

Investigating the impact of spin effects at the high-energy neutrino-nucleon interactions while it crosses the Earth's core

R. Francener,¹ D.R. Gratieri,^{2,1} and G. Torrieri^{1,3}

¹*Instituto de Física Gleb Wataghin - UNICAMP, 13083-859, Campinas, SP, Brazil.*

²*Escola de Engenharia Industrial Metalúrgica de Volta Redonda,*

Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF), 27255-125, Volta Redonda, RJ, Brazil

³*Institute of Physics, Jan Kochanowski University, Ul. Uniwersytecka 7, 25-406 Kielce, Poland.*

In this work, we investigate the impact of assuming the polarization of the Earth's outer core on the propagation of neutrinos that cross the all the Earth. We taking into account the spin-dependent structure functions to describe the polarized neutrino-nucleon cross-section, and also on the neutrino absorption while it crosses all of the Earth. We found that adding spin information and simultaneously assuming polarization of Earth's outer core impacts the probability of neutrino absorption in the energy range of 10 - 100 TeV and for upward neutrino direction. However, the magnitude of the effect is small and should be comparable with the magnitude of the errors associated with the IceCube neutrino data.

PACS numbers:

Keywords: Neutrino Absorption, Polarized Targets, Earth's Outer Core.

I. INTRODUCTION

Interactions with polarized nuclei have gained great attention in theoretical and experimental physics community since the results of the *European Muon Collaboration (EMC)* from the late eighties [1, 2]. Such results pointed out that “the total quark spin constitutes only a small fraction $\Delta\Sigma(Q^2)$ of the proton's spin”. This result became known as the “Proton Spin Crisis” (PSC). Usually, the nucleon spin is assumed to be given in terms of the sum of the spin contributions from quarks, gluons and orbital magnetic moment from both quarks and gluons,

$$\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\Delta\Sigma(Q^2) + \Delta G(Q^2) + L_q(Q^2) + L_g(Q^2), \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta G(Q^2)$ is the gluon contribution to the nucleon spin, $L_q(Q^2)$ and $L_g(Q^2)$ are the *Orbital Angular Momentum (OAM)* contributions from quarks and gluons, respectively. The quark contribution to nucleon spin, $\Delta\Sigma(Q^2)$, can also be understood in terms of the sum in all quarks of integral in x of helicity distributions ($\Delta q^i(x, Q^2)$) [1, 2]. In all cases, in the *Naive Parton Model*, the quantity $\Delta q^i(x, Q^2)dx$ is the number of polarized (anti)quarks of type q carrying a momentum fraction between x and $x + dx$. The index $i = u, d, c, s, b, t$ stands for each quark flavor. Within the *Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD)* there are both perturbative and non-perturbative corrections, in such way that the structure functions associated with the nucleons are obtained from the partonic density functions through the *Factorization Theorem* [3]. For a complete review, see [4]. For the theoretical formalism, we point to reference [5], which we follow closely. See also [6]. Explicitly, the result from the EMC collaboration pointed out that $\Delta\Sigma(Q^2) = 0.14 \pm 0.23$. Current analysis from COMPASS collaboration [7] report that about $31\% \pm 11\%$ of proton spin comes from quarks, for $Q^2 = 3 \text{ GeV}^2$. Actually, the literature seems to converge for the longitudinally spin polarization scattering, but there still a puzzle for transversely polarized nuclear targets interacting with transversely polarized projectile nucleons ($\approx 40\%$) and charged leptons ($\approx 5 - 10\%$) [8]. To illustrate the actual scenario, in Fig. 1 we present the contribution to proton's spin due to quarks measured by several collaborations [1, 2, 7, 9–17] as function of the respective momentum scale, Q^2 . For comparison, our results assuming the predictions from [18–22] are also shown. At the present level of experimental accuracy, the scaling of polarized PDFs was still not clearly seen [4]. In fact, the structure functions associated with the quarks are relatively the most known ones for the both unpolarized and polarized cases. Moreover, a recent work from *JAM Collaboration* [23] based on the STAR data [24] in the range of $0.01 \leq x \leq 0.3$ and $Q^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^2$, presents for the first time results favoring the nonzero helicity sea asymmetry, with $\Delta\mathcal{X}^2/N_{dat} \approx 1\sigma$. Such results are from a global analysis of both unpolarized and polarized PDFs. Concerning the gluon spin, we know today [4] that at small x and large Q^2 the *gluon density function*, $g(x, Q^2)$, is considerably larger than the density functions associated to the quarks, which implies that at the high energy regime the nucleon can be understood as a collective of gluons. Hence, it is straightforward to expect some degree of contribution from




FIG. 1: Compilation of experimental results for the quarks contribution to proton spin from [1, 2, 7, 9–17]. For comparison, the prediction from KATAO [18–20] and DSSV [21, 22] are also shown.

gluons to the nucleon spin. Indeed, in [8], which is a review of the topic, it is stated that while the contribution from the valence quarks saturates at the high-energy limit, the gluon contribution is expected to reach $\approx 50\%$ at the present accelerator energies. This is in agreement with recent results from lattice QCD [25] and also with experimental analyses [26]. Moreover, since $\Delta\Sigma(Q^2)$ and $\Delta G(Q^2)$ are observables, overall spin conservation ($S_p = 1/2$) can be used, and implies a large contribution from OAM to the proton spin [27]. Indeed, in [28] it is shown that orbital angular momentum is generated in the partonic dynamical evolution as it is given by the *DGLAP* equations [29–31].

To better describe the quark and gluon content and aspects of the three-dimensional structure of the nucleon, there are generalized parton distribution (GPDs) and transverse momentum dependent distributions (TMDs) [32, 33]. Such distributions are complementary and aim to describe the transverse plane of nucleon propagation. Another important class of parton distributions are the longitudinal spin-dependent ones, which describe the asymmetry between quarks with opposite spins in the nucleon. Recently, several experimental collaborations have focused their efforts on measuring the (longitudinal) spin-dependent structure functions in collisions of charged leptons with polarized hydrogen, deuterium and helium-3 nuclei [10, 11, 14, 17, 34]. Current measurements focus on modest kinematic ranges ($x > 10^{-3}$ and $Q^2 < 10^2$ GeV). With existing data on spin asymmetry and spin-dependent structure functions, different authors have built fits that parameterize these data [18–22] and allow extrapolations beyond observed kinematic ranges. One of the main goals of the future Electron-Ion Collider (EIC) [35] is to improve our understanding of the helicity distributions of quarks and gluons inside nucleons and heavy nuclei. With this new collider it is intended to increase the current observation range of these distributions. While x should be decreased to approximately $5 \cdot 10^{-5}$, Q^2 should be increased to approximately 10^3 GeV 2 (see Fig. 10 in [35]). Typical IceCube events occur with $x \sim 10^{-2, -3}$ and $Q^2 \sim 10^{3, 4}$, very close to the future EIC data, making the necessary extrapolation much closer and with a high confidence level.

In this work we present a study of the impact of polarization of hadronic targets on Deep Inelastic Scattering (DIS) of muonic neutrinos and antineutrinos, and we apply the obtained result to the neutrinos absorption by the Earth. Such a study is strongly motivated by a probable polarization of the Earth’s outer core, which is generated by a turbulent flow of liquid metal [36]. We will verify if through the interaction of neutrinos with the Earth it is possible to estimate the polarization of the outer core. This study is also motivated by the recent IceCube measurement of the cross section of muonic neutrinos by the Earth’s absorption [37]. This measurement indicates that the cross section, in the observed energy range (6.3 – 980 TeV), is about 1.3 times the cross section predicted by the standard model [38]. The interaction of neutrinos with the Earth can be measured through the attenuation of the incident neutrino flux that crosses the Earth and is measured by the IceCube, as illustrated in Fig. 2. The IceCube detector can measure High Energy Neutrino Sample, with energies above 60 TeV. In this energy range the predominant interaction is deeply inelastic scattering [39]. For the neutrino to reach the detector, it is necessary that it does not interact via charged current when crossing the Earth. Neutral current interaction only decreases the energy of the beam. Although in this work we focus on the analysis of the interaction of muon neutrino, the results are also very similarly applicable




FIG. 2: Attenuation of neutrino flux by Earth's absorption.

for electron neutrino. In the energy limit of the neutrino much larger than the mass of the lepton produced, electron and muon neutrinos have the same cross section with hadronic targets. However, for the analysis of the absorption of electron neutrino it is necessary to also include the effects of interaction with electrons (Glashow resonance) [40, 41]. For recent work on neutrino absorption considering Glashow resonance, see Refs. [42–44].

II. FORMALISM

A correct description of the proton spin from quarks is of particular interest for neutrino physics. Neutrino and antineutrino are left-handed and right-handed chiral eigenstates, respectively. So, (anti)neutrino capturing the (right)left-hand component of the quark wavefunction, and any change between distribution of the quarks right and left-hand in the nucleons will impact specifically (anti)neutrino scattering and absorption cross section. At this point one must notice that besides the fact that weak neutrino-nucleon interactions are given in terms of chiral states. Thus, the information about how much of the nucleon spin is due to the quarks, *i. e.*, the value of $\Delta\Sigma(Q^2)$, is not taken into account in the most common procedure of calculation of neutrino-nucleon cross-section at the deep inelastic regime¹. At sufficiently high energies, due to *asymptotic freedom* [45, 46], it is possible to describe the neutrino-nucleon interaction in terms of the neutrino scattering on free quarks that constitute the nucleon. The assumption of the equal distribution of left and right quark spins leads to the average of the initial polarization state. As both the *charged current (CC)* and *neutral current (NC)* DIS processes are inclusive reactions, they take into account all the possible final hadronic states, and a sum over all the final state polarization possibilities is also applied [47]. In [5], the formalism to include spin effects at (anti)neutrino-nucleon interaction is presented.

In the unpolarized DIS (CC), the neutrino ν_l (antineutrino $\bar{\nu}_l$) with energy E_ν interacts by exchanging a virtual boson W^\pm of four - momentum q ($q^2 = -Q^2$). The initial lepton becomes the associated charged lepton $l^\pm (= e, \mu, \tau)$ with energy E' and the hadron goes to an unknown state of invariant mass W , characterized by $W^2 > m_N^2$, with m_N being the mass of the hadronic target. In terms of Bjorken's x , the inelasticity $y = (E_\nu - E')/E_\nu$ and the virtuality of the exchanged boson Q^2 , the unpolarized double differential cross section of neutrino DIS is given by [48]

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\nu(\bar{\nu})}}{dx dy} = \frac{G_F^2 E_\nu m_N}{\pi} \left(\frac{M_W^2}{Q^2 + M_W^2} \right)^2 \left\{ \left(y^2 x + \frac{m_l^2 y}{2E_\nu m_N} \right) F_1(x, Q^2) + \left(1 - y - \frac{m_l^2}{4E_\nu^2} - \frac{m_N x y}{2E_\nu} \right) F_2(x, Q^2) + \right. \\ \left. + (-) \left(x y - \frac{x y^2}{2} - \frac{m_l^2 y}{4E_\nu m_N} \right) F_3(x, Q^2) + \frac{m_l^2 (m_l^2 + Q^2)}{E_\nu^2 m_N^2 x} F_4(x, Q^2) - \frac{m_l^2}{E_\nu m_N} F_5(x, Q^2) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where G_F is the Fermi's constant, M_W the W^\pm boson mass, m_l the mass of the lepton produced and F_i are the spin

¹ At the high neutrino energies, where the description of the nucleon target in terms of form factors is no longer available.




FIG. 3: The thickness of the Earth in centimeters of the water for nucleons unpolarized and with outer core partially polarized. We use the PREM model [53].

independent structure functions. In the parton model, $F_2(x, Q^2)$ is interpreted in terms of the sum of the helicity distributions of the quarks that have the flavor that can interact with the neutrino [49]. $F_1(x, Q^2)$ can be written in terms of $F_2(x, Q^2)$ with the Callan-Gross relation and $F_3(x, Q^2)$ is associated with quark - antiquark asymmetry. In this paper we use the CTEQ18 parameterization [50] for quark distributions, which uses the DGLAP evolution equations. In the high energy limit, which we are interested in, we also assume that the Albright - Jarlskog relations [51] hold. The standard variables of DIS are connected by $Q^2 = 2E_\nu m_N xy$, in the rest frame of target.

Moreover, when we consider the polarized hadronic target, the cross section of the Eq. 2 is modified by a factor dependent on the hadronic spin, given by [5, 6]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\Delta\sigma^{\nu(\bar{\nu})}}{dx dy} = \frac{G_F^2 M E_\nu}{\pi} \left(\frac{M_W^2}{Q^2 + M_W^2} \right)^2 \lambda_N \left\{ (-) \left[-yx(2-y) + \frac{2x^3 y^3 m_l^2}{Q^2} \right] g_1(x, Q^2) + (-) \left(\frac{4x^3 y^2 m_l^2}{Q^2} \right) g_2(x, Q^2) + \right. \\ \left. + \frac{2xym_l^2}{Q^2} \left(1 - y - \frac{x^2 y^2 m_l^2}{Q^2} \right) g_3(x, Q^2) + \left[-1 + y - \frac{2x^2 y m_l^2}{Q^2} \left(1 - \frac{3y}{2} - \frac{x^2 y^2 m_l^2}{Q^2} \right) \right] g_4(x, Q^2) + \right. \\ \left. + \left(-y^2 x + \frac{2x^4 y^3 m_l^2}{Q^2} \right) g_5(x, Q^2) \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where λ_N is the helicity of the hadronic target and $g_i(x, Q^2)$ are the spin - dependent structure functions. Unlike the $F_i(x, Q^2)$ functions, the $g_i(x, Q^2)$ functions in the parton model are written with the difference of the helicity distributions of the each quarks, describing the net amount of quarks with spin in a given direction [6]. In the limit of energies of interest in this work, we assume the validity of the Dicus relation [52]. Such a relation allows us to write g_4 in terms of g_5 , similar to the Callan-Gross relation, $g_4(x, Q^2) = 2xg_5(x, Q^2)$. Both relationships emerged from the observation that, when we neglect the masses involved, helicity is conserved in the quark-gluon coupling. The polarized structure functions are described in [5], where it is shown that the contributions from $g_2(x, Q^2)$ and $g_3(x, Q^2)$ to the cross-sections are suppressed by factors like m_l^2/Q^2 , which could be measured in the neutrino factories. However, in this work we are initially interested in $Q^2 \geq m_W^2$, which is the typical value for the neutrino-nucleon interactions at the IceCube neutrino observatory. Hence, we can disregard contributions from $g_2(x, Q^2)$ and $g_3(x, Q^2)$. Also, in the same limit, as the same structures appears in in both polarized and unpolarized cases, the polarized contribution to the neutrino-nucleon cross-section can be obtained from Eq. 2 replacing $F_1(x, Q^2) \rightarrow -g_5(x, Q^2)$, $F_2(x, Q^2) \rightarrow -g_4(x, Q^2)$, and $F_3(x, Q^2) \rightarrow 2g_1(x, Q^2)$.

An accurate description of the neutrino - nucleon cross section, as well as the distribution of matter in the interior of the Earth, is fundamental to estimate the absorption of neutrinos that cross the Earth, given that these are fundamental ingredients for the calculation. The probability of the neutrino crossing without being absorbed can be

quantified with [41]

$$P_{Shad}(E_\nu, \theta_z) = \exp \left[-N_A \sigma(E_\nu) \int_0^{r(\theta_z)} \rho_N(r) dr \right], \quad (4)$$

where N_A is the Avogadro numbers, $\rho(r)$ the Earth's density profile and $r(\theta_z) = -2R_{Earth} \cos \theta_z$ is the total distance travelled by neutrino. In this work we use the PREM model [53] for the description of the Earth's profile density. In Fig. 3 we show the thickness of matter traversed by the neutrino as a function of the zenith angle. We see two distinct cases: in the continuous black line we show the thickness of matter crossed without considering polarization. While the dashed curves show the thickness of matter traversed unpolarized (red) and polarized (below) considering a hypothetical case of 30% polarization in the outer core (blue). The PREM model indicates that the outer core is located between 1221.5 km and 3480.0 km, which implies that the neutrino crosses this potentially polarized layer only if it hits with $\cos(\theta_z)$ less than -0.84 .

III. RESULTS

Initially, we present in Fig. 4 the cross section of (a) muon and (c) tau neutrino; and (b) muon and (d) tau antineutrino with a isoscalar target as a function of (anti)neutrino energy. We calculate the cross sections for unpolarized and polarized targets with helicity $\lambda_N = -1$. For the calculation of the polarized cross sections, we use two different parameterizations of the spin-dependent structure functions, DSSV [21] and KATAO [18]. Both parameterizations lead to similar results. The impact of target polarization on the cross section becomes less significant




FIG. 4: Cross section for muon (a) neutrino and (b) antineutrino DIS with the isoscalar target. In (c) and (d) we present the same results for tau neutrino. We consider two distinct cases: unpolarized target and polarized with DSSV [21] and KATAO [18] parameterizations of spin - dependent structure functions.




FIG. 5: Difference between unpolarized and polarized differential cross sections normalized by unpolarized differential cross sections for (a) neutrino and (b) antineutrino incident. We calculate using the KATAO [18] and CTEQ18 [50] parameterization, for neutrino and antineutrino incident with energies of 10^3 GeV.

with increasing energy, practically disappearing for energies above 10^7 GeV. For lower energies of incoming neutrino, $10^3 - 10^4$ GeV, the unpolarized and polarized cross sections differ by a multiplicative factors of $0.7 - 1.3$, depending on the parameterization of the spin - dependent structure functions and whether the beam is neutrino or antineutrino.

To better trace the origin of the polarization effect on the neutrino-nucleon interaction (CC), we present Fig. 5. In it we quantify the difference between the unpolarized (UU) and polarized (LL) differential cross section, normalized with the unpolarized differential cross section. θ_z is the angle between the direction of arrival of the neutrino (antineutrino) with the spin of the isoscalar target, considering again $\lambda_N = -1$. We clearly see that the difference between the differential cross sections is maximized when the spins are parallel or antiparallel to the direction of propagation of the incident neutrino. In Q^2 , this normalized difference is maximized in different regions for neutrino and antineutrino. While for the neutrino we have a maximum of ≈ 80 GeV², for the antineutrino the maximum goes beyond 200 GeV², the region with the smallest contribution to the total cross section.

In Fig. 6 we present our result for the probability of crossing without being absorbed, P_{Shad} , of muonic neutrinos by the Earth as a function of the energy and the cosine of the zenith angle of incidence of the neutrino. In the upper panel, we present P_{Shad} for antineutrinos and in the lower panel for neutrinos. In the Figs. 6a and 6c we do not consider any polarization on earth. In the Figs. 6b and 6d, P_{Shad} is calculated considering 100% polarization in the outer core of the Earth. The calculation of the cross sections disregarding polarization is performed with the structure functions constructed with the quark distributions parameterized by CTEQ18 [50]. For the cross section with polarization correction of the hadronic target (Figs. 6b and 6d), we used the KATAO parameterization [18] spin - dependent structure functions, besides, of course, CTEQ18 for the spin - independent structure functions. The choice of KATAO parameterization for this result is practically indifferent to the choice of DSSV, because, as previously discussed and illustrated in Fig. 4, both lead to very similar cross sections.

In Fig. 7 we present the difference between the absorption probabilities of unpolarized and polarized Earth. In Figs. 7a and 7c (7b and 7d) are the results for the absorption of antineutrino (neutrino) considering two cases: 30% and 100% of polarization in the outer core, respectively. The effect is restricted to the region where the neutrino impinges with $\cos(\theta_z) < -0.84$, given that this is the necessary condition for it to cross the outer core. We can see that neutrino and antineutrino have opposite effects: while P_{Shad} of neutrinos decreases with the effect of polarization, P_{Shad} of antineutrinos increases with said effect. This fact hinders the experimental validation of the model, since the IceCube does not distinguish the charge of the produced lepton. Even considering 100% polarization the effect is small, however in the IceCube observation region ($10^3 - 10^6$ GeV).

To better quantify the difference described above and presented in Fig. 7, we calculate the percentage difference between unpolarized and polarized absorptions ($(P_{Shad}^{UNPOL.} - P_{Shad}^{POL.})/P_{Shad}^{UNPOL.}$). We estimate that in the IceCube observation region where the absorption is significant, with 30% polarization the absorption changes between 0% and $\pm 5\%$. For 100% polarization this percentage rises to about $\pm 18\%$. It is still possible to observe that the mentioned effect is maximized with $\cos(\theta_z) \rightarrow -0.98$, when the neutrino crosses the largest possible amount of the outer core. Despite being significant percentages in the change of absorption, it is very difficult to observe it. Because we use high percentages of polarization to get it, and the effects on neutrinos and antineutrinos are of similar but opposite




FIG. 6: Probability of the antineutrino, (a) and (b), and neutrino, (c) and (d), crossing the Earth without interacting via charged current as a function of energy and $\cos(\theta_z)$ considering the unpolarized Earth, (a) and (c), and with 100% polarization in the outer core, (b) and (d).

magnitudes. To observe this effect, a future detector capable of distinguishing between neutrinos and antineutrinos would be needed.

IV. SUMMARY

In this study we have investigated the impact of the polarization of the Earth's outer core on the absorption of neutrinos in the IceCube observation region. Our main motivation was to verify if a possible estimate of the polarization of the Earth's outer core can be made in the future by attenuating the flux of neutrinos that cross the Earth. Our results showed that the effects of polarization on absorption, although in the IceCube region, are small even considering 100% polarization. Added to this, while the absorption of neutrinos decreases, that of antineutrinos increases with the polarization of the hadronic targets, making it a difficult task to estimate the nuclear polarization by the attenuation of the neutrino flux. Given the magnitude of the impact of polarization on neutrino absorption, a more detailed analysis of the angular and energy distributions of the expected number of events in the IceCube detector becomes unfeasible. The future EIC may change the current view we have of the contribution of sea quarks to the proton spin, and motivate more detailed analyzes of neutrino absorption considering polarization on Earth. Furthermore, with the neutrino detectors of the future, such as IceCube-Gen2 [54] and GRAND [55], the prospect of measuring these smaller magnitude effects may become feasible. This work is far from a comprehensive estimate of possible spin QCD effects. Even if earth polarization is exactly zero, it does not mean spin dependent effects vanish:




FIG. 7: Difference between probability of the antineutrino, (a) and (b), and neutrino, (c) and (d), crossing the Earth without interacting via charged current as a function of energy and $\cos(\theta_z)$ considering the unpolarized Earth, (a) and (c), and with 100% polarization in the outer core, (b) and (d).

It is known that correlations of spin in nuclei are strong, i.e. each nucleon's polarization depends on the others. “One level down”, parton level correlations are both strong and relatively unknown (for instance, is the up quark more likely to be aligned or anti-aligned with the proton's spin?). Accounting for these effects would require convoluting into the earth's profile both the nuclear spin wavefunction of iron and medium-modified quark TMDs, and is currently beyond the scope of this work. We show the impact of polarization only on muon neutrinos absorption. However, the effect on electronic neutrinos is essentially the same, as they have the same cross section in the high energy limit. For tauonic neutrinos there is a greater difference in cross section at lower energies, due to the mass of the tau produced. However, a more detailed analysis of tau neutrinos absorption for future detectors presupposes the study of flux regeneration by tau decay, which is outside the scope of this work.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially financed by the Brazilian funding agencies CNPq and CAPES. G.T. acknowledges support from Bolsa de produtividade CNPQ 306152/2020-7, Bolsa de pesquisa FAPESP 2021/01700-2, Participação Temático FAPESP, 2017/05685-2 and the grant BPN/ULM/2021/1/00039 from the Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange.

-
- [1] J. Ashman *et al.* [EMC Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **206**, 364 (1988);
- [2] J. Ashman *et al.* [EMC Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B **328**, 1 (1989);
- [3] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper and G. F. Sterman, Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. **5**, 1-91 (1989);
- [4] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2022**, 083C01 (2022);
- [5] S. Forte, M. L. Mangano and G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. B **602**, 585–621 (2001);
- [6] M. Anselmino, P. Gambino and J. Kalinowski, Zeit. Phys. C **64**, 267 (1994);
- [7] C. Adolph *et al.* [COMPASS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **769**, 34-41 (2017);
- [8] C. A. Aidala, S. D. Bass, D. Hasch and G. K. Mallot, Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 655 (2013);
- [9] V. Y. Alexakhin *et al.* [COMPASS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **647**, 8 (2007);
- [10] C. Adolph *et al.* [COMPASS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **753**, 18 (2016);
- [11] R. G. Fersch *et al.* [CLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. C **96**, 065208 (2017);
- [12] A. Airapetian *et al.* [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **75**, 012007 (2007);
- [13] B. Adeva *et al.* [Spin Muon Collaboration], Phys. Lett. D **302**, 533 (1993);
- [14] K. Abe *et al.* [E143 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **58**, 112003 (1998);
- [15] P. L. Anthony *et al.* [E142 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **54**, 6620 (1996);
- [16] K. Abe *et al.* [E142 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 26 (1997);
- [17] N. Sato, W. Melnitchouk, S. E. Kuhn, J. J. Ethier and A. Accardi, [Jefferson Lab Angular Momentum Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **93**, 074005 (2016);
- [18] A. N. Khorramian, S. Atashbar Tehrani, S. Taheri Monfared, F. Arbabifar and F. I. Olness, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 054017 (2011);
- [19] H. Khanpour, S. Taheri Monfared and S. Atashbar Tehrani, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 074006 (2017);
- [20] H. Khanpour, S. Taheri Monfared and S. Atashbar Tehrani, Phys. Rev. D **105**, 074023 (2022);
- [21] D. de Florian, R. Sassot, M. Stratmann and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 034030 (2009);
- [22] I. Borsa, D. de Florian and I. Pedron. arXiv:2210.12014 [hep-ph];
- [23] C. Cocuzza *et al.* [JAM], SciPost Phys. Proc. **8**, 025 (2022);
- [24] J. J. Ethier, N. Sato and W. Melnitchouk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **119** no.13, 132001 (2017);
- [25] Y. Yang *et al.* Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 102001 (2017);
- [26] D. de Florian, R. Sassot, M. Stratmann and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 012001 (2014);
- [27] S. Scopetta and V. Vento, [arXiv:hep-ph/9907441 [hep-ph]];
- [28] P. G. Ratcliffe Phys. Lett. B, v. 192, n. 1-2, p. 180-184, (1987);
- [29] V. N. Gribov and L. N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **15**, 438-450 IPTI-381-71 (1972);
- [30] G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B **126**, 298-318 (1977).
- [31] Y. L. Dokshitzer, Sov. Phys. JETP **46**, 641-653 (1977);
- [32] M. Diehl, Eur. Phys. J. A **52**, 149 (2016);
- [33] C. Riedl, Acta Phys. Pol. B **53**, 5-A2 (2022);
- [34] A. Airapetian *et al.* [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **442**, 484 (1998);
- [35] A. Accardi *et al.* Eur. Phys. J. A **52**, 268 (2016);
- [36] N. Schaeffer, D. Jault, H. C. Nataf and A. Fournier, Geophys. J. Int. **211**, 1–29 (2017);
- [37] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* [IceCube], Nature **551**, 596-600 (2017);
- [38] A. Cooper-Sarkar, P. Mertsch and S. Sarkar, JHEP **1108**, 042 (2011);
- [39] J. A. Formaggio and G. P. Zeller, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1307 (2012);
- [40] S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. **118**, 316 (1960);
- [41] R. Gandhi, C. Quigg, M. H. Reno and I. Sarcevic, Astropart. Phys. D **5**, 81 (1996);
- [42] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* [IceCube], Nature **591**, 220 (2021), [Erratum: Nature **592**, E11 (2021)];
- [43] V. P. Gonçalves, D. R. Gratieri and A. S. C. Quadros, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 496 (2021);
- [44] V. P. Gonçalves, D. R. Gratieri and A. S. C. Quadros, Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, 1011 (2022);
- [45] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1343-1346 (1973);
- [46] H. D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1346-1349 (1973);
- [47] F. Halzen and A. D. Martin, John Wiley & Sons, New York, (2008);
- [48] S. Kretzer and M. H. Reno, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 113007 (2002);
- [49] E. A. Paschos and J. Y. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 033002 (2002);
- [50] Tie-Jiun Hou *et al.* Phys. Rev. D **103**, 014013 (2021);
- [51] C. H. Albright and C. Jarlskog, Nucl. Phys. B **84**, 467 (1975);
- [52] D. A. Dicus, Phys. Rev. D **5**, 1367 (1972);
- [53] A. M. Dziewonski and D. L. Anderson, Phys. Earth Plan. Int. **25**, 297 (1981);
- [54] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* [IceCube-Gen2], J. Phys. G **48**, 060501 (2021);
- [55] J. Álvarez-Muñiz *et al.* [GRAND Collaboration], Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron. **63**, 219501 (2020);