

# Angular dependence in transverse momentum dependent diffractive parton distributions at small- $x$

Yoshitaka Hatta<sup>1,2</sup> and Feng Yuan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Physics Department, Building 510A, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*RIKEN BNL Research Center, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York 11973, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Nuclear Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

We discuss the angular dependence of the recently proposed transverse momentum dependent quark and gluon diffractive parton distributions at small- $x$ . We introduce the diffractive versions of the Sivvers function and the elliptic gluon Wigner distribution and evaluate them in simple models with gluon saturation and study their geometric scaling properties. We also show that the diffractive version of the linearly polarized gluon distribution identically vanishes to leading order. These distributions enrich the physics opportunities for measuring semi-inclusive diffractive DIS processes at the future electron-ion colliders.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Diffractive Deep Inelastic Scattering (DIS) has long been argued to be one of the most promising channels to probe the gluon saturation in hadrons and nuclei at small- $x$  [1–9]. The process is characterized by an elastically scattered target separated by a large rapidity gap  $Y_{\mathcal{P}} = \ln 1/x_{\mathcal{P}}$  from the fragments of the virtual photon (see Fig. 1). Typically, the diffractively produced system consists of a single vector meson [4, 6] or 2-3 jets [1, 10–21] (exclusive diffraction), or it can also be any hadronic final states which span a rapidity range  $Y_{\beta} = \ln 1/\beta$  (inclusive diffraction). Due to the color singlet exchange between the virtual photon and the target, at high energy the cross section behaves like the square of the gluon distribution, resulting in a stronger sensitivity to the gluon dynamics in the nonlinear regime than in non-diffractive processes.

Recently, the notion of semi-inclusive diffractive DIS (SIDDIS) has been proposed in [22]. This is literally a hybrid of diffractive DIS and semi-inclusive DIS (SIDIS). Namely, one requires the elastically scattered target and a rapidity gap  $Y_{\mathcal{P}}$  as in inclusive diffraction, but at the same time detects a single species of hadrons out of the diffractively produced system. Compared to SIDIS, naturally SIDDIS is more sensitive to the gluon saturation. Compared to diffractive DIS, SIDDIS has an additional kinematical handle, the transverse momentum  $k_{\perp}$  of the observed hadron, which brings in a number of interesting new features as is familiar in the context of SIDIS. In a sense, SIDDIS is similar to diffractive dijet production where the jet transverse momentum plays the role of  $k_{\perp}$ , and indeed their cross sections are closely related [11]. From experimental point of view, an advantage of SIDDIS is that one does not have to reconstruct jets in the final state which may be an increasingly challenging task as  $|k_{\perp}|$  becomes smaller. On the other hand, it requires the measurement of the invariant mass  $M_X^2 = \frac{1-\beta}{\beta} Q^2$  as well as particle identification of the produced system.

The basic ingredient in describing SIDDIS is the transverse momentum dependent (TMD) diffractive parton distribution functions (DPDFs) [22]. This is the TMD




FIG. 1. A schematic picture of semi-inclusive diffractive DIS (SIDDIS). Due to a color singlet (‘Pomeron’) exchange, the elastically scattered nucleon and the diffractively produced system are separated by a rapidity gap  $Y_{\mathcal{P}} = \ln 1/x_{\mathcal{P}}$ . The produced system itself has a rapidity span  $Y_{\beta} = \ln 1/\beta$  and  $x_B = \beta x_{\mathcal{P}}$  is the usual Bjorken variable.

version of the standard collinear DPDFs [23] and can be in principle rigorously defined once QCD factorization is established. At small- $x$ , they can be analyzed within the frameworks of high energy factorization and the Color Glass Condensate (CGC) [24–28]. In Ref. [22], the quark and gluon TMD DPDFs at small- $x$  have been evaluated directly from their operator definitions in terms of the color dipole S-matrix, the ubiquitous building block of parton distributions and QCD amplitudes in the saturation regime. The results are consistent, in appropriate kinematical limits, with the earlier calculations of the diffractive structure functions [2–4, 29, 30] recently extended to next-to-leading order [31] in the CGC framework. In the forward limit, the gluon TMD DPDF is equivalent to the ‘Pomeron unintegrated gluon distribution’ studied in [19–21].

In this paper, we investigate the azimuthal angle correlation in the quark and gluon TMD DPDFs. In addition to  $k_{\perp}$ , TMD DPDFs depend on another transverse vector  $\Delta_{\perp}$ , the nucleon recoil transverse momentum. Moreover, if the incoming nucleon is transversely polarized, there

is a third transverse vector  $S_\perp$ , the nucleon spin vector. One would then expect that these vectors strongly correlate with each other and generate a rich pattern of angular dependencies within the distributions. The situation is actually similar to the quark and gluon Wigner distributions which also depend on these vectors. This is so because both the Wigner distributions and TMD DPDFs are related to the dipole S-matrix such that, very roughly,  $(\text{TMD DPDF}) \sim (\text{Wigner})^2$ . There are however interesting differences, as we shall explore below.

A complementary study can also be carried out for the moderate/large- $x$  kinematics, where the above-mentioned correlations provide access to the quark/gluon Wigner distributions in the respective kinematics. A more general framework to address this physics is the so-called fracture functions or target fragmentation functions [23, 32–36]. Recent developments along this direction have also revealed opportunities to explore the relevant aspects of nucleon tomography [37–43] in measurements at JLab [44] and potential measurements in future experiments at JLab and the electron-ion collider (EIC) [45–50].

## II. DIFFRACTIVE PDFS FROM DIPOLE AMPLITUDE AT SMALL- $x$ : GENERAL FRAMEWORK

The definition of the TMD DPDFs has been given in Ref. [22] which are reproduced here for completeness. For the quark TMD DPDF, we have

$$2E_{P'} \frac{df_q^D(x, k_\perp; x_{P'}, t)}{d^3 P'} = \int \frac{d\xi^- d^2 \xi_\perp}{2(2\pi)^6} e^{-ix\xi^- P^+ + i\xi_\perp \cdot \vec{k}_\perp} \times \langle PS | \bar{\psi}(\xi) \mathcal{L}_n^\dagger(\xi) \gamma^+ | P' X \rangle \langle P' X | \mathcal{L}_n(0) \psi(0) | PS \rangle, \quad (1)$$

with a future pointing gauge link in the fundamental representation  $\mathcal{L}_n(\xi) \equiv \exp(-ig \int_0^\infty d\lambda v \cdot A(\lambda n + \xi))$ . In the above definition, we have chosen that the nucleon is moving along  $+\hat{z}$  direction that its momentum  $P$  is dominated by its plus component. A light-cone vector  $n$  is conjugate to the nucleon momentum  $n^2 = 0$  and  $n \cdot P = 1$ . The momentum transfer between the initial and final states is denoted by  $\vec{\Delta} = P' - P$  and  $t = \Delta^2$ . Furthermore, we define  $x_{P'} = n \cdot (P - P')$  to represent the momentum fraction carried by the Pomeron and  $\beta = x/x_{P'}$ . Similarly, we can define the gluon TMD DPDF

$$2E_{P'} \frac{df_g^D(x, k_\perp; x_{P'}, t)}{d^3 P'} = \int \frac{d\xi^- d^2 \xi_\perp}{x P^+ (2\pi)^6} e^{-ix\xi^- P^+ + i\xi_\perp \cdot \vec{k}_\perp} \times \langle PS | F^{+\mu}(\xi) \mathcal{L}_n^\dagger(\xi) \gamma^+ | P' X \rangle \langle P' X | \mathcal{L}_n(0) F_\mu^+(0) | PS \rangle \quad (2)$$

For this case, the gauge link is in the adjoint representation.

The above definitions are also similar to the non-diffractive TMDs for the semi-inclusive DIS (SIDIS) [51–53]. However, there is a major difference




FIG. 2. Feynman diagrams for the diffractive quark TMDs at small- $x$  in the dipole formalism.

between these two TMDs. In the non-diffractive TMDs, the associate gauge links can go to either  $+\infty$  or  $-\infty$  [54–56], where the  $-\infty$  gauge links correspond to the Drell-Yan type of hard processes, such as virtual photon,  $Z/W$  vector Boson, Higgs Boson productions in  $pp$  collisions. But, for the diffractive TMDs, the gauge links can only go to  $+\infty$ , corresponding to the semi-inclusive diffractive DIS processes in  $ep/eA$  collisions. This is because the QCD factorization is known to break down for the diffractive processes in  $pp$  collisions [57–61], where the relevant TMD definition would require a gauge link goes to  $-\infty$ . In other words, the TMD DPDF with gauge link going to  $-\infty$  does not exist.

At small- $x$ , we can compute the TMD DPDFs in the CGC formalism [24–28]. The leading order Feynman diagrams have been computed in Ref. [22]. For convenience, we show the four diagrams for the quark TMD DPDF calculations. Similar diagrams can be drawn for the gluon TMD DPDF. The quark TMD DPDF is related to the color dipole S-matrix

$$\mathcal{F}_x(q_\perp, \Delta_\perp) = \int \frac{d^2 b_\perp d^2 r_\perp}{(2\pi)^4} e^{iq_\perp \cdot r_\perp + i\Delta_\perp \cdot b_\perp} \times \frac{1}{N_c} \left\langle \text{Tr} \left[ U \left( b_\perp + \frac{r_\perp}{2} \right) U^\dagger \left( b_\perp - \frac{r_\perp}{2} \right) \right] \right\rangle_x \quad (3)$$

where the brackets  $\langle \dots \rangle$  denote the CGC averaging [26] and

$$U(b_\perp) = \text{P exp} \left( ig \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dz^- A^+(z^-, b_\perp) \right), \quad (4)$$

is the Wilson line along the lightcone in the fundamental representation. Similarly, the gluon TMD DPDF is related to the dipole S-matrix in the adjoint representation. It is known that these dipole S-matrices contain nontrivial correlations between  $\Delta_\perp$  and  $q_\perp$ , and also the

spin vector  $\vec{S}_\perp$  if the nucleon is transversely polarized. As already commented in [22], such correlations will be reflected in TMD DPDFs with observable consequences.

The goal of this paper is to compute these correlations in the quark and gluon DPDFs in the CGC framework. To do so, we first recapitulate the main result of [22]. The typical Feynman diagrams necessary to evaluate the quark and gluon TMD DPDFs are shown in Fig. 2 where the double lines represent gauge links. To the order of accuracy, the final state  $|X\rangle$  is saturated by a single antiquark and a gluon for the quark and gluon DPDFs, respectively. The phase space of the antiquark/gluon is integrated out while ensuring the rapidity gap  $Y_{\mathcal{P}} = \ln 1/x_{\mathcal{P}}$  due to the colorless exchange from the nucleon target.

The result for the quark TMD DPDF is

$$x \frac{df_q^D(\beta, k_\perp; x_{\mathcal{P}})}{dY_{\mathcal{P}} dt d\phi_\Delta} = \int d^2 k_{1\perp} d^2 k_{2\perp} \mathcal{F}_{x_{\mathcal{P}}}(k_{1\perp}, \Delta_\perp) \times \mathcal{F}_{x_{\mathcal{P}}}(k_{2\perp}, \Delta_\perp) \frac{N_c \beta}{(2\pi)^2} \mathcal{T}_q(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}), \quad (5)$$

where  $\phi_\Delta$  represents the azimuthal angle of the recoil nucleon momentum  $\vec{\Delta}_\perp$ .  $k_{1\perp}$  is the transverse momentum of one of the two vertical gluon lines in the left diagram of Fig. 2, and  $k_{2\perp}$  is for the complex conjugate diagram.  $\mathcal{T}_q$  represents the sum of four terms  $\mathcal{T}_q \equiv T_q(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) - T_q(k_\perp, 0, k_{2\perp}) - T_q(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, 0) + T_q(k_\perp, 0, 0)$  where

$$T_q(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) = \frac{k'_{1\perp} \cdot k'_{2\perp} k_\perp^2}{[\beta k_\perp^2 + (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^{\prime 2}][\beta k_\perp^2 + (1-\beta)k_{2\perp}^{\prime 2}]}, \quad (6)$$

with  $k'_{i\perp} = k_\perp - k_{i\perp}$ .  $\mathcal{F}_{x_{\mathcal{P}}}(k_{i\perp}, \Delta_\perp)$  is as in (3) evaluated at  $x = x_{\mathcal{P}}$ . Similarly, the gluon TMD DPDF reads

$$x \frac{df_g^D(\beta, k_\perp; x_{\mathcal{P}})}{dY_{\mathcal{P}} dt d\phi_\Delta} = \int d^2 k_{1\perp} d^2 k_{2\perp} \mathcal{G}_{x_{\mathcal{P}}}(k_{1\perp}, \Delta_\perp) \times \mathcal{G}_{x_{\mathcal{P}}}(k_{2\perp}, \Delta_\perp) \frac{N_c^2 - 1}{2\pi^2(1-\beta)} \mathcal{T}_g(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}), \quad (7)$$

where we again defined  $\mathcal{T}_g \equiv T_g(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) - T_g(k_\perp, 0, k_{2\perp}) - T_g(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, 0) + T_g(k_\perp, 0, 0)$  and

$$T_g(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) = \frac{1}{[\beta k_\perp^2 + (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^{\prime 2}]} \times \frac{1}{[\beta k_\perp^2 + (1-\beta)k_{2\perp}^{\prime 2}]} \left[ \beta(1-\beta)k_\perp^2 \frac{k_{1\perp}^{\prime 2} + k_{2\perp}^{\prime 2}}{2} + (1-\beta)^2(k'_{1\perp} \cdot k'_{2\perp})^2 + \beta^2 \frac{(k_\perp^2)^2}{2} \right]. \quad (8)$$

For a later purpose, we make a one step back in the derivation and write

$$T_g(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) = \delta_\perp^{\alpha\alpha'} \delta_\perp^{\nu\nu'} R_g^{\alpha\nu}(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}) R_g^{\alpha'\nu'}(k_\perp, k_{2\perp}), \quad (9)$$

where

$$R_g^{\alpha\nu}(k_\perp, k_{i\perp}) = \frac{(1-\beta)k'_{i\perp}{}^\alpha k'_{i\perp}{}^\nu + \beta k_\perp^2 \delta_\perp^{\alpha\nu}/2}{(1-\beta)k'_{i\perp}{}^2 + \beta k_\perp^2}. \quad (10)$$

Finally,  $\mathcal{G}$  is the gluon dipole S-matrix

$$\mathcal{G}_x(q_\perp, \Delta_\perp) = \int \frac{d^2 b_\perp d^2 r_\perp}{(2\pi)^4} e^{iq_\perp \cdot r_\perp + i\Delta_\perp \cdot b_\perp} \times \frac{1}{N_c^2 - 1} \left\langle \text{Tr} \left[ \tilde{U} \left( b_\perp + \frac{r_\perp}{2} \right) \tilde{U}^\dagger \left( b_\perp - \frac{r_\perp}{2} \right) \right] \right\rangle_x \quad (11)$$

where  $\tilde{U}$  is the same Wilson line but in the adjoint representation.

### III. ELLIPTIC TMD DPDFS

Let us first discuss the ‘elliptic’ TMD DPDFs. For this purpose, we can follow the parameterization in Ref. [11, 62]

$$\mathcal{F}_x = \mathcal{F}_0(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|) + 2 \cos(2\phi_q - 2\phi_\Delta) \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|), \quad \mathcal{G}_x = \mathcal{G}_0(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|) + 2 \cos(2\phi_q - 2\phi_\Delta) \mathcal{G}_\epsilon(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|). \quad (12)$$

Therefore, the  $\cos(2\phi)$  term in the TMD DPDF can be written as

$$x \frac{df_{q\epsilon}^D(\beta, k_\perp; x_{\mathcal{P}})}{dY_{\mathcal{P}} dt d\phi_\Delta} = 2 \int d^2 k_{1\perp} d^2 k_{2\perp} \mathcal{F}_\epsilon(k_{1\perp}, \Delta_\perp) \times \mathcal{F}_0(k_{2\perp}, \Delta_\perp) \frac{N_c \beta}{(2\pi)^2} \mathcal{T}_q(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) 2 \cos(2\phi_{k_1} - 2\phi_\Delta).$$

We can perform the angular integral in Eq. (5). For the  $\phi_\Delta$ -independent term, we have

$$x \frac{df_q^D(\beta, k_\perp; x_{\mathcal{P}})}{dY_{\mathcal{P}} dt d\phi_\Delta} = \frac{N_c \beta}{16(1-\beta)^2} (\Gamma^q(\beta, k_\perp))^2, \quad (14)$$

$$x \frac{df_g^D(\beta, k_\perp; x_{\mathcal{P}})}{dY_{\mathcal{P}} dt d\phi_\Delta} = \frac{(N_c^2 - 1)}{16(1-\beta)^3} (\Gamma^g(\beta, k_\perp))^2, \quad (15)$$

where we have taken the limit  $\Delta_\perp \rightarrow 0$ .  $\Gamma^q(\beta, k_\perp)$  and  $\Gamma^g(\beta, k_\perp)$  are defined as

$$\Gamma^q(\beta, k_\perp) = \int_0^\infty dk_{1\perp}^2 \mathcal{F}_0(k_{1\perp}^2) \left\{ 1 - 2\beta + \frac{\alpha_{1\perp}^2}{\omega_{1\perp}^2} \right\} \quad (16)$$

$$\Gamma^g(\beta, k_\perp) = \int_0^\infty dk_{1\perp}^2 \mathcal{G}_0(k_{1\perp}^2) \left\{ \frac{2\beta(1-\beta)k_\perp^2}{\omega_{1\perp}^2} - \frac{\omega_{1\perp}^2}{k_\perp^2} + \beta^2 + (1-\beta)^2 + (1-\beta) \frac{k_{1\perp}^2}{k_\perp^2} \right\}, \quad (17)$$

where  $\alpha_{1\perp}^2 = (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^2 - (1-2\beta)k_\perp^2$  and

$$\omega_{1\perp}^2 = \sqrt{(k_\perp^2 + (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^2)^2 - 4(1-\beta)^2 k_\perp^2 k_{1\perp}^2}. \quad (18)$$




FIG. 3. Azimuthal angular symmetric contributions to  $\Gamma^{q,g}$  the TMD DPDFs as functions of  $k_\perp/\tilde{Q}_{(a)s}$  where  $\tilde{Q}_{(a)s} = \sqrt{1-\beta}Q_{(a)s}$ .

In the elliptic term, we write  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|) \approx \Delta_\perp^2 \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\epsilon(q_\perp^2)$  as  $\Delta_\perp \rightarrow 0$  and perform the angular integral

$$x \frac{df_{q\epsilon}^D(\beta, k_\perp; x_{\mathcal{P}})}{dY_{\mathcal{P}} dt d\phi_\Delta} = \frac{N_c \beta \Delta_\perp^2}{16(1-\beta)^2} \Gamma^q \Gamma_\epsilon^q \cos(2\phi_k - 2\phi_\Delta) \quad (19)$$

$$x \frac{df_{g\epsilon}^D(\beta, k_\perp; x_{\mathcal{P}})}{dY_{\mathcal{P}} dt d\phi_\Delta} = \frac{(N_c^2 - 1) \Delta_\perp^2}{16(1-\beta)^3} \Gamma^g \Gamma_\epsilon^g \cos(2\phi_k - 2\phi_\Delta), \quad (20)$$

where  $\Gamma^{q,g}(\beta, k_\perp)$  are the same as above and

$$\Gamma_\epsilon^q(\beta, k_\perp) = 2 \int_0^\infty dk_{1\perp}^2 \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_\epsilon(k_{1\perp}^2) \frac{\alpha_{1\perp}^2}{k_\perp^2 k_{1\perp}^2 (1-\beta)^2} \times \left\{ \omega_{1\perp}^2 - k_\perp^2 - (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^2 + \frac{2(1-\beta)^2 k_\perp^2 k_{1\perp}^2}{\omega_{1\perp}^2} \right\} \quad (21)$$

$$\Gamma_\epsilon^g(\beta, k_\perp) = 2 \int_0^\infty dk_{1\perp}^2 \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_\epsilon(k_{1\perp}^2) \frac{\omega_{1\perp}^4 - 2\beta(1-\beta)k_\perp^4}{k_\perp^4 k_{1\perp}^2 (1-\beta)^2} \times \left\{ \frac{2(1-\beta)^2 k_\perp^2 k_{1\perp}^2}{\omega_{1\perp}^2} + (k_\perp^2 + (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^2) \times \left( 1 - \frac{(k_\perp^2 + (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^2)}{\omega_{1\perp}^2} \right) \right\}. \quad (22)$$

At small- $x$ , it is known that  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and  $\mathcal{G}_0$  show the geometric scaling behavior. Namely, they depend on  $x$  and  $k_\perp$  through the combination  $k_\perp/Q_{(a)s}(x)$  where  $Q_s$  and  $Q_{as}$  with  $Q_{as}^2 = \frac{N_c}{C_F} Q_s^2$  are the quark and gluon saturation scales, respectively. Such a scaling is inherited by

the ordinary quark and gluon TMDs at small- $x$ . However, this is not the case for TMD DPDFs because of the additional parameter  $\beta$ . Nevertheless, it has been observed in [19, 22] that TMD DPDFs exhibit the modified geometric scaling in terms of the rescaled variable  $k_\perp/\tilde{Q}_{(a)s}$  where  $\tilde{Q}_{(a)s} \equiv \sqrt{1-\beta}Q_{(a)s}$ .

Previous studies [63, 64] have shown that geometric scaling is violated in the elliptic, or more generally, angular-dependent gluon distributions due to the small- $x$  evolution effect. However, in regimes where the evolution is not important, we may expect that there is an approximate (modified) geometric scaling. We study this by using a simple Gaussian model

$$\mathcal{F}_0(q_\perp), \mathcal{G}_0(q_\perp) = \frac{S_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{1}{\pi Q_{(a)s}^2} e^{-q_\perp^2/Q_{(a)s}^2}, \quad (23)$$

$$\mathcal{F}_\epsilon(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|) = \frac{S_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\Delta_\perp^2 q_\perp^2}{\pi(Q_s^2)^2 \Lambda^2} e^{-q_\perp^2/Q_s^2}, \quad (24)$$

$$\mathcal{G}_\epsilon(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|) = \frac{S_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\Delta_\perp^2 q_\perp^2}{\pi(Q_{as}^2)^2 \Lambda^2} e^{-q_\perp^2/Q_{as}^2}, \quad (25)$$

where  $S_\perp$  is the transverse area of the nucleon. In the elliptic part, we have implemented the minimum requirement that  $\mathcal{F}_\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_\epsilon \propto q_\perp^2 \Delta_\perp^2$  as  $q_\perp, \Delta_\perp \rightarrow 0$ . For more realistic models, see [15, 62, 63, 65, 66]. In  $r_\perp$ -space, (23) and (24) implies

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{N_c} \text{Tr} U \left( \frac{r_\perp}{2} \right) U^\dagger \left( -\frac{r_\perp}{2} \right) \right\rangle = e^{-\frac{r_\perp^2 Q_s^2}{4}} \left( 1 - 2 \cos(2\phi_r - 2\phi_\Delta) \frac{Q_s^2 r_\perp^2 \Delta_\perp^2}{4\Lambda^2} \right). \quad (26)$$

(25) is then consistent with the identity  $\text{Tr}[\tilde{U}\tilde{U}^\dagger] = |\text{Tr}[UU^\dagger]|^2 - 1$  and the relation  $Q_{as}^2 \approx 2Q_s^2$  in the large- $N_c$  approximation.

With these parametrizations, the integrals (16), (17), (21), (22) can be readily performed. We first extract the analytical behavior as  $\beta \rightarrow 1$ . As explained in [22], this can be conveniently done by rescaling  $k_{1\perp}^2 = \tilde{k}_{1\perp}^2/(1-\beta)$  and expanding around  $\beta = 1$ . The result is

$$\Gamma^q, \Gamma_\epsilon^q, \Gamma_\epsilon^g \propto 1 - \beta, \quad \Gamma^g \propto (1 - \beta)^2. \quad (27)$$

We then plot the rescaled distributions  $\Gamma^q/(1-\beta)N^q$  with normalization factors  $N^q = N^g = S_\perp/4\pi^3$  and  $N_q^\epsilon = N_g^\epsilon = S_\perp/4\pi^3\Lambda^2$ , etc. as functions of  $k_\perp/\tilde{Q}_{(a)s}$  for three different values  $\beta = 0.3, 0.5, 0.8$ . We see in Fig. 3 that the azimuthally symmetric distributions approximately obey the modified geometric scaling consistently with the previous result [22]. On the other hand, we see in Fig. 4 that the elliptic quark distribution  $\Gamma_\epsilon^q$  does not show the scaling behavior at high  $k_\perp$ . The elliptic gluon distribution  $\Gamma_\epsilon^g$  approximately does, but somewhat unexpectedly, it does not go to zero as  $k_\perp \rightarrow 0$ . Normally one would expect that the  $\cos 2\phi_k$  angular dependence should vanish as  $k_\perp^2$  as  $k_\perp \rightarrow 0$ . While this does not cause immediate problems, it is still an intriguing observation.




FIG. 4. Azimuthal angular asymmetric contribution to the elliptic TMD DPDFs  $\Gamma_e^{q,g}$  as functions of  $k_\perp/\tilde{Q}_{(a)s}$ .

#### IV. SPIN-DEPENDENT TMD DPDF

In order to study spin-dependent TMD DPDFs, we introduce the nucleon helicity ( $\pm$ ) dependent dipole amplitudes.  $\mathcal{F}_0$  in (12) can be interpreted as the helicity-conserving amplitude

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_x^{+-}(q_\perp, \Delta_\perp) &= \mathcal{F}_x^{--}(q_\perp, \Delta_\perp) \\ &= \mathcal{F}_0(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|) + i\Delta_\perp \cdot q_\perp O(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The imaginary piece is sometimes referred to as the spin-independent odderon, see, e.g., [67–70]. On the other hand, the helicity-flip dipole amplitude can be parameterized as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_x^{+-}(q_\perp, \Delta_\perp) &= \frac{\Delta_\perp^x + i\Delta_\perp^y}{M} \mathcal{F}_{1T} \\ &\quad - i\frac{q_\perp^x + iq_\perp^y}{M} O_{1T}^\perp(|q_\perp|, |\Delta_\perp|) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where  $M$  is the nucleon mass.  $O_{1T}^\perp$  is the so-called spin-dependent odderon [71, 72]. We have adopted the following conventions for the transverse polarization states

$$|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|+\rangle \pm |-\rangle), \quad (30)$$

$$|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|+\rangle \pm i|-\rangle), \quad (31)$$

where the left hand sides represent transversely polarized nucleon states along the  $\hat{x}$  and  $\hat{y}$  directions, respectively.

The spin-dependent odderon is known to contribute to the Siverson function for the non-diffractive SIDIS, leading to non-zero gluon Siverson function as small- $x$ . Meanwhile, it also contributes to the spin asymmetries in the exclusive processes [73]. Substituting the above expression to the quark TMD DPDF, we will show that it will contribute to the Siverson asymmetry in the diffractive semi-inclusive processes.

We follow the same parameterization as that of non-diffractive TMDs for the transverse spin dependent TMD DPDF,

$$\delta f_q^D(\vec{S}_\perp) = \frac{k_\perp \sin(\phi_k - \phi_S)}{M} f_{1Tq}^{D\perp}(\beta, k_\perp; x_P), \quad (32)$$

where  $\phi_S$  is the angle of the transverse nucleon vector  $\vec{S}_\perp$ . To zeroth order in  $\Delta_\perp$ , the quark Siverson TMD DPDF can be evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} x \frac{d f_{1Tq}^{D\perp}(\beta, k_\perp; x_P)}{dY_P dt} \sin(\phi_k - \phi_S) &= 2 \int d^2 k_{1\perp} d^2 k_{2\perp} O_{1T}^\perp(k_{1\perp}, \Delta_\perp) \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{F}_0(k_{2\perp}, \Delta_\perp) \frac{N_c \beta}{2\pi} \mathcal{T}_q(k_\perp, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) \\ &\quad \times \frac{k_{1\perp}}{k_\perp} \sin(\phi_{k_1} - \phi_S), \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where we summed over the final state nucleon spin  $S'$  and integrated over  $\phi_\Delta$ . Again, after integrating over  $\phi_{k_1}$  and  $\phi_{k_2}$  we find a Siverson-type distribution

$$x \frac{d f_{1Tq}^{D\perp}(\beta, k_\perp; x_P)}{dY_P dt} = \frac{\pi N_c \beta}{8(1-\beta)^2} \Gamma^q \Gamma_{S_\perp}^q, \quad (34)$$

where  $\Gamma^q(k_\perp, \beta)$  is the same as above and

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{S_\perp}^q(k_\perp, \beta) &= \frac{-1}{1-\beta} \int_0^\infty dk_{1\perp}^2 O_{1T}^\perp(k_{1\perp}^2) \frac{\alpha_{1\perp}^2}{k_\perp^2} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ 1 - \frac{k_\perp^2 + (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^2}{\omega_{1\perp}^2} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

with  $\Gamma_{S_\perp}^q \sim (1-\beta)^0$  as  $\beta \rightarrow 1$ .

To illustrate the above feature, we assume a saturation model for  $O_{1T}^\perp(q_\perp)$ ,

$$O_{1T}^\perp(q_\perp; \Delta_\perp = 0) = \frac{S_\perp}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{c_{odd}}{\pi Q_s^2} e^{-q_\perp^2/Q_s^2}, \quad (36)$$

where we introduced a parameter  $c_{odd}$  to represent the small contribution from the Odderon. In Fig. 5, we show  $\Gamma_{S_\perp}^q(\beta, k_\perp)/N_S^q$  with  $N_S^q = c_{odd} S_\perp / (2\pi)^2$  as function of  $k_\perp/\tilde{Q}_s$  for three different  $\beta$  values. Again, the quark Siverson DPDF contribution  $\Gamma_{S_\perp}^q(\beta, k_\perp)$  has a modified geometric scaling behavior below the saturation scale  $\tilde{Q}_s$ . However, at large transverse momentum, the scaling behavior is broken.






FIG. 5. Siverson contribution to the TMD quark DPDFs  $\Gamma_S^q$  as functions of  $k_{\perp}/\tilde{Q}_s$ .

At higher orders in  $\Delta_{\perp}$ , more complicated angular correlations which involve all three angles  $\phi_{k,S,\Delta}$  are possible. For example, the  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta_{\perp})$  terms in (28) and (29) lead to

$$f_q^D \sim (\vec{S}_{\perp} \times \vec{\Delta}_{\perp})(\vec{\Delta}_{\perp} \cdot \vec{k}_{\perp}) \sim \Delta_{\perp}^2 \sin(\phi_S + \phi_k - 2\phi_{\Delta}) \quad (37)$$

Interestingly, the above spin-dependent correlations are entirely absent in the gluon TMD DPDF. This is because the dipole S-matrix in the adjoint representation (11) is a real operator whereas the one in the fundamental representation has a nonzero imaginary part which can be identified as the odderon. In contrast, in the TMD case both the quark and gluon Siverson functions are related to the spin-dependent odderon at small- $x$ .

## V. VANISHING OF THE LINEARLY POLARIZED GLUON TMD DPDF

Next we consider the generalization of the linearly polarized gluon TMD to DPDF. This is defined by replacing in (2)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F^{+\mu} \dots F_{\mu}^{+} \rangle &\rightarrow \langle F^{+i} \dots F^{+j} \rangle \\ &= \frac{\delta^{ij}}{2} f_g^D + \left( \frac{k_{\perp}^i k_{\perp}^j}{k_{\perp}^2} - \frac{\delta^{ij}}{2} \right) h_{1g}^{\perp D}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

It is straightforward to compute the linearly polarized gluon TMD DPDF  $h_{1g}^{\perp D}$ . All we need to do is to replace (9) with

$$T_g^h(k_{\perp}, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) = \delta_{\perp}^{\alpha\alpha'} \delta_{h_{\perp}}^{\nu\nu'} R_g^{\alpha\nu}(k_{\perp}, k_{1\perp}) R_g^{\alpha'\nu'}(k_{\perp}, k_{2\perp}), \quad (39)$$

where  $\delta_{h_{\perp}}^{\nu\nu'} = \frac{2k_{\perp}^{\nu} k_{\perp}^{\nu'}}{k_{\perp}^2} - \delta_{\perp}^{\nu\nu'}$ . This gives

$$\begin{aligned} x \frac{dh_{1g}^{\perp D}(\beta, k_{\perp}; x_P)}{dY_P dt} &= \int d^2 k_{1\perp} d^2 k_{2\perp} \mathcal{G}_{x_P}(k_{1\perp}, \Delta_{\perp}) \\ &\times \mathcal{G}_{x_P}(k_{2\perp}, \Delta_{\perp}) \frac{N_c^2 - 1}{\pi(1-\beta)} \mathcal{T}_g^h(k_{\perp}, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where we again defined  $\mathcal{T}_g^h \equiv T_g^h(k_{\perp}, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) - T_g^h(k_{\perp}, 0, k_{2\perp}) - T_g^h(k_{\perp}, k_{1\perp}, 0) + T_g^h(k_{\perp}, 0, 0)$ . Explicitly,

$$\begin{aligned} T_g^h(k_{\perp}, k_{1\perp}, k_{2\perp}) &= -\frac{1-\beta}{2k_{\perp}^2} \frac{1}{[\beta k_{\perp}^2 + (1-\beta)k_{1\perp}^2]} \\ &\times \frac{1}{[\beta k_{\perp}^2 + (1-\beta)k_{2\perp}^2]} [\beta(k_{\perp}^2)^2 (k'_{1\perp}{}^2 + k'_{2\perp}{}^2) \\ &- 4(1-\beta)k_{\perp} \cdot k'_{1\perp} k_{\perp} \cdot k'_{2\perp} k'_{1\perp} \cdot k'_{2\perp} \\ &- 2\beta k_{\perp}^2 ((k_{\perp} \cdot k'_{1\perp})^2 + (k_{\perp} \cdot k'_{2\perp})^2) \\ &+ 2(1-\beta)k_{\perp}^2 (k'_{1\perp} \cdot k'_{2\perp})^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Interestingly, however, we find that  $\mathcal{T}_g^h$  identically vanishes due to a highly nontrivial cancellation among the four terms in  $\mathcal{T}_g^h$ . This indicates that the two-gluon exchange ‘‘Pomeron’’ does not couple to the linearly polarized gluon distribution and unpolarized gluon in the final state. This is different from the non-diffractive TMD gluon distribution, which comes from quark radiation in the CGC and contributes to a significant linearly polarization for both dipole and Weizsaecker-Williams gluon distributions [74].

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have computed various transverse momentum dependent diffractive PDFs in the small- $x$  dipole formalism. We focused on, in particular, the non-trivial correlations between the transverse momentum  $\vec{k}_{\perp}$  of the probing quark/gluon, the momentum transfer  $\vec{\Delta}_{\perp}$  from the nucleon target, and the transverse polarization vector  $\vec{S}_{\perp}$ . Interesting results were found from our derivations. First, the linearly polarized gluon TMD does not exist in the diffractive case. Second, the Siverson and elliptic TMD DPDFs have the ‘modified geometric scaling’ behavior [19, 22]. However, the scaling of these angular-dependent DPDFs is not as clear as in their angular-independent counterparts, and in some cases explicitly violated in the large- $k_{\perp}$  region. We also expect that the remaining scaling property is washed out once the small- $x$  evolution effects are turned on [63, 64]. Finally, the angular-dependent DPDFs have different large- $\beta$  behaviors (different powers of  $1-\beta$ ) from the angular independent distributions.

It will be interesting to investigate the phenomenological implications of our findings for future measurements at the EIC such as semi-inclusive hadron/jet production in diffractive DIS (Fig. 1) and two plus one jet diffractive production. In addition, it will be instructive to study inclusive or semi-inclusive diffractive processes in the collinear generalized parton distribution (GPD) framework. Some preliminary exploration has been carried out in Ref. [43]. More systematic studies are needed to fully explore the potential of this physics at the EIC. We will come back to this in a future publication.

**Acknowledgments:** We thank Shohini Bhattacharya and Edmond Iancu for discussions. Y. H. thanks Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, where this work was initiated, for hospitality. F. Y. is grateful to the support from France-Berkeley-Fund from University of California at Berkeley. This material is based upon work supported by the LDRD programs of Brookhaven Science

Associates, and by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics, under contract numbers DE-AC02-05CH11231 and DE-SC0012704. It is also under the umbrella of the Quark-Gluon Tomography (QGT) Topical Collaboration with Award DE-SC0023646 and the Saturated Glue (SURGE) Topical Theory Collaboration.

- 
- [1] J. Bartels, H. Lotter and M. Wüsthoff, *Phys. Lett. B* **379**, 239-248 (1996) [erratum: *Phys. Lett. B* **382**, 449-449 (1996)] doi:10.1016/0370-2693(96)00412-1 [arXiv:hep-ph/9602363 [hep-ph]].
- [2] M. Wüsthoff, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 4311-4321 (1997) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.56.4311 [arXiv:hep-ph/9702201 [hep-ph]].
- [3] W. Buchmuller, T. Gehrmann and A. Hebecker, *Nucl. Phys. B* **537**, 477-500 (1999) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(98)00682-8 [arXiv:hep-ph/9808454 [hep-ph]].
- [4] K. J. Golec-Biernat and M. Wüsthoff, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 114023 (1999) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.60.114023 [arXiv:hep-ph/9903358 [hep-ph]].
- [5] Y. V. Kovchegov and E. Levin, *Nucl. Phys. B* **577**, 221-239 (2000) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(00)00125-5 [arXiv:hep-ph/9911523 [hep-ph]].
- [6] H. Kowalski, L. Motyka and G. Watt, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 074016 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.074016 [arXiv:hep-ph/0606272 [hep-ph]].
- [7] Y. Hatta, E. Iancu, C. Marquet, G. Soyez and D. N. Triantafyllopoulos, *Nucl. Phys. A* **773**, 95-155 (2006) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2006.04.003 [arXiv:hep-ph/0601150 [hep-ph]].
- [8] C. Marquet, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 094017 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.094017 [arXiv:0706.2682 [hep-ph]].
- [9] H. Kowalski, T. Lappi, C. Marquet and R. Venugopalan, *Phys. Rev. C* **78**, 045201 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.78.045201 [arXiv:0805.4071 [hep-ph]].
- [10] T. Altinoluk, N. Armesto, G. Beuf and A. H. Rezaeian, *Phys. Lett. B* **758**, 373-383 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.05.032 [arXiv:1511.07452 [hep-ph]].
- [11] Y. Hatta, B. W. Xiao and F. Yuan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, no.20, 202301 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.202301 [arXiv:1601.01585 [hep-ph]].
- [12] R. Boussarie, A. V. Grabovsky, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, *JHEP* **11**, 149 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2016)149 [arXiv:1606.00419 [hep-ph]].
- [13] R. Boussarie, A. V. Grabovsky, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no.7, 074020 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.074020 [arXiv:1905.07371 [hep-ph]].
- [14] M. Fucilla, A. V. Grabovsky, E. Li, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, *JHEP* **03**, 159 (2023) doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2023)159 [arXiv:2211.05774 [hep-ph]].
- [15] J. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no.11, 114017 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.114017 [arXiv:1611.02397 [hep-ph]].
- [16] Y. Hagiwara, Y. Hatta, R. Pasechnik, M. Tasevsky and O. Teryaev, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, no.3, 034009 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.034009 [arXiv:1706.01765 [hep-ph]].
- [17] H. Mäntysaari, N. Mueller and B. Schenke, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, no.7, 074004 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.074004 [arXiv:1902.05087 [hep-ph]].
- [18] H. Mäntysaari, N. Mueller, F. Salazar and B. Schenke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, no.11, 112301 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.112301 [arXiv:1912.05586 [nucl-th]].
- [19] E. Iancu, A. H. Mueller and D. N. Triantafyllopoulos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, no.20, 202001 (2022) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.202001 [arXiv:2112.06353 [hep-ph]].
- [20] E. Iancu, A. H. Mueller, D. N. Triantafyllopoulos and S. Y. Wei, *JHEP* **10**, 103 (2022) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2022)103 [arXiv:2207.06268 [hep-ph]].
- [21] S. Hauksson, E. Iancu, A. H. Mueller, D. N. Triantafyllopoulos and S. Y. Wei, [arXiv:2402.14748 [hep-ph]].
- [22] Y. Hatta, B. W. Xiao and F. Yuan, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, no.9, 094015 (2022) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.094015 [arXiv:2205.08060 [hep-ph]].
- [23] A. Berera and D. E. Soper, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 6162-6179 (1996) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.53.6162 [arXiv:hep-ph/9509239 [hep-ph]].
- [24] A. H. Mueller, *Nucl. Phys. B* **415**, 373-385 (1994) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(94)90116-3
- [25] A. H. Mueller, *Nucl. Phys. B* **558**, 285-303 (1999) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00394-6 [arXiv:hep-ph/9904404 [hep-ph]].
- [26] L. D. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 2233-2241 (1994) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.2233 [arXiv:hep-ph/9309289 [hep-ph]].
- [27] L. D. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 3352-3355 (1994) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.49.3352 [arXiv:hep-ph/9311205 [hep-ph]].
- [28] L. D. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 2225-2233 (1994) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.50.2225 [arXiv:hep-ph/9402335 [hep-ph]].
- [29] F. Hautmann, Z. Kunszt and D. E. Soper, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3333-3336 (1998) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.81.3333 [arXiv:hep-ph/9806298 [hep-ph]].
- [30] F. Hautmann and D. E. Soper, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 011501 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.63.011501 [arXiv:hep-ph/0008224 [hep-ph]].
- [31] G. Beuf, T. Lappi, H. Mäntysaari, R. Paatelainen and J. Penttala, [arXiv:2401.17251 [hep-ph]].

- [32] L. Trentadue and G. Veneziano, *Phys. Lett. B* **323**, 201-211 (1994) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(94)90292-5
- [33] M. Grazzini, L. Trentadue and G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys. B* **519**, 394-404 (1998) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(97)00840-7 [arXiv:hep-ph/9709452 [hep-ph]].
- [34] D. Graudenz, *Nucl. Phys. B* **432**, 351-376 (1994) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(94)90606-8 [arXiv:hep-ph/9406274 [hep-ph]].
- [35] D. de Florian, C. A. Garcia Canal and R. Sassot, *Nucl. Phys. B* **470**, 195-210 (1996) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(96)00159-9 [arXiv:hep-ph/9510262 [hep-ph]].
- [36] J. C. Collins, *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 3051-3056 (1998) [erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 019902 (2000)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.61.019902 [arXiv:hep-ph/9709499 [hep-ph]].
- [37] M. Anselmino, V. Barone and A. Kotzinian, *Phys. Lett. B* **699**, 108-118 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.03.067 [arXiv:1102.4214 [hep-ph]].
- [38] M. Anselmino, V. Barone and A. Kotzinian, *Phys. Lett. B* **706**, 46-52 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.10.064 [arXiv:1109.1132 [hep-ph]].
- [39] M. Boglione, J. Collins, L. Gamberg, J. O. Gonzalez-Hernandez, T. C. Rogers and N. Sato, *Phys. Lett. B* **766**, 245-253 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.01.021 [arXiv:1611.10329 [hep-ph]].
- [40] K. B. Chen, J. P. Ma and X. B. Tong, *JHEP* **11**, 038 (2021) doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2021)038 [arXiv:2108.13582 [hep-ph]].
- [41] K. B. Chen, J. P. Ma and X. B. Tong, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, no.9, 9 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.094015 [arXiv:2308.11251 [hep-ph]].
- [42] K. B. Chen, J. P. Ma and X. B. Tong, [arXiv:2402.15112 [hep-ph]].
- [43] Y. Guo and F. Yuan, [arXiv:2312.01008 [hep-ph]].
- [44] H. Avakian *et al.* [CLAS], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, no.2, 022501 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.022501 [arXiv:2208.05086 [hep-ex]].
- [45] D. Boer, M. Diehl, R. Milner, R. Venugopalan, W. Vogel-sang, D. Kaplan, H. Montgomery, S. Vidor, A. Accardi and E. C. Aschenauer, *et al.* [arXiv:1108.1713 [nucl-th]].
- [46] J. L. Abelleira Fernandez *et al.* [LHeC Study Group], *J. Phys. G* **39**, 075001 (2012) doi:10.1088/0954-3899/39/7/075001 [arXiv:1206.2913 [physics.acc-ph]].
- [47] A. Accardi, J. L. Albacete, M. Anselmino, N. Armesto, E. C. Aschenauer, A. Bacchetta, D. Boer, W. K. Brooks, T. Burton and N. B. Chang, *et al.* *Eur. Phys. J. A* **52**, no.9, 268 (2016) doi:10.1140/epja/i2016-16268-9 [arXiv:1212.1701 [nucl-ex]].
- [48] R. Abdul Khalek, A. Accardi, J. Adam, D. Adamiak, W. Akers, M. Albaladejo, A. Al-bataineh, M. G. Alexeev, F. Ameli and P. Antonioli, *et al.* *Nucl. Phys. A* **1026**, 122447 (2022) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2022.122447 [arXiv:2103.05419 [physics.ins-det]].
- [49] F. Gross, E. Klempt, S. J. Brodsky, A. J. Buras, V. D. Burkert, G. Heinrich, K. Jakobs, C. A. Meyer, K. Orginos and M. Strickland, *et al.* *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83**, 1125 (2023) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11949-2 [arXiv:2212.11107 [hep-ph]].
- [50] P. Achenbach, D. Adhikari, A. Afanasev, F. Afzal, C. A. Aidala, A. Al-bataineh, D. K. Almaalol, M. Amarian, D. Androic and W. R. Armstrong, *et al.* [arXiv:2303.02579 [hep-ph]].
- [51] P. J. Mulders and R. D. Tangerman, *Nucl. Phys. B* **461**, 197-237 (1996) [erratum: *Nucl. Phys. B* **484**, 538-540 (1997)] doi:10.1016/0550-3213(95)00632-X [arXiv:hep-ph/9510301 [hep-ph]].
- [52] D. Boer and P. J. Mulders, *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 5780-5786 (1998) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.57.5780 [arXiv:hep-ph/9711485 [hep-ph]].
- [53] A. Bacchetta, M. Diehl, K. Goeke, A. Metz, P. J. Mulders and M. Schlegel, *JHEP* **02**, 093 (2007) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/02/093 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611265 [hep-ph]].
- [54] J. C. Collins, *Phys. Lett. B* **536**, 43-48 (2002) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)01819-1 [arXiv:hep-ph/0204004 [hep-ph]].
- [55] X. d. Ji and F. Yuan, *Phys. Lett. B* **543**, 66-72 (2002) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)02384-5 [arXiv:hep-ph/0206057 [hep-ph]].
- [56] A. V. Belitsky, X. Ji and F. Yuan, *Nucl. Phys. B* **656**, 165-198 (2003) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(03)00121-4 [arXiv:hep-ph/0208038 [hep-ph]].
- [57] C. E. DeTar, S. D. Ellis and P. V. Landshoff, *Nucl. Phys. B* **87**, 176-188 (1975) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(75)90260-6
- [58] J. L. Cardy and G. A. Winbow, *Phys. Lett. B* **52**, 95-96 (1974) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(74)90729-1
- [59] J. C. Collins, L. Frankfurt and M. Strikman, *Phys. Lett. B* **307**, 161-168 (1993) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(93)90206-W [arXiv:hep-ph/9212212 [hep-ph]].
- [60] J. C. Collins, *J. Phys. G* **28**, 1069-1078 (2002) doi:10.1088/0954-3899/28/5/327 [arXiv:hep-ph/0107252 [hep-ph]].
- [61] T. Affolder *et al.* [CDF], *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5043-5048 (2000) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.84.5043
- [62] R. Pasechnik and M. Taševský, [arXiv:2310.10793 [hep-ph]].
- [63] Y. Hagiwara, Y. Hatta and T. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no.9, 094036 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.094036 [arXiv:1609.05773 [hep-ph]].
- [64] X. Yao, Y. Hagiwara and Y. Hatta, *Phys. Lett. B* **790**, 361-366 (2019) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.01.029 [arXiv:1812.03959 [hep-ph]].
- [65] E. Iancu and A. H. Rezaeian, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, no.9, 094003 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.094003 [arXiv:1702.03943 [hep-ph]].
- [66] B. Linek, A. Łuszczak, M. Łuszczak, R. Pasechnik, W. Schäfer and A. Szczurek, *JHEP* **10**, 179 (2023) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2023)179 [arXiv:2308.00457 [hep-ph]].
- [67] Y. V. Kovchegov, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, *Phys. Lett. B* **586**, 267-281 (2004) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2004.02.036 [arXiv:hep-ph/0309281 [hep-ph]].
- [68] Y. Hatta, E. Iancu, K. Itakura and L. McLerran, *Nucl. Phys. A* **760**, 172-207 (2005) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysa.2005.05.163 [arXiv:hep-ph/0501171 [hep-ph]].
- [69] A. Dumitru, G. A. Miller and R. Venugopalan, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no.9, 094004 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.094004 [arXiv:1808.02501 [hep-ph]].
- [70] S. Benić, D. Horvatić, A. Kaushik and E. A. Vivoda, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, no.7, 074005 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.074005 [arXiv:2306.10626 [hep-ph]].
- [71] J. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, no.7, 074050 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.074050 [arXiv:1308.5912 [hep-ph]].



- [72] D. Boer, M. G. Echevarria, P. Mulders and J. Zhou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, no.12, 122001 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.122001 [arXiv:1511.03485 [hep-ph]].
- [73] R. Boussarie, Y. Hatta, L. Szymanowski and S. Wallon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, no.17, 172501 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.172501 [arXiv:1912.08182 [hep-ph]].
- [74] A. Metz and J. Zhou, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 051503 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.051503 [arXiv:1105.1991 [hep-ph]].