

Azimuthal modulations and extraction of generalized parton distributions

Jian-Wei Qiu,^{1,2,*} Nobuo Sato,^{1,†} and Zhite Yu^{1,‡}

¹*Theory Center, Jefferson Lab, Newport News, Virginia 23606, USA*

²*Department of Physics, William & Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23187, USA*

(Dated: September 12, 2024)

Azimuthal modulations are crucial for the phenomenological extraction and separation of various generalized parton distributions. We provide a new choice of frame and corresponding formalism to describe the azimuthal distributions, based on the separation of physics occurring at different momentum scales. We demonstrate that this new description is not only well-suited for experimental analysis, but also advantageous in separating contributions from different subprocesses to the same physical cross section.

Introduction.—Generalized parton distributions (GPDs) encode rich information that can unravel many aspects of hadron structure, including quark and gluon tomography [1, 2], mechanical properties [3–5], and spin [6] and mass [7–10] decompositions. They can be extracted from exclusive hadron scattering processes [11–39] by virtue of the QCD factorization theorem [40–43]. Reconstructing GPDs from data has been, and will continue to be, a major focus of the current and future high-energy nuclear facilities [44–65].

Unlike parton distribution functions (PDFs) or transverse-momentum-dependent PDFs (TMDs), which enter observables at the cross-section level, GPDs enter at the amplitude level. This feature imposes a challenge, among others, that a single physical cross section could involve subprocesses not associated with parton dynamics. An example is the Bethe-Heitler (BH) subprocess, in which the nucleon is probed via a low-virtuality photon, that accompanies the deeply virtual Compton scattering (DVCS) [11, 12]. Furthermore, even for those subprocesses that involve partons and can be factorized into GPDs, there are multiple types of GPDs contributing all at the same time and the resulting physical observables are given as highly nontrivial expressions of these GPDs and nucleon form factors.

Despite this complexity, azimuthal modulations offer, in principle, a unique opportunity to isolate different types of GPDs [66], similar to the TMD extraction from semi-inclusive deep inelastic scattering (SIDIS) [67–69] and Drell-Yan processes [70]. However, for exclusive processes, the standard treatment to decompose the observables in terms of their azimuthal structures [15, 71–93] is challenging due to the presence of BH channels, in addition to introducing higher-twist ambiguities [89, 94, 95]. As we will argue, the difficulties are rooted in the choice of frame to study the exclusive process. Although a physical event occurs regardless of the choice of frame, which only differs by a Lorentz transformation, the event shape or angular distribution does depend on the frame in which it is analyzed. An improper choice causes the azimuthal structures to lose a clear physical interpreta-

tion and makes the extraction of GPDs from physical observables increasingly difficult.

In this Letter, we resolve this problem by analyzing the azimuthal modulations of GPD processes within the framework of *single-diffractive hard exclusive processes* (SDHEPs) [43]. Specifically we consider a generic process of the form

$$h(p) + B(p_2) \rightarrow h'(p') + C(q_1) + D(q_2), \quad (1)$$

where a colliding hadron h is diffracted into h' by an incident beam particle B , and the final-state particles C and D have large balancing transverse momenta with respect to the h - B collision axis, relative to the diffractive momentum transfer, i.e., $q_{1T} \sim q_{2T} \sim q_T \gg \sqrt{-t} \equiv \sqrt{-(p-p')^2}$. With these two distinct scales, the process in Eq. (1) can be described in two stages,

$$h(p) \rightarrow A^*(\Delta = p - p') + h'(p'), \quad (2a)$$

$$\rightsquigarrow A^*(\Delta) + B(p_2) \rightarrow C(q_1) + D(q_2), \quad (2b)$$

at a soft scale $\sqrt{-t}$ and a hard scale q_T , respectively, linked by a long-lived virtual state A^* of momentum Δ .

The amplitude in Eq. (1) comprises various subprocesses characterized by different A^* states. The BH subprocess occurs when $A^* = \gamma^*$, contributing at leading power (LP) in $\sqrt{-t}/q_T$, while the GPD subprocess occurs at the next-to-leading power (NLP) with $A^* = [q\bar{q}]$ or $[gg]$, and three- or more-parton channels happen at higher powers. It is the separation of scales in Eq. (2) and the associated power counting that dictate the state of A^* , allowing us to describe consistently the azimuthal structures generated by BH and partonic subprocesses.

Azimuthal modulations in SDHEPs.—Following Eq. (2), we describe the kinematics of SDHEPs in two frames as shown in Fig. 1. First, we consider the diffraction subprocess [Eq. (2a)] in the *diffractive frame*, chosen as the center-of-mass (c.m.) frame of the h - B system, with \hat{z}_D oriented along the direction of h and \hat{x}_D along $\Delta_T \equiv (\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}')_T$. The \hat{x}_D axis varies event by event, and trades the azimuthal angle ϕ_Δ of Δ_T in the lab frame




Fig. 1. Frames for analyzing SDHEPs in Eq. (1). The big vertical arrow refers to the Lorentz transformation from the Lab frame to the SDHEP frame. The linear polarization ζ_γ along ϕ_γ applies only to photoproduction processes.

for the azimuthal angle ϕ_S of the hadron's transverse spin \mathbf{S}_T , similar to the treatment of SIDIS [67–69, 96]. The distribution of ϕ_Δ (and thus ϕ_S) is nontrivial only when $S_T \equiv |\mathbf{S}_T| \neq 0$, allowing us to characterize the diffraction process with variables ϕ_S , t , and the skewness $\xi = [(p - p') \cdot n] / [(p + p') \cdot n]$, where the lightlike vector $n^\mu = (1, 0, 0, -1) / \sqrt{2}$ is oriented along the direction of $B(p_2)$.

Having fixed the kinematics of the diffraction, we describe the kinematics of the hard $2 \rightarrow 2$ scattering subprocess [Eq. (2b)] in the *SDHEP frame* as shown in Fig. 1. This frame is defined as the c.m. of the A^* and B , with \hat{z}_S oriented along the momentum of A^* and \hat{x}_S lying on the diffraction plane along the opposite direction of the transverse momentum \mathbf{p}_T of h . The C and D are produced in the scattering plane that intersects with the diffractive plane along the \hat{z}_S axis, making an angle ϕ . Their kinematics is then described by two angles θ and ϕ , with the c.m. energy $\sqrt{\hat{s}}$ determined by t and ξ . In this way, the kinematics of SDHEP events is completely described in terms of five kinematic variables $(t, \xi, \phi_S, \theta, \phi)$.

We note that the Lorentz transformation from the diffractive frame to the SDHEP frame is a transverse boost [37] (up to corrections of order M_B^2/q_T^2 with M_B being the B mass, which is 0 for lepton and photon beams), which keeps the vector n , and thus the definition of ξ , unchanged. The advantage of the SDHEP frame is that the \hat{z}_S axis is along two real or quasi-real particles such that the distribution of the azimuthal angle ϕ has a pure dynamical origin determined by the spin states of A^* and B , without any kinematic distortion.

With this setup, the total reaction amplitude can be written schematically as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\lambda_h \lambda_B}^{hB \rightarrow h'CD} = \sum_{A^*} e^{-i\lambda_h \phi_S} F_{\lambda_h}^{h \rightarrow h'A^*}(t, \xi) \otimes e^{i(\lambda_A - \lambda_B)\phi} H_{\lambda_A \lambda_B}^{A^*B \rightarrow CD}(\hat{s}, \theta), \quad (3)$$

where the two stages for each A^* channel are factorized in terms of the diffractive structure function $F_{\lambda_h}^{h \rightarrow h'A^*}$ and hard scattering coefficient $H_{\lambda_A \lambda_B}^{A^*B \rightarrow CD}$. Importantly, two distinct azimuthal phases emerge, one from each frame: a ϕ_S dependence in the diffractive frame controlled by the initial hadron helicity λ_h , and a ϕ dependence in the SDHEP frame associated with the hard scattering, determined by the helicities λ_A and λ_B of the A^* and B particles, respectively. In general, when computing physical observables, one needs to square Eq. (3) and trace over the spin density matrices for the incoming particles, i.e., $\rho_{\lambda_h \lambda_h'}^{(h)} \rho_{\lambda_B \lambda_B'}^{(B)} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_h \lambda_B} \mathcal{M}_{\lambda_h' \lambda_B'}^*$, causing different h and B helicities as well as different A^* channels to interfere, giving rise to a variety of azimuthal modulations in ϕ_S and ϕ . For instance, for a nucleon target with transverse spin S_T , the interference of $\lambda_h = \pm 1/2$ leads to $\cos \phi_S$ and $\sin \phi_S$ modulations, while the interference between two (A^*, B) channels of helicities (λ_A, λ_B) and (λ_A', λ_B') would lead to the azimuthal modulations $\cos[(\Delta\lambda_A - \Delta\lambda_B)\phi]$ and $\sin[(\Delta\lambda_A - \Delta\lambda_B)\phi]$, with $(\Delta\lambda_A, \Delta\lambda_B) \equiv (\lambda_A - \lambda_A', \lambda_B - \lambda_B')$.

It is these azimuthal modulations in ϕ and ϕ_S that ultimately allow us to separate the GPD-dependent spin structures. Unlike the azimuthal modulations in SIDIS and Drell-Yan processes, the modulations in SDHEPs contain unique effects stemming from interference between particles of different species and numbers, characteristic of multi-particle interference featured in high-twist inclusive processes [97]. These modulations reflect a deeper quantum effect in quantum field theory, where particle flavors and numbers are not conserved. In the next sections, we will specialize the SDHEP framework for different exclusive reactions and focus the discussion around their emerging azimuthal modulations.

Electroproduction processes.—An example in this class of processes is the electroproduction of a real photon off a nucleon N , i.e., $h = h' = N$, $B = C = e$, and $D = \gamma$ in Eqs. (1) and (2).




Fig. 2. The first two channels in the photon electroproduction. The two parton lines in (b) are either quarks or gluons.

In a physical gauge, the amplitude with $(N + 1)$ particles in A^* is suppressed by a factor of $\sqrt{-t}/q_T$ relative to the amplitude with N particles in A^* . Therefore, the leading channel is the BH subprocess, $A^* = \gamma^*$, with three possible helicity states, $\lambda_A^\gamma = \pm 1$ or 0, as shown in

Fig. 2(a). The sub-amplitude can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{[1]} &= \frac{-e}{t} F_N^\mu(p, p') G_\mu^\gamma(\Delta, p_2, q_1, q_2) \\ &= \frac{e}{t} \left[\sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} (F_N \cdot \epsilon_\lambda^*) (\epsilon_\lambda \cdot G^\gamma) - 2(F_N \cdot n)(\bar{n} \cdot G^\gamma) \right], \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where $F_N^\mu(p, p') = \langle N(p') | J^\mu(0) | N(p) \rangle$ defines the nucleon form factors F_1 and F_2 as usual with the electromagnetic current J^μ . The hard coefficient G_μ^γ describes the scattering of the virtual photon with the electron. In the second line of Eq. (4), we use the kinematics in the SDHEP frame to decompose the photon propagator into a sum of three polarizations, with the polarization vector being $\epsilon_\pm^\mu = (0, \mp 1, -i, 0)/\sqrt{2}$ for the transverse γ_T^* and $\epsilon_0^\mu = \bar{n}^\mu = (1, 0, 0, 1)/\sqrt{2}$ for the longitudinal γ_L^* . One can show by Ward identity that only the γ_T^* contributes to the amplitude at LP, while the γ_L^* amplitude is NLP, which is at the same power as the case for two-parton channels in Fig. 2(b), $A^* = [q\bar{q}]$ or $[gg]$. The amplitude of the latter can be factorized into GPDs F and \tilde{F} , with perturbative coefficients G and \tilde{G} , respectively,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{[2]} &= \sum_q \int_{-1}^1 dx [F^q(x, \xi, t) G^q(x, \xi; \hat{s}, \theta, \phi) \\ &\quad + \tilde{F}^q(x, \xi, t) \tilde{G}^q(x, \xi; \hat{s}, \theta, \phi)] + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{-t}/q_T), \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

where we have suppressed the factorization scale for sim-

licity, and neglected the gluon GPD contributions since we will be working at leading order (LO) in the strong coupling. At this order, G^q and \tilde{G}^q take a scaling form, reducing the GPD convolution in Eq. (5) to four simple complex-valued moment integrals [98]. The amplitudes $\mathcal{M}^{[\geq 3]}$ involving three- or more-parton channels in A^* enter at next-to-NLP (NNLP), together with the high-twist effects in Eq. (5) [37, 38, 71, 84, 99–115].

As a result, the full amplitude \mathcal{M} receives a LP contribution from γ_T^* , with helicities $\lambda_A^\gamma = \pm 1$ and NLP corrections from the γ_L^* and $[q\bar{q}]$ channels, both with helicities 0. Importantly, the ϕ dependence of the corresponding hard coefficients in Eqs. (4) and (5) are given by $\epsilon_\pm \cdot G^\gamma \propto e^{\pm i\phi}$ and $(\bar{n} \cdot G^\gamma, G^q, \tilde{G}^q) \propto e^{0 \cdot i\phi}$, where we suppress the ϕ dependence stemming from the electron helicity since it disappears in the amplitude squared. Therefore, up to the NLP accuracy, the $|\mathcal{M}|^2$ includes the γ_T^* amplitude squared, which gives a flat ϕ distribution, and its interference with the γ_L^* and $[q\bar{q}]$ amplitudes, which gives rise to $\cos \phi$ and $\sin \phi$ modulations. The resulting NLP cross section for the photon electroproduction process is

$$\frac{d\sigma_e^\gamma}{dt d\xi d\phi_S d \cos \theta d\phi} = \frac{d\sigma_e^{\gamma, \text{unp.}}}{dt d\xi d \cos \theta} \Omega_e^\gamma(\phi_S, \phi), \quad (6)$$

where $d\sigma_e^{\gamma, \text{unp.}}$ is the unpolarized differential cross section and $\Omega_e^\gamma(\phi_S, \phi)$ modulates the azimuthal distributions as

$$\begin{aligned} (2\pi)^2 \Omega_e^\gamma(\phi_S, \phi) &= 1 + P_e P_N A_{LL}^{\text{LP}} + P_e S_T A_{TL}^{\text{LP}} \cos \phi_S + (A_{UU}^{\text{NLP}} + P_e P_N A_{LL}^{\text{NLP}}) \cos \phi + (P_e A_{UL}^{\text{NLP}} + P_N A_{LU}^{\text{NLP}}) \sin \phi \\ &\quad + S_T (A_{TU,1}^{\text{NLP}} \cos \phi_S \sin \phi + A_{TU,2}^{\text{NLP}} \sin \phi_S \cos \phi) + P_e S_T (A_{TL,1}^{\text{NLP}} \cos \phi_S \cos \phi + A_{TL,2}^{\text{NLP}} \sin \phi_S \sin \phi), \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

where P_e and P_N are the net helicities of the electron and nucleon beams, respectively. The polarization asymmetries A 's given in terms of form factors $F_{1,2}$ and GPD moments can be found in [116]. Their superscripts refer to the power of $\sqrt{-t}/q_T$ at which they contribute and their subscripts refer sequentially to the nucleon and electron polarizations, with “U”, “L”, and “T” standing for “unpolarized”, “longitudinally polarized”, and “transversely polarized”, respectively. As discussed, the $\cos \phi_S$ and $\sin \phi_S$ modulations arise only when the nucleon has a nonzero transverse spin S_T . At NLP, both modulations are present in (TU) and (TL) configurations, and we distinguish them with additional subscripts 1, 2.

The LP asymmetries only depend on the form factors, whereas the NLP asymmetries depend on the GPD moments in a linear form. Up to this order, we have eight NLP asymmetries in total, corresponding exactly to the eight real degrees of freedom of the GPD moments.

Therefore, a complete measurement of all the polarization asymmetries, extracted with the aid of the azimuthal projections, can disentangle all the GPD moments.

While our calculation is restricted to LO in the strong coupling, the azimuthal modulation analysis is based on rotational symmetry which extends to all orders in perturbative QCD for the helicity-zero GPDs $F^{q,g}$ and $\tilde{F}^{q,g}$. Beyond LO and at NLP, the photon electroproduction receives contributions from the gluon transversity GPD F_T^g , which carries a helicity $\lambda_A^{gT} = \pm 2$ and interferes with the γ_T^* amplitude to give $\cos 3\phi$ and $\sin 3\phi$ modulations.

Beyond the NLP accuracy, NNLP contributions include the square of the γ_L^* and $[q\bar{q}]$ amplitudes and the interference of the γ_T^* with three-parton channels, $A^* = [q\bar{q}g]$ or $[ggg]$. The latter carry helicities $\lambda_A^{qqg} = \pm 1$ and $\lambda_A^{ggg} = \pm 1$ or ± 3 . These give rise to additional azimuthal modulations ($\cos 2\phi, \sin 2\phi$) as well as ($\cos 4\phi, \sin 4\phi$). This pattern builds up and generates a

tower of azimuthal modulations as one progresses to increasingly higher twists.




Fig. 3. Monte Carlo reconstructed ϕ distributions for (a) unpolarized case and (b) single electron polarization. The two curves in each figure refer to the azimuthal distributions reconstructed in the SDHEP and Breit frames.

The key difference between our formalism and the traditional approach is that the z_S axis used to define ϕ in the SDHEP frame is determined by the A^* direction. In contrast, the Breit frame in the traditional approach is defined for the DVCS subprocess using the highly virtual photon $\gamma_{ee}^*(q = p_2 - q_1)$ which does not exist for the BH subprocess. Due to this inconsistency, the traditional azimuthal modulations derived from tensor contractions [71] are highly convoluted and difficult to interpret, in contrast to our results in Eq. (7). To illustrate this, in Fig. 3(a) we show the unpolarized ϕ distributions in the SDHEP and Breit frames evaluated using the nucleon form factors from Ref. [117] and GPD models from Refs. [118–121]. We perform the simulation using JLab kinematics with an electron beam energy of $E_e = 12$ GeV, restricting the final state phase space to $q_T \geq 1$ GeV and $|t| \leq 0.2$ GeV². As expected, the SDHEP-based ϕ modulation exhibits a clear $\cos \phi$ structure with an amplitude that is exactly A_{UU}^{NLP} , as shown in Eq. (7), in contrast to the Breit-frame modulation which approximately follows a harmonic series of the form $\sum_{n=0}^4 a_n \cos n\phi$. This kind of distortion induced by the Breit frame makes the connection of the observables with the underlying GPDs increasingly difficult [71, 84, 90] compared to our approach. Similarly, Fig. 3(b) shows the azimuthal modulations with a polarized electron beam ($P_e = 1$). In this case, the SDHEP modulations contain an additional $\sin \phi$ component on

top of the unpolarized distribution with an amplitude exactly equal to A_{UL}^{NLP} . The Breit frame modulations, on the other hand, exhibits a highly distorted azimuthal modulation.

Another feature of our two-stage kinematic description is that the ϕ_S modulations are regular and predictable as well, further facilitating the extraction of GPDs. In contrast, the ϕ_S distribution in the Breit frame [67] is distorted due to a Jacobian factor from the Lab-to-Breit frame transformation. These effects are power-suppressed in SIDIS [68, 69], but can become important in reconstructing GPDs because the latter themselves enter the observables at NLP. However, these effects are typically ignored in the literature [71].

Our formalism also applies to the meson electroproduction process, which includes the $A^* = \gamma^*$ channel [43]. However, this channel is electromagnetically suppressed relative to the two-parton channels $A^* = [q\bar{q}]/[gg]$ and can be neglected. Because of this, the Breit-frame azimuthal distribution is relatively regular and less critically dependent on the choice of frame. However, the GPDs are not the same in different frames. Although the difference is power suppressed and can be potentially addressed by a full high-twist analysis [89], it may not be numerically small at current experimental energies such as those at JLab. Furthermore, it is unclear whether an all-order twist-3 factorization holds [122]. Due to these uncontrolled power-suppressed effects, which can potentially contaminate the otherwise controllable pure GPD signal, we advocate for the use of the SDHEP framework in analyzing this process.

Photoproduction processes.—An example in this category is the dilepton photoproduction off a nucleon, i.e., $h = h' = N$, $B = \gamma$, and $(C, D) = (\ell^-, \ell^+)$. The treatment is similar to the photon electroproduction. This reaction contains both the BH channel with $A^* = \gamma^*$ and two-parton channels with $A^* = [q\bar{q}]$ or $[gg]$, with the hard-scattering subprocesses $\gamma^* + \gamma \rightarrow \ell^- + \ell^+$ and $[q\bar{q}]/[gg] + \gamma \rightarrow \gamma_{\ell\ell}^* \rightarrow \ell^- + \ell^+$, respectively. The main difference from the electroproduction is that the photon beam can carry a linear polarization ζ_γ in addition to a net helicity (circular polarization) P_γ , which allows the interference of opposite photon beam helicities. This injects two additional units of helicity flips, $\Delta\lambda_B = \pm 2$, and gives rise to $\cos 3\phi$ and $\sin 3\phi$ modulations in the interference of one- and two-parton channels.

Up to NLP, the cross section $d\sigma_\gamma^{\ell\ell}$ takes a form similar to Eq. (6), with the azimuthal modulation given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(2\pi)^2 \Omega_\gamma^{\ell\ell}(\phi_S, \phi) = & 1 + P_N P_\gamma A_{LL}^{\text{LP}} + S_T P_\gamma A_{TL}^{\text{LP}} \cos \phi_S + \zeta_\gamma A_{UT}^{\text{LP}} \cos(4\phi - 2\phi_\gamma) + (A_{UU}^{\text{NLP}} + P_N P_\gamma A_{LL}^{\text{NLP}}) \cos \phi \\
& + (P_N A_{LU}^{\text{NLP}} + P_\gamma A_{UL}^{\text{NLP}}) \sin \phi + \zeta_\gamma A_{UT}^{\text{NLP}} \cos(3\phi - 2\phi_\gamma) + P_N \zeta_\gamma A_{LT}^{\text{NLP}} \sin(3\phi - 2\phi_\gamma) \\
& + S_T (A_{TU,1}^{\text{NLP}} \cos \phi_S \sin \phi + A_{TU,2}^{\text{NLP}} \sin \phi_S \cos \phi) + S_T P_\gamma (A_{TL,1}^{\text{NLP}} \cos \phi_S \cos \phi + A_{TL,2}^{\text{NLP}} \sin \phi_S \sin \phi)
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ S_T \zeta_\gamma [A_{TT,1}^{\text{NLP}} \cos \phi_S \sin(3\phi - 2\phi_\gamma) + A_{TT,2}^{\text{NLP}} \sin \phi_S \cos(3\phi - 2\phi_\gamma)] . \quad (8)$$

Here, ϕ_γ is the direction of the linear photon polarization, as shown in Fig. 1, and the expressions for the asymmetries can be found in [116]. Similar to Eq. (7), the LP asymmetries only depend on $F_{1,2}$ while the NLP asymmetries are linear in the GPD moments [15].

In contrast to photon electroproduction, the azimuthal ϕ dependence in dilepton photoproduction occurs at LP, because the linear polarization ζ_γ of the incoming photon causes interference between the two γ_T^* helicities and results in a $\cos(4\phi - 2\phi_\gamma)$ modulation. Also, four additional asymmetries (A_{UT}^{NLP} , A_{LT}^{NLP} , $A_{TT,1}^{\text{NLP}}$, $A_{TT,2}^{\text{NLP}}$) are presented, all induced by the linear polarization of the incoming photons. They are not independent but provide valuable constraints for reconstructing GPDs, especially when transversely polarized targets are unavailable.

We note that in traditional treatments [15, 123–126], the chosen frame to study this process is similar to our SDHEP frame, but with the \hat{z} axis along the opposite direction of the diffracted nucleon, i.e., $-\mathbf{p}'$. Correspondingly, the ϕ definition changes in a nontrivial manner, leading to additional ϕ -dependent factors that distort the regularity of the azimuthal modulation, similar to the Breit-frame description of photon electroproduction. We stress that in the presence of the $A^* = \gamma^*$ subprocess, the only way to avoid irregularities in azimuthal modulations is to consider the process in the SDHEP frame.

The same analysis can be applied to other photoproduction processes, including the diphoton production [25, 127, 128], photon-meson pair production [29–32, 34, 43], and meson-pair production [24, 27, 28].

Mesoproduction processes.—Dilepton [21–23] or diphoton [33, 35] mesoproduction processes can also be studied within the SDHEP framework. However, the theoretical description of their azimuthal modulations is simpler compared to the above-mentioned process, because experimentally only charged scalar meson beams like π^\pm or K^\pm are available. Therefore, only flavor transition GPDs are allowed, forbidding the γ^* and gluon channels. The only possible ϕ modulations arise from the interference between twist-2 and higher-twist GPDs, making the SDHEP frame the most natural choice.

Summary and outlook.—In this Letter, we have provided a unified description of all $2 \rightarrow 3$ exclusive processes for extracting GPDs in the two-stage SDHEP framework, which offers a consistent and universal GPD definition. Our work presents the first dedicated coherent formulation of the emerging azimuthal distributions in these processes, enabling a dynamical interpretation of each type of harmonic modulation, and removing potential irregularities—often difficult to interpret—in azimuthal modulations stemming from inconsistent frame choices used to treat the BH and GPD subprocesses.

Reconstructing GPDs from all these processes at existing facilities such as JLab and the future Electron-Ion Collider is critical for testing the universality and predictive power of QCD calculations, as well as for fully realizing the 3D imaging program. We believe that adopting the SDHEP framework based on the separation of physics at different momentum scales is advantageous not only for providing a unified theoretical framework for studying all classes of GPD processes outlined in this Letter but also for the extraction of GPDs from experimental analyses and Lattice QCD calculations [94, 95].

We thank Y. Guo, E. Moffat, and M. G. Santiago for helpful discussions and communications. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Contract No. DE-AC05-06OR23177, under which Jefferson Science Associates, LLC operates Jefferson Lab, the Jefferson Lab LDRD program project No. LD2312, No. LD2406. The work of NS was also supported by the DOE, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics in the Early Career Program.

* jqiu@jlab.org

† nsato@jlab.org

‡ yuzhite@jlab.org (corresponding author)

- [1] M. Burkardt, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 071503 (2000), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 66, 119903 (2002)], hep-ph/0005108.
- [2] M. Burkardt, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **18**, 173 (2003), hep-ph/0207047.
- [3] M. V. Polyakov, Phys. Lett. B **555**, 57 (2003), hep-ph/0210165.
- [4] M. V. Polyakov and P. Schweitzer, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **33**, 1830025 (2018), 1805.06596.
- [5] V. D. Burkert, L. Elouadrhiri, and F. X. Girod, Nature **557**, 396 (2018).
- [6] X.-D. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 610 (1997), hep-ph/9603249.
- [7] X.-D. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 1071 (1995), hep-ph/9410274.
- [8] X.-D. Ji, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 271 (1995), hep-ph/9502213.
- [9] C. Lorcé, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 120 (2018), 1706.05853.
- [10] A. Metz, B. Pasquini, and S. Rodini, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 114042 (2020), 2006.11171.
- [11] X.-D. Ji, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7114 (1997), hep-ph/9609381.
- [12] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 5524 (1997), hep-ph/9704207.
- [13] S. J. Brodsky, L. Frankfurt, J. F. Gunion, A. H. Mueller, and M. Strikman, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 3134 (1994), hep-ph/9402283.
- [14] L. Frankfurt, W. Koepf, and M. Strikman, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 3194 (1996), hep-ph/9509311.
- [15] E. R. Berger, M. Diehl, and B. Pire, Eur. Phys. J. C

- 23**, 675 (2002), hep-ph/0110062.
- [16] M. Guidal and M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 012001 (2003), hep-ph/0208275.
- [17] A. V. Belitsky and D. Mueller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 022001 (2003), hep-ph/0210313.
- [18] A. V. Belitsky and D. Mueller, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 116005 (2003), hep-ph/0307369.
- [19] S. Kumano, M. Strikman, and K. Sudoh, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 074003 (2009), 0905.1453.
- [20] S. Kumano and M. Strikman, Phys. Lett. B **683**, 259 (2010), 0909.1299.
- [21] E. R. Berger, M. Diehl, and B. Pire, Phys. Lett. B **523**, 265 (2001), hep-ph/0110080.
- [22] S. V. Goloskokov and P. Kroll, Phys. Lett. B **748**, 323 (2015), 1506.04619.
- [23] T. Sawada, W.-C. Chang, S. Kumano, J.-C. Peng, S. Sawada, and K. Tanaka, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 114034 (2016), 1605.00364.
- [24] M. El Beiyad, B. Pire, M. Segond, L. Szymanowski, and S. Wallon, Phys. Lett. B **688**, 154 (2010), 1001.4491.
- [25] A. Pedrak, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski, and J. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 074008 (2017), [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 100, 039901 (2019)], 1708.01043.
- [26] A. Pedrak, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski, and J. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 114027 (2020), 2003.03263.
- [27] M. Siddikov and I. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 034037 (2023), 2212.14019.
- [28] M. Siddikov and I. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 096031 (2023), 2309.09748.
- [29] R. Boussarie, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski, and S. Wallon, J. High Energy Phys. **02**, 054 (2017), [Erratum: J. High Energy Phys. 10, 029 (2018)], 1609.03830.
- [30] G. Duplančić, K. Passek-Kumerički, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski, and S. Wallon, J. High Energy Phys. **11**, 179 (2018), 1809.08104.
- [31] G. Duplančić, S. Nabeebaccus, K. Passek-Kumerički, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski, and S. Wallon, J. High Energy Phys. **03**, 241 (2023), 2212.00655.
- [32] G. Duplančić, S. Nabeebaccus, K. Passek-Kumerički, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski, and S. Wallon, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 094023 (2023), 2302.12026.
- [33] J.-W. Qiu and Z. Yu, J. High Energy Phys. **08**, 103 (2022), 2205.07846.
- [34] J.-W. Qiu and Z. Yu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 161902 (2023), 2305.15397.
- [35] J.-W. Qiu and Z. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 074023 (2024), 2401.13207.
- [36] K. Goeke, M. V. Polyakov, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **47**, 401 (2001), hep-ph/0106012.
- [37] M. Diehl, Phys. Rept. **388**, 41 (2003), hep-ph/0307382.
- [38] A. V. Belitsky and A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rept. **418**, 1 (2005), hep-ph/0504030.
- [39] S. Boffi and B. Pasquini, Riv. Nuovo Cim. **30**, 387 (2007), 0711.2625.
- [40] J. C. Collins, L. Frankfurt, and M. Strikman, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 2982 (1997), hep-ph/9611433.
- [41] J. C. Collins and A. Freund, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 074009 (1999), hep-ph/9801262.
- [42] X.-D. Ji and J. Osborne, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 094018 (1998), hep-ph/9801260.
- [43] J.-W. Qiu and Z. Yu, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 014007 (2023), 2210.07995.
- [44] A. Aktas et al. (H1), Eur. Phys. J. C **44**, 1 (2005), hep-ex/0505061.
- [45] F. D. Aaron et al. (H1), Phys. Lett. B **681**, 391 (2009), 0907.5289.
- [46] S. Chekanov et al. (ZEUS), JHEP **05**, 108 (2009), 0812.2517.
- [47] R. Akhunzyanov et al. (COMPASS), Phys. Lett. B **793**, 188 (2019), [Erratum: Phys.Lett.B 800, 135129 (2020)], 1802.02739.
- [48] S. Stepanyan et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 182002 (2001), hep-ex/0107043.
- [49] S. Chen et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 072002 (2006), hep-ex/0605012.
- [50] C. Muñoz Camacho et al. (Jefferson Lab Hall A, Hall A DVCS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 262002 (2006), nucl-ex/0607029.
- [51] F. X. Girod et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 162002 (2008), 0711.4805.
- [52] G. Gavalian et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. C **80**, 035206 (2009), 0812.2950.
- [53] S. Pisano et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. D **91**, 052014 (2015), 1501.07052.
- [54] M. Defurne et al. (Jefferson Lab Hall A), Phys. Rev. C **92**, 055202 (2015), 1504.05453.
- [55] H. S. Jo et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 212003 (2015), 1504.02009.
- [56] M. Defurne et al., Nature Commun. **8**, 1408 (2017), 1703.09442.
- [57] M. Hattawy et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 202004 (2017), 1707.03361.
- [58] M. Benali et al., Nature Phys. **16**, 191 (2020), 2109.02076.
- [59] R. Dupré et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. C **104**, 025203 (2021), 2102.07419.
- [60] F. Georges et al. (Jefferson Lab Hall A), Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 252002 (2022), 2201.03714.
- [61] G. Christiaens et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **130**, 211902 (2023), 2211.11274.
- [62] A. Accardi et al., Eur. Phys. J. A **52**, 268 (2016), 1212.1701.
- [63] R. Abdul Khalek et al., Nucl. Phys. A **1026**, 122447 (2022), 2103.05419.
- [64] D. P. Anderle et al., Front. Phys. (Beijing) **16**, 64701 (2021), 2102.09222.
- [65] A. Accardi et al. (2023), 2306.09360.
- [66] M. Diehl, T. Gousset, B. Pire, and J. P. Ralston, Phys. Lett. B **411**, 193 (1997), hep-ph/9706344.
- [67] M. Diehl and S. Sapeta, Eur. Phys. J. C **41**, 515 (2005), hep-ph/0503023.
- [68] A. Bacchetta, M. Diehl, K. Goeke, A. Metz, P. J. Mulders, and M. Schlegel, JHEP **02**, 093 (2007), hep-ph/0611265.
- [69] A. Bacchetta, D. Boer, M. Diehl, and P. J. Mulders, JHEP **08**, 023 (2008), 0803.0227.
- [70] C. S. Lam and W.-K. Tung, Phys. Rev. D **18**, 2447 (1978).
- [71] A. V. Belitsky, D. Mueller, and A. Kirchner, Nucl. Phys. B **629**, 323 (2002), hep-ph/0112108.
- [72] M. Guidal, Eur. Phys. J. A **37**, 319 (2008), [Erratum: Eur.Phys.J.A 40, 119 (2009)], 0807.2355.
- [73] M. Guidal and H. Moutarde, Eur. Phys. J. A **42**, 71 (2009), 0905.1220.
- [74] M. Guidal, Phys. Lett. B **689**, 156 (2010), 1003.0307.
- [75] M. Guidal, Phys. Lett. B **693**, 17 (2010), 1005.4922.
- [76] M. Guidal, H. Moutarde, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Rept.

- Prog. Phys. **76**, 066202 (2013), 1303.6600.
- [77] M. Boër and M. Guidal, J. Phys. G **42**, 034023 (2015), 1412.4651.
- [78] K. Kumerički, D. Müller, and M. Murray, Phys. Part. Nucl. **45**, 723 (2014), 1301.1230.
- [79] K. Kumericki, D. Mueller, and K. Passek-Kumericki, Nucl. Phys. B **794**, 244 (2008), hep-ph/0703179.
- [80] K. Kumerički and D. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **841**, 1 (2010), 0904.0458.
- [81] K. Kumericki, D. Mueller, and A. Schafer, JHEP **07**, 073 (2011), 1106.2808.
- [82] G. R. Goldstein, J. O. Hernandez, and S. Liuti, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 034007 (2011), 1012.3776.
- [83] K. Kumericki, S. Liuti, and H. Moutarde, Eur. Phys. J. A **52**, 157 (2016), 1602.02763.
- [84] B. Kriesten, S. Liuti, L. Calero-Diaz, D. Keller, A. Meyer, G. R. Goldstein, and J. Osvaldo Gonzalez-Hernandez, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 054021 (2020), 1903.05742.
- [85] B. Kriesten and S. Liuti, Phys. Rev. D **105**, 016015 (2022), 2004.08890.
- [86] B. Kriesten, S. Liuti, and A. Meyer, Phys. Lett. B **829**, 137051 (2022), 2011.04484.
- [87] M. Almaeen, J. Grigsby, J. Hoskins, B. Kriesten, Y. Li, H.-W. Lin, and S. Liuti (2022), 2207.10766.
- [88] M. Almaeen, T. Alghamdi, B. Kriesten, D. Adams, Y. Li, and H.-W. L. a. S. Liuti (2024), 2405.05826.
- [89] Y. Guo, X. Ji, and K. Shiells, JHEP **12**, 103 (2021), 2109.10373.
- [90] K. Shiells, Y. Guo, and X. Ji, JHEP **08**, 048 (2022), 2112.15144.
- [91] J. Grigsby, B. Kriesten, J. Hoskins, S. Liuti, P. Alonzi, and M. Burkardt, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 016001 (2021), 2012.04801.
- [92] H. Moutarde, P. Sznajder, and J. Wagner, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 614 (2019), 1905.02089.
- [93] M. Čuić, K. Kumerički, and A. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 232005 (2020), 2007.00029.
- [94] S. Bhattacharya, K. Cichy, M. Constantinou, J. Dodson, X. Gao, A. Metz, S. Mukherjee, A. Scapellato, F. Steffens, and Y. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **106**, 114512 (2022), 2209.05373.
- [95] S. Bhattacharya et al., Phys. Rev. D **109**, 034508 (2024), 2310.13114.
- [96] A. Bacchetta, U. D'Alesio, M. Diehl, and C. A. Miller, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 117504 (2004), hep-ph/0410050.
- [97] J.-W. Qiu and G. F. Sterman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 2264 (1991).
- [98] J.-W. Qiu, N. Sato, and Z. Yu (2024), in preparation.
- [99] I. V. Anikin, B. Pire, and O. V. Teryaev, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 071501 (2000), hep-ph/0003203.
- [100] M. Penttinen, M. V. Polyakov, A. G. Shuvaev, and M. Strikman, Phys. Lett. B **491**, 96 (2000), hep-ph/0006321.
- [101] A. V. Belitsky and D. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **589**, 611 (2000), hep-ph/0007031.
- [102] N. Kivel and M. V. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. B **600**, 334 (2001), hep-ph/0010150.
- [103] A. V. Radyushkin and C. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 114012 (2001), hep-ph/0010296.
- [104] Y. Guo, X. Ji, B. Kriesten, and K. Shiells, JHEP **06**, 096 (2022), 2202.11114.
- [105] N. Kivel, M. V. Polyakov, A. Schafer, and O. V. Teryaev, Phys. Lett. B **497**, 73 (2001), hep-ph/0007315.
- [106] A. V. Radyushkin and C. Weiss, Phys. Lett. B **493**, 332 (2000), hep-ph/0008214.
- [107] A. V. Radyushkin and C. Weiss, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 097504 (2001), hep-ph/0106059.
- [108] F. Aslan, M. Burkardt, C. Lorcé, A. Metz, and B. Pasquini, Phys. Rev. D **98**, 014038 (2018), 1802.06243.
- [109] J. Blumlein, B. Geyer, and D. Robaschik, Nucl. Phys. B **755**, 112 (2006), hep-ph/0605310.
- [110] J. Blumlein, D. Robaschik, and B. Geyer, Eur. Phys. J. C **61**, 279 (2009), 0812.1899.
- [111] V. M. Braun and A. N. Manashov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 202001 (2011), 1108.2394.
- [112] V. M. Braun and A. N. Manashov, JHEP **01**, 085 (2012), 1111.6765.
- [113] V. M. Braun, A. N. Manashov, and B. Pirnay, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 014003 (2012), 1205.3332.
- [114] V. M. Braun, A. N. Manashov, and B. Pirnay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 242001 (2012), 1209.2559.
- [115] V. M. Braun, A. N. Manashov, D. Müller, and B. M. Pirnay, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 074022 (2014), 1401.7621.
- [116] See Supplemental Material for specific expressions of the unpolarized cross section and polarization asymmetries in terms of the form factors and GPD moments for both the real photon electroproduction in Eqs. (6) and (7) and dilepton photoproduction processes in Eq. (8).
- [117] J. J. Kelly, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 068202 (2004).
- [118] S. V. Goloskokov and P. Kroll, Eur. Phys. J. C **42**, 281 (2005), hep-ph/0501242.
- [119] S. V. Goloskokov and P. Kroll, Eur. Phys. J. C **53**, 367 (2008), 0708.3569.
- [120] S. V. Goloskokov and P. Kroll, Eur. Phys. J. C **65**, 137 (2010), 0906.0460.
- [121] P. Kroll, H. Moutarde, and F. Sabatie, Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, 2278 (2013), 1210.6975.
- [122] G. Duplancić, P. Kroll, K. Passek-K., and L. Szymanowski, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 034008 (2024), 2312.13164.
- [123] M. Boër, M. Guidal, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Eur. Phys. J. A **51**, 103 (2015).
- [124] M. Boër, M. Guidal, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Eur. Phys. J. A **52**, 33 (2016), 1510.02880.
- [125] P. Nadel-Turonski, T. Horn, Y. Ilieva, F. J. Klein, R. Parnusyan, and S. Stepanyan, AIP Conf. Proc. **1182**, 843 (2009).
- [126] P. Chatagnon et al. (CLAS), Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 262501 (2021), 2108.11746.
- [127] O. Grocholski, B. Pire, P. Sznajder, L. Szymanowski, and J. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 114006 (2021), 2110.00048.
- [128] O. Grocholski, B. Pire, P. Sznajder, L. Szymanowski, and J. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **105**, 094025 (2022), 2204.00396.

Supplemental Material for “Azimuthal Modulations and Extraction of Generalized Parton Distributions”

Jian-Wei Qiu,^{1,2} Nobuo Sato,¹ and Zhite Yu¹

¹*Theory Center, Jefferson Lab, Newport News, Virginia 23606, USA*

²*Department of Physics, William & Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23187, USA*

(Dated: September 12, 2024)

A: Polarization asymmetry coefficients for the real photon electroproduction process

We first denote the unpolarized cross section in Eq. (6) and the polarization asymmetry coefficients in Eq. (7) as

$$\frac{d\sigma_e^{\gamma, \text{unp.}}}{dt d\xi d\cos\theta} = \frac{\alpha_e^3}{(1+\xi)^2} \frac{m^2}{s t^2} \Sigma_{UU}^{\text{LP}}, \quad A_X^{\text{LP}} = \frac{1}{\Sigma_{UU}^{\text{LP}}} \Sigma_X^{\text{LP}}, \quad A_Y^{\text{NLP}} = \frac{-t}{m\sqrt{\hat{s}}} \frac{1}{\Sigma_{UU}^{\text{LP}}} \Sigma_Y^{\text{NLP}}, \quad (\text{S1})$$

where $\alpha_e = e^2/(4\pi)$ is the electromagnetic coupling, m is the nucleon mass, $X \in \{LL, TL\}$ for the LP asymmetries, $Y \in \{UU, LL, (TL, 1), (TL, 2), UL, LU, (TU, 1), (TU, 2)\}$ for the NLP asymmetries, and \hat{s} is the c.m. energy squared of the $2 \rightarrow 2$ hard scattering between the A^* and e , given by

$$\hat{s} = t + \frac{2\xi(s-m^2)}{1+\xi} \simeq \frac{2\xi}{1+\xi} s + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^2}{s}, \frac{t}{q_T^2}\right). \quad (\text{S2})$$

The LP quantities Σ_X^{LP} are given by

$$\Sigma_{UU}^{\text{LP}} = \left[\frac{1}{\sin^2(\theta/2)} + \sin^2(\theta/2) \right] \left[\left(\frac{1-\xi^2-t}{2\xi^2 m^2} - 2 \right) \left(F_1^2 - \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2^2 \right) - \frac{t}{m^2} (F_1 + F_2)^2 \right], \quad (\text{S3a})$$

$$\Sigma_{LL}^{\text{LP}} = \left[\frac{1}{\sin^2(\theta/2)} - \sin^2(\theta/2) \right] (F_1 + F_2) \left[F_1 \left(\frac{-t}{\xi m^2} - \frac{4\xi}{1+\xi} \right) - \frac{t}{m^2} F_2 \right], \quad (\text{S3b})$$

$$\Sigma_{TL}^{\text{LP}} = \frac{\Delta_T}{2m} \left[\frac{1}{\sin^2(\theta/2)} - \sin^2(\theta/2) \right] (F_1 + F_2) \left[-4F_1 + \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \frac{-t}{m^2} F_2 \right], \quad (\text{S3c})$$

which are quadratic in the form factors F_1 and F_2 defined in Eq. (4),

$$F_N^\mu(p, p') = \langle N(p') | J^\mu(0) | N(p) \rangle = \bar{u}(p') \left[F_1(t) \gamma^\mu - F_2(t) \frac{i\sigma^{\mu\Delta}}{2m} \right] u(p). \quad (\text{S4})$$

The momentum $\Delta = p - p'$ is defined as in Eq. (2), with Δ_T being its transverse component in the diffractive frame,

$$\Delta_T = \frac{\sqrt{(1-\xi^2)(-t) - 4\xi^2 m^2}}{1+\xi}. \quad (\text{S5})$$

The NLP quantities Σ_Y^{NLP} contain both quadratic forms of (F_1, F_2) and linear expressions of the GPD moments,

$$V_{\mathcal{F}}(\xi, t) \equiv \{\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{\mathcal{E}}\}(\xi, t) = \sum_q e_q^2 \int_{-1}^1 dx \frac{\{H^{q,+}, E^{q,+}, \tilde{H}^{q,+}, \tilde{E}^{q,+}\}(x, \xi, t)}{x - \xi + i\epsilon}, \quad (\text{S6})$$

where we have assembled them in a complex-valued vector $V_{\mathcal{F}}$, and the ‘+’ superscripts refer to charge-conjugation-even GPD combinations,

$$F^{q,+}(x, \xi, t) = F^q(x, \xi, t) \mp F^q(-x, \xi, t), \quad (\text{S7})$$

with \mp for $F = H$ or E and $F = \tilde{H}$ or \tilde{E} , respectively. To write in a compact notation, we introduce the matrix M ,

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 & -\frac{t}{4m^2} F_2 & \xi(F_1 + F_2) & 0 \\ (1+\xi)(F_1 + F_2) & \xi(F_1 + F_2) & \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} F_1 & -\xi F_1 - (1+\xi) \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2 \\ \xi(F_1 + F_2) & \left(\frac{\xi^2}{1+\xi} + \frac{t}{4m^2} \right) (F_1 + F_2) & -\xi F_1 + \frac{t}{4m^2} \frac{1-\xi^2}{\xi} F_2 & -\left(\frac{\xi^2}{1+\xi} + \frac{t}{4m^2} \right) F_1 - \frac{\xi t}{4m^2} F_2 \\ \xi F_1 - \frac{t}{4m^2} \frac{1-\xi^2}{\xi} F_2 & \left(\xi + \frac{t}{4\xi m^2} \right) F_1 + \frac{\xi t}{4m^2} F_2 & -\xi(F_1 + F_2) & -\frac{\xi t}{4m^2} (F_1 + F_2) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{S8})$$

Denoting M_i as the i -th row vector of M , we have the NLP quantities as

$$\Sigma_{UU}^{\text{NLP}} = \frac{\Delta_T}{2m} \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \left[\frac{2 \sin \theta}{\xi} \left(F_1^2 - \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2^2 \right) - \frac{4 + (1 - \cos \theta)^2}{\sin \theta \cos^2(\theta/2)} (M_1 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}) \right], \quad (\text{S9a})$$

$$\Sigma_{LL}^{\text{NLP}} = -\frac{\Delta_T}{m} \left[\sin \theta (F_1 + F_2) \left(\frac{1+\xi}{\xi} F_1 + F_2 \right) + \frac{3 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_2 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}) \right], \quad (\text{S9b})$$

$$\Sigma_{TL,1}^{\text{NLP}} = 2 \sin \theta (F_1 + F_2) \left[F_1 + \left(\frac{\xi}{1+\xi} + \frac{t}{4\xi m^2} \right) F_2 \right] + \frac{2(3 - \cos \theta)}{\sin \theta} (M_3 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}), \quad (\text{S9c})$$

$$\Sigma_{TL,2}^{\text{NLP}} = 2 \sin \theta (F_1 + F_2) \left(F_1 + \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2 \right) + \frac{2(3 - \cos \theta)}{\sin \theta} (M_4 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}), \quad (\text{S9d})$$

$$\Sigma_{UL}^{\text{NLP}} = -\frac{\Delta_T}{m} \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \frac{3 - \cos \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_1 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}), \quad (\text{S9e})$$

$$\Sigma_{LU}^{\text{NLP}} = -\frac{\Delta_T}{2m} \frac{4 + (1 - \cos \theta)^2}{\sin \theta \cos^2(\theta/2)} (M_2 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}), \quad (\text{S9f})$$

$$\Sigma_{TU,1}^{\text{NLP}} = \frac{4 + (1 - \cos \theta)^2}{\sin \theta \cos^2(\theta/2)} (M_3 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}), \quad (\text{S9g})$$

$$\Sigma_{TU,2}^{\text{NLP}} = \frac{4 + (1 - \cos \theta)^2}{\sin \theta \cos^2(\theta/2)} (M_4 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}), \quad (\text{S9h})$$

Apparently, the real and imaginary parts of the GPD moments are controlled by the same matrix M , so the measurement of all these eight NLP polarization asymmetries results in a linear set of equations for the GPD moments,

$$M \cdot V_{\mathcal{F}} = \hat{V}_{\text{exp}}, \quad (\text{S10})$$

where $\hat{V}_{\text{exp}} = (\hat{V}_{\text{exp}}^1, \hat{V}_{\text{exp}}^2, \hat{V}_{\text{exp}}^3, \hat{V}_{\text{exp}}^4)^T$ are the experimentally reconstructed (complex) values of the left-hand sides. Eq. (S10) can be easily inverted to give a unique set of solutions for the GPD moments, $V_{\mathcal{F}} = M^{-1} \cdot \hat{V}_{\text{exp}}$.

B: Polarization asymmetry coefficients for the dilepton photoproduction process

First, similarly to Eq. (6), the NLP cross section for the dilepton photoproduction process is

$$\frac{d\sigma_{\gamma}^{\ell\ell}}{dt d\xi d\phi_S d \cos \theta d\phi} = \frac{d\sigma_{\gamma}^{\ell\ell, \text{unp.}}}{dt d\xi d \cos \theta} \Omega_{\gamma}^{\ell\ell}(\phi_S, \phi). \quad (\text{S11})$$

We denote the unpolarized cross section $d\sigma_{\gamma}^{\ell\ell, \text{unp.}}$ and the polarization asymmetry coefficients in $\Omega_{\gamma}^{\ell\ell}$ [in Eq. (8)] as

$$\frac{d\sigma_{\gamma}^{\ell\ell, \text{unp.}}}{dt d\xi d \cos \theta} = \frac{2\alpha_e^3}{(1+\xi)^2} \frac{m^2}{s t^2} \Sigma_{UU}^{\text{LP}}, \quad A_X^{\text{LP}} = \frac{1}{\Sigma_{UU}^{\text{LP}}} \Sigma_X^{\text{LP}}, \quad A_Y^{\text{NLP}} = \frac{-t}{2m\sqrt{\hat{s}}} \frac{1}{\Sigma_{UU}^{\text{LP}}} \Sigma_Y^{\text{NLP}}, \quad (\text{S12})$$

where $X \in \{LL, TL, UT\}$ for the LP asymmetries, $Y \in \{UU, LL, (TL, 1), (TL, 2), UL, LU, (TU, 1), (TU, 2), UT, LT, (TT, 1), (TT, 2)\}$ for the NLP asymmetries, and \hat{s} is the same as Eq. (S2). The LP quantities Σ_X^{LP} are given by quadratic forms of the form factors F_1 and F_2 ,

$$\Sigma_{UU}^{\text{LP}} = \left(\frac{1 + \cos^2 \theta}{\sin^2 \theta} \right) \left[\frac{\Delta_T^2}{2m^2} \left(\frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \right)^2 \left(F_1^2 - \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2^2 \right) - \frac{t}{m^2} (F_1 + F_2)^2 \right], \quad (\text{S13a})$$

$$\Sigma_{LL}^{\text{LP}} = -\left(\frac{1 + \cos^2 \theta}{\sin^2 \theta} \right) (F_1 + F_2) \left[\frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \frac{\Delta_T^2}{m^2} F_1 - \frac{t}{m^2} (F_1 + F_2) \right], \quad (\text{S13b})$$

$$\Sigma_{TL}^{\text{LP}} = \frac{\Delta_T}{2m} \left(\frac{1 + \cos^2 \theta}{\sin^2 \theta} \right) (F_1 + F_2) \left(4F_1 + \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \frac{t}{m^2} F_2 \right), \quad (\text{S13c})$$

$$\Sigma_{UT}^{\text{LP}} = -\frac{\Delta_T^2}{2m^2} \left(\frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \right)^2 \left(F_1^2 - \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2^2 \right), \quad (\text{S13d})$$

where Δ_T is the same as Eq. (S5). As in Eq. (S9), we write these equations in a compact form showing the linear dependence of the NLP quantities Σ_Y^{NLP} on the GPD moments, by introducing an additional matrix \tilde{M} that differs

from M only by flipping the signs of the last two columns. Since the GPD moments in the dilepton photoproduction differ from the photon electroproduction only by a complex conjugate, we still use $V_{\mathcal{F}}$ in Eq. (S6) and write Σ_Y^{NLP} as

$$\Sigma_{UU}^{\text{NLP}} = \frac{\Delta_T}{m} \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \left[-\frac{4 \cot \theta}{\xi} \left(F_1^2 - \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2^2 \right) + \frac{1+\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_1 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*) \right], \quad (\text{S14a})$$

$$\Sigma_{LL}^{\text{NLP}} = \frac{\Delta_T}{m} \left[\frac{4 \cot \theta}{\xi} (F_1 + F_2) ((1+\xi)F_1 + \xi F_2) - \frac{1+\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_2 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*) \right], \quad (\text{S14b})$$

$$\Sigma_{TL,1}^{\text{NLP}} = -8(F_1 + F_2) \cot \theta \left[F_1 + \left(\frac{\xi}{1+\xi} + \frac{t}{4\xi m^2} \right) F_2 \right] + 2 \frac{1+\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_3 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14c})$$

$$\Sigma_{TL,2}^{\text{NLP}} = -8 \cot \theta (F_1 + F_2) \left(F_1 + \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2 \right) + 2 \frac{1+\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_4 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14d})$$

$$\Sigma_{UL}^{\text{NLP}} = -\frac{\Delta_T}{m} \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \frac{1+\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_1 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14e})$$

$$\Sigma_{LU}^{\text{NLP}} = \frac{\Delta_T}{m} \frac{1+\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_2 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14f})$$

$$\Sigma_{TU,1}^{\text{NLP}} = -2 \frac{1+\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_3 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14g})$$

$$\Sigma_{TU,2}^{\text{NLP}} = 2 \frac{1+\cos^2 \theta}{\sin \theta} (M_4 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14h})$$

$$\Sigma_{UT}^{\text{NLP}} = -\frac{\Delta_T}{m} \frac{1+\xi}{\xi} \left[\frac{4 \cot \theta}{\xi} \left(F_1^2 - \frac{t}{4m^2} F_2^2 \right) + \sin \theta (\widetilde{M}_1 \cdot \text{Re } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*) \right], \quad (\text{S14i})$$

$$\Sigma_{LT}^{\text{NLP}} = -\frac{\Delta_T}{m} \sin \theta (\widetilde{M}_2 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14j})$$

$$\Sigma_{TT,1}^{\text{NLP}} = 2 \sin \theta (\widetilde{M}_3 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14k})$$

$$\Sigma_{TT,2}^{\text{NLP}} = -2 \sin \theta (\widetilde{M}_4 \cdot \text{Im } V_{\mathcal{F}}^*), \quad (\text{S14l})$$

where \widetilde{M}_i denotes the i -th row of \widetilde{M} .

Compared to the photon electroproduction results in Eq. (S9), we now have four more constraints on the GPD moments from $(A_{UT}^{\text{NLP}}, A_{LT}^{\text{NLP}}, A_{TT,1}^{\text{NLP}}, A_{TT,2}^{\text{NLP}})$. They are not independent from the other eight. Specifically, \widetilde{M}_1 can be written as a linear combination of M_1, M_2 , and M_3 , so its information on the real parts of the GPD moments is covered by $(A_{UU}^{\text{NLP}}, A_{LL}^{\text{NLP}}, A_{TL,1}^{\text{NLP}})$. Similarly, $\widetilde{M}_2, \widetilde{M}_3$, and \widetilde{M}_4 can be written as linear combinations of (M_1, M_2, M_4) , (M_1, M_3, M_4) , and (M_2, M_3, M_4) , respectively. Nevertheless, the linear photon polarization might be more easily controlled in experiments than the transverse target spin, so the asymmetry A_{UT}^{NLP} can be used in place of $A_{TL,1}^{\text{NLP}}$, and A_{LT}^{NLP} in place of $A_{TU,2}^{\text{NLP}}$.