers a direct probe of the gluon TMDs with non-zero values providing a ‘smoking gun’ evidence for finite gluon TMD value. The far improved precision from the tagged heavy flavor measurements therefore provides an attractive channel to measure these asymmetries. We have explored other beam energy configurations for e and p beams, particularly the lower energy configuration with 5 GeV electron and 100 GeV proton beams. The lower energy configuration was found to give larger projected uncertainties at all x_T values as the total charm production cross-section decreases.

V. SUMMARY

We have presented a study of heavy flavor hadron pair reconstruction performance at an EIC detector with MAPS based silicon tracker and vertexing subsystems, using events generated using PYTHIA 6.4 simulations. Exclusive reconstruction of the heavy flavor hadron pairs via their hadronic decays provide an experimentally clean measurement, however suffers from loss of statistics due to small hadronic branching ratios of heavy flavor hadrons. A heavy flavor tagging algorithm is developed utilizing the decay topology of heavy flavor hadrons. The tagging is found to improve the statistical precision




FIG. 6. Projections for the statistical uncertainties for A_{UT} , shown as error bars around zero, in different Q^2 (top) and x_B (bottom) bins using exclusively reconstructed $D^0 - \bar{D}^0$ pairs (dashed lines) and tagged heavy flavor pairs (solid lines), for a projected luminosity of 100 fb^{-1} for $e + p$ collisions at beam energies $18 \times 275 \text{ GeV}$. The bin boundaries corresponding to the projections for the exclusive and tagged cases are indicated by dashed and solid lines on the top axis, respectively. The solid curve shows the A_{UT} evaluated through PYTHIA 6.4 with an input gluon Sivers asymmetry equal to 10% of the positivity bound.

of heavy flavor measurements significantly with good purity for heavy flavor selection. The purity with topological tagging enhances the purity for heavy flavor selection by a factor of 35, compared to without the topological selection. The initial azimuthal asymmetry in gluon distributions were found to be retained, with some dilution, by the final state heavy flavor hadron pair, for both exclusive reconstruction and tagged heavy flavor hadrons. Statistical uncertainty projections for the heavy flavor hadron pair transverse asymmetries corresponding to the

gluon Sivers TMD and TMDs of linearly polarized gluons respectively are evaluated. The heavy flavor hadron tagging is found to give about an order of magnitude improved uncertainty projections compared to the exclusive reconstruction. The tagged measurements can provide a gluon rich measurement compared to inclusive di-hadrons and di-jets measurements. This study opens up heavy flavor hadron pair measurements as an attractive complementary and independent channel to access gluon TMDs at the EIC.

-
- [1] M. Grosse Perdekamp and F. Yuan, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **65**, 429 (2015), arXiv:1510.06783 [hep-ph].
- [2] D. W. Sivers, *Phys. Rev. D* **41**, 83 (1990).
- [3] D. Boer, S. J. Brodsky, P. J. Mulders, and C. Pisano, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 132001 (2011), arXiv:1011.4225 [hep-ph].
- [4] A. Airapetian *et al.* (HERMES), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 012002 (2005), arXiv:hep-ex/0408013.
- [5] X. Qian *et al.* (Jefferson Lab Hall A), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 072003 (2011), arXiv:1106.0363 [nucl-ex].
- [6] M. G. Alekseev *et al.* (COMPASS), *Phys. Lett. B* **692**, 240 (2010), arXiv:1005.5609 [hep-ex].
- [7] A. Accardi *et al.*, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **52**, 268 (2016), arXiv:1212.1701 [nucl-ex].
- [8] R. Abdul Khalek *et al.*, (2021), arXiv:2103.05419 [physics.ins-det].
- [9] V. Barone, F. Bradamante, and A. Martin, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **65**, 267 (2010), arXiv:1011.0909 [hep-ph].
- [10] S. J. Brodsky, D. S. Hwang, and I. Schmidt, *Phys. Lett. B* **530**, 99 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0201296.
- [11] M. G. A. Buffing, A. Mukherjee, and P. J. Mulders, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 054027 (2013), arXiv:1306.5897 [hep-ph].
- [12] J. Collins and T. Rogers, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 074020 (2015), arXiv:1412.3820 [hep-ph].
- [13] C. A. Aidala, B. Field, L. P. Gamberg, and T. C. Rogers, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 094002 (2014), arXiv:1401.2654 [hep-ph].
- [14] S. M. Aybat, A. Prokudin, and T. C. Rogers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 242003 (2012), arXiv:1112.4423 [hep-ph].
- [15] P. Sun and F. Yuan, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 114012 (2013), arXiv:1308.5003 [hep-ph].
- [16] U. D'Alesio, F. Murgia, and C. Pisano, *JHEP* **09**, 119 (2015), arXiv:1506.03078 [hep-ph].
- [17] M. Anselmino, M. Boglione, U. D'Alesio, A. Kotzinian, F. Murgia, and A. Prokudin, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 094007 (2005), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* **72**, 099903 (2005)], arXiv:hep-ph/0507181.
- [18] M. Anselmino, M. Boglione, U. D'Alesio, A. Kotzinian, S. Melis, F. Murgia, A. Prokudin, and C. Turk, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **39**, 89 (2009), arXiv:0805.2677 [hep-ph].

- [19] V. Barone, S. Melis, and A. Prokudin, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 114025 (2010), arXiv:1009.3423 [hep-ph].
- [20] D. Boer, C. Lorcé, C. Pisano, and J. Zhou, *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2015**, 371396 (2015), arXiv:1504.04332 [hep-ph].
- [21] M. Anselmino, U. D'Alesio, S. Melis, and F. Murgia, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 094011 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0608211.
- [22] A. Airapetian *et al.* (HERMES), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 152002 (2009), arXiv:0906.3918 [hep-ex].
- [23] C. Adolph *et al.* (COMPASS), *Phys. Lett. B* **744**, 250 (2015), arXiv:1408.4405 [hep-ex].
- [24] M. Burkardt, *Phys. Rev. D* **69**, 091501 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0402014.
- [25] C. Adolph *et al.* (COMPASS), *Phys. Lett. B* **772**, 854 (2017), arXiv:1701.02453 [hep-ex].
- [26] A. Adare *et al.* (PHENIX), *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 012006 (2014), arXiv:1312.1995 [hep-ex].
- [27] X.-d. Ji, J.-p. Ma, and F. Yuan, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 034005 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0404183.
- [28] D. Boer, P. J. Mulders, C. Pisano, and J. Zhou, *JHEP* **08**, 001 (2016), arXiv:1605.07934 [hep-ph].
- [29] L. Zheng, E. C. Aschenauer, J. H. Lee, B.-W. Xiao, and Z.-B. Yin, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 034011 (2018), arXiv:1805.05290 [hep-ph].
- [30] J. Arrington *et al.*, (2021), arXiv:2102.08337 [nucl-ex].
- [31] G. Contin *et al.*, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **907**, 60 (2018), arXiv:1710.02176 [physics.ins-det].
- [32] A. Fantoni (ALICE), *Phys. Scripta* **95**, 084011 (2020).
- [33] ECCE Collaboration, <https://www.ecce-eic.org>, .
- [34] ATHENA Collaboration, <https://wiki.bnl.gov/athena/index.php>, .
- [35] S. Agostinelli *et al.* (GEANT4), *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506**, 250 (2003).
- [36] M. Kelsey, R. Cruz-Torres, X. Dong, Y. Ji, S. Radhakrishnan, and E. Sichtermann, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 054002 (2021), arXiv:2107.05632 [hep-ph].
- [37] D. P. Anderle, X. Dong, F. Hekhorn, M. Kelsey, S. Radhakrishnan, E. Sichtermann, L. Xia, H. Xing, F. Yuan, and Y. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 114039 (2021), arXiv:2110.04489 [hep-ex].
- [38] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, *JHEP* **05**, 026 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [39] P. Zyla *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *PTEP* **2020**, 083C01 (2020).
- [40] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, *JHEP* **04**, 063 (2008), arXiv:0802.1189 [hep-ph].
- [41] M. Cacciari, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72**, 1896 (2012), arXiv:1111.6097 [hep-ph].
- [42] A. Hocker *et al.*, (2007), arXiv:physics/0703039.