

# A hybrid model for multi-particle production and multi-fragment emission in electron-nucleus collisions at the forthcoming Electron-Ion Collider

Ting-Ting Duan<sup>1,\*</sup>, Sahanaa Büriechin<sup>1,†</sup>, Hai-Ling Lao<sup>2,‡</sup>, Fu-Hu Liu<sup>1,§</sup>, Khusniddin K. Olimov<sup>3,4,¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institute of Theoretical Physics, State Key Laboratory of Quantum Optics Technologies and Devices & Collaborative Innovation Center of Extreme Optics, Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, China*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Science Teaching, Beijing Vocational College of Agriculture, Beijing 102442, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Laboratory of High Energy Physics, Physical-Technical Institute of Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, Chingiz Aytmatov Str. 2b, Tashkent 100084, Uzbekistan*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Natural Sciences, National University of Science and Technology MISIS (NUST MISIS), Almalyk Branch, Almalyk 110105, Uzbekistan*

**Abstract:** To present a prediction of the multi-particle production and multi-fragment emission in electron-nucleus ( $eA$ ) collisions at the forthcoming Electron-Ion Collider (EIC), a simple hybrid model which is based on the multi-source thermal model and the ideal gas model is proposed in this article. According to the hybrid model, some statistical laws such as the two-component Erlang distribution and others are presented, which means a two-source production. These statistical laws are hopeful to describe the bulk properties of multiple particles produced in the scattering of electron-nucleon ( $eN$ ) and multiple fragments emitted in the fragmentation of excited residual nucleus. Although both the scattering and fragmentation can occur in  $eA$  collisions at the EIC, their two-sources are different. In  $eN$  scattering, the multiple particles come from the soft excitation and hard scattering processes respectively, which are classified as two different types of events. In nuclear fragmentation, the multiple fragments come from the cold and hot sources which exist in the same excited nucleus.

**Keywords:** multi-particle production; multi-fragment emission; multiplicity distribution; transverse momentum distribution; the Electron-Ion Collider

**PACS Nos.:** 12.40.Ee, 13.85.Hd, 25.30.-c, 25.30.Dh, 25.70.Pq

## I. INTRODUCTION

Numerous particles and fragments have been measured in high-energy nuclear collision experiments [1–3]. It is understood that these multiple particles and fragments stem from different sources with varying production mechanisms [4–8]. Multiple particles may be produced within the region occupied by participants; however, only a few may emerge through cascade processes occurring in spectator regions when available. Similarly, while numerous fragments can be emitted from spectators’ regions—only a limited number of light fragments might be released from participant areas.

At the nucleon level, participants and spectators consist of nucleons along with their clusters [9–13]. At the partonic level—participants include quarks and gluons while spectators also comprise similar constituents [14–18]. In nuclear

---

\* 202312602001@email.sxu.edu.cn

† 202201101236@email.sxu.edu.cn

‡ hailinglao@163.com; hailinglao@pku.edu.cn

§ Correspondence: fuhuliu@163.com; fuhuliu@sxu.edu.cn

¶ Correspondence: khkolimov@gmail.com; kh.olimov@uzsci.net

collisions induced by hadrons—the hadron acts as a participant that is (approximately) equivalent to a nucleon. In nuclear collisions induced by a lepton, the lepton acts as a participant that is approximately equivalent to a parton. The statistical distribution laws governing the multiple particles and fragments produced in these interactions are of particular interest to us.

Generally, both types of products exhibit similarities and differences in their statistical distribution laws [19–26]. Our investigations reveal that the multiplicity and transverse momentum distributions of multiple particles are analogous; they adhere to the two-component Erlang distribution within the framework of a multi-source thermal model [27, 28]. Similarly, the multiplicity distributions for both multiple particles and fragments follow this same distribution and model. However, it is important to note that the emission sources for multiple particles differ from those for fragments. The study of multiple particles can be conducted at the parton level while investigations into multiple fragments can be performed at the nucleon level.

Understanding the statistical distribution laws followed by multiple particles and fragments generated in electron-nucleus ( $eA$ ) collisions at the forthcoming Electron Ion Collider (EIC) holds significant importance. Firstly,  $eA$  collisions represent a deep inelastic scattering process between an incoming projectile electron ( $e$ ) and a target nucleon ( $N$ ) within the target nucleus, where  $N$  may be either a proton ( $p$ ) or neutron ( $n$ ). Secondly,  $eN$  scattering constitutes an even deeper inelastic scattering process involving interactions between incoming electron  $e$  with target quarks ( $q$ ) and/or gluons ( $g$ ) present within nucleon  $N$ . Consequently,  $eA$  collisions encompass both an  $eN$  scattering event as well as an excited residual nucleus. In contrast,  $eN$  scattering involves one or more instances of  $eq$  (or  $eg$ ) scattering.

Compared to nuclear collisions induced by hadrons or nuclei,  $eA$  collisions offer a cleaner environment without the complexity of background products, serving as an essential baseline for both hadron-nucleus and nucleus-nucleus collisions. The bulk properties of the final-state particles and fragments generated in  $eA$  collisions also establish a fundamental reference point, crucial for investigating the unique characteristics of new particle production. Furthermore, when juxtaposed with  $ee$  collisions, the nuclear effects observed in  $eA$  collisions can significantly influence experimental outcomes, making the study of these effects an intriguing area of research.

In this article, we introduce a straightforward hybrid model for multi-particle production and multi-fragment emission. We present statistical distribution laws comprising two components, which anticipate the bulk properties of the final-state particles and fragments produced in  $eA$  collisions at the EIC.

## II. THE HYBRID MODEL FOR $eA$ COLLISIONS AT THE EIC

It is widely accepted that  $eA$  collisions at the EIC represent a deep inelastic scattering process at the nucleon level. However, it is important to note that the actual interaction occurring in  $eA$  collisions can be understood as  $eN$  collisions, which also constitute a deep inelastic scattering process but occur at the parton level. By excluding the participating nucleon involved in the deep inelastic scattering within  $eA$  collisions, one can obtain the remnant portion of the nucleus. This remnant is referred to as a spectator and has the potential to form an excited nucleus that subsequently fragments into various components.

### A. Multi-particle production

It is believed that  $eN$  scattering during  $eA$  collisions leads to multi-particle production process. Several thermal and statistical models related to multi-particle production may be applied to analyze this phenomenon within  $eN$  scattering. For instance, one might consider modelling the  $eN$  scattering process using a multi-source thermal model [27, 28], wherein each nucleon is treated as an extensive system composed of valence quarks, sea quarks, and gluons. Given that  $eN$  scattering can proceed through both soft and hard processes, event samples are typically mixtures of soft excitations and hard scatterings. In this context, an electron interacts with several  $(m_1 - 1)$  sea

quarks and/or gluons during the soft excitation phase—denoted as Process One—while another scenario involves an electron interacting with a valence quark during hard scattering—referred to as Process Two.

Regarding multiplicity ( $n_{ch}$ ) distribution of charged particles, each participant (whether electron or parton) involved in the soft process contributes a quantity denoted by  $n_{i1}$ , which follows an exponential distribution  $f_{n_{i1}}(n_{i1})$  characterized by its parameter  $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$ , representing its average value. Similarly, each participant engaged in the hard process contributes a quantity represented by  $n_{i2}$ , adhering to another exponential distribution  $f_{n_{i2}}(n_{i2})$ , but defined by its own parameter  $\langle n_{i2} \rangle$ . Each participant is regarded as having an effective energy source [22–24]. The behavior of multiple participants is hopeful to be described by the multi-source thermal model [27, 28].

One has a general exponential distribution

$$f_{n_i}(n_i) = \frac{1}{\langle n_i \rangle} \exp\left(-\frac{n_i}{\langle n_i \rangle}\right), \quad (1)$$

which is normalized to 1. Here, a subscript  $n_i$  is used to distinguish the distribution from others which will be discussed later. The Erlang distribution is

$$f_{n_{ch},E}(n_{ch}) = \frac{n_{ch}^{m_j-1}}{(m_j-1)!\langle n_i \rangle^{m_j}} \exp\left(-\frac{n_{ch}}{\langle n_i \rangle}\right), \quad (2)$$

which is the fold of  $m_j$  ( $j = 1$  or  $2$ ) exponential distributions, where  $n_i = n_{i1}$  ( $n_i = n_{i2}$ ) and  $\langle n_i \rangle = \langle n_{i1} \rangle$  ( $\langle n_i \rangle = \langle n_{i2} \rangle$ ) are for the soft (hard) process. The numbers of participants in the soft and hard processes are  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  ( $= 2$ ) respectively. Eq. (2) is normalized to 1 and results in the average of  $n_{ch}$  to be

$$\langle n_{ch} \rangle = \int n_{ch} f_{n_{ch},E}(n_{ch}) dn_{ch} = m_j \langle n_i \rangle. \quad (3)$$

The  $n_{ch}$  distribution of charged particles measured in the final state is a two-component Erlang distribution (the superposition of two Erlang distributions) [27] given by

$$f_{n_{ch},2E}(n_{ch}) = \frac{k_1 n_{ch}^{m_1-1}}{(m_1-1)!\langle n_{i1} \rangle^{m_1}} \exp\left(-\frac{n_{ch}}{\langle n_{i1} \rangle}\right) + \frac{(1-k_1)n_{ch}}{\langle n_{i2} \rangle^2} \exp\left(-\frac{n_{ch}}{\langle n_{i2} \rangle}\right), \quad (4)$$

where  $k_1$  and  $1-k_1$  are the contribution fractions of the soft and hard processes. Eq. (4) is normalized to 1 and gives

$$\langle n_{ch} \rangle = \int n_{ch} f_{n_{ch},2E}(n_{ch}) dn_{ch} = k_1 m_1 \langle n_{i1} \rangle + 2(1-k_1)\langle n_{i2} \rangle. \quad (5)$$

The transverse momentum ( $p_T$ ) distribution of charged particles can be fitted using several functions, including the standard distributions (Fermi–Dirac/Bose–Einstein or Maxwell–Boltzmann) and their multi-component forms, the Tsallis distribution and its multi-component variants, inverse power laws and their alternative representations, as well as various superpositions of these functions. Additionally, some Monte Carlo event generators have been employed for this purpose [29, 30]. Within the framework of a multi-source thermal model, the two-component Erlang distribution has been utilized to fit the  $p_T$  distribution of charged particles [28].

Similar to the distributions of  $n_i$  and  $n_{ch}$ , both the transverse momentum  $p_{ti}$  distribution contributed by each participant and the overall  $p_T$  distribution exhibit analogous expressions:

$$f_{p_{ti}}(p_{ti}) = \frac{1}{\langle p_{ti} \rangle} \exp\left(-\frac{p_{ti}}{\langle p_{ti} \rangle}\right), \quad (6)$$

$$f_{p_T,E}(p_T) = \frac{p_T^{M_j-1}}{(M_j-1)!\langle p_{ti} \rangle^{M_j}} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T}{\langle p_{ti} \rangle}\right), \quad (7)$$

$$f_{p_T,2E}(p_T) = \frac{K_1 p_T^{M_1-1}}{(M_1-1)!\langle p_{ti1} \rangle^{M_1}} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T}{\langle p_{ti1} \rangle}\right) + \frac{(1-K_1)p_T}{\langle p_{ti2} \rangle^2} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T}{\langle p_{ti2} \rangle}\right). \quad (8)$$

Here,  $M_j$  ( $j = 1$  or  $2$ ) is the number of participant partons in the  $j$ -th process (soft or hard process) with  $M_2 = 2$  in general,  $K_1$  ( $1 - K_1$ ) is the contribution fraction of the soft (hard) process, and  $\langle p_{ti1} \rangle$  ( $\langle p_{ti2} \rangle$ ) is the average contribution of each participant in the soft (hard) process. Eqs. (7) and (8) are normalized to 1 and give the averages of  $p_T$  to be

$$\langle p_T \rangle = \int p_{ti} f_{p_T, E}(p_{ti}) dp_{ti} = M_j \langle p_{ti} \rangle \quad (9)$$

and

$$\langle p_T \rangle = \int p_{ti} f_{p_T, 2E}(p_{ti}) dp_{ti} = K_1 M_1 \langle p_{ti1} \rangle + 2(1 - K_1) \langle p_{ti2} \rangle, \quad (10)$$

respectively. According to a thermal-related method [31, 32], one has the temperature  $T = \langle p_T \rangle / 3.07$ .

Eqs. (1) and (6), (2) and (7), along with (4) and (8), share similar forms but differ in terms of variables and parameters. In Eq. (4), the free parameters are denoted as  $k_1$ ,  $m_1$ ,  $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$ , and  $\langle n_{i2} \rangle$ . Conversely, in Eq. (8), they are represented by  $K_1$ ,  $M_1$ ,  $\langle p_{ti1} \rangle$ , and  $\langle p_{ti2} \rangle$ . The values assigned to  $k_1$  and  $K_1$  ( $m_1$  and  $M_1$ ) in Eqs. (4) and (8) may vary due to differences in event samples.

According to the two-cylinder model [33, 34], which is a component of the multi-source thermal model [27, 28], whether considering soft excitation or hard scattering process, both incoming projectile  $e$  and target  $N$  can penetrate one another. This interaction leads to the formation of a projectile string alongside a target string. In rapidity space, these strings distribute uniformly across their respective rapidity ranges:  $[y_{P \min}, y_{P \max}]$  for projectiles;  $[y_{T \min}, y_{T \max}]$  for targets. Notably, while leading target protons occupy rapidity position at  $y_T$ , it is important to emphasize that neither projectile  $e$ —which does not serve as a leading particle—nor target neutrons should be classified among leading charged particles.

When the strings are broken, for an isotropic emission source located at the rapidity  $y_x$ , the pseudorapidity distribution of charged particles is given by

$$f_\eta(\eta, y_x) = \frac{1}{2 \cosh^2(\eta - y_x)}. \quad (11)$$

In experiments, the pseudorapidity distribution of charged particles is given by

$$f_\eta(\eta) = \frac{K_P}{2(y_{P \max} - y_{P \min})} \int_{y_{P \min}}^{y_{P \max}} \frac{dy_x}{\cosh^2(\eta - y_x)} + \frac{K_T}{2(y_{T \max} - y_{T \min})} \int_{y_{T \min}}^{y_{T \max}} \frac{dy_x}{\cosh^2(\eta - y_x)} + \frac{1 - K_P - K_T}{2 \cosh^2(\eta - y_T)}, \quad (12)$$

where  $K_P$ ,  $K_T$ , and  $1 - K_P - K_T$  are the contribution fractions of the projectile string, target string, and leading target protons, respectively.

The length,  $L_{y_P} = y_{P \max} - y_{P \min}$  ( $L_{y_T} = y_{T \max} - y_{T \min}$ ), of the projectile (target) string in the soft process is longer than that in the hard process. Because of the contribution fraction of the soft process being larger, the average string length in the soft and hard processes is predominantly determined by the soft process. The kinematic relationship between projectile and target strings is quantitatively expressed through the rapidity gap parameter:  $\Delta y = y_{P \min} - y_{T \max}$ . This dimensionless quantity exhibits three characteristic regimes:  $\Delta y > 0$ ,  $\Delta y = 0$ , and  $\Delta y < 0$ , which implies the spatially separated configuration, marginally connected state, and geometrically overlapping domain, respectively. Thus, the sign convention establishes a bijective correspondence between algebraic values and physical interpretations.

## B. Multi-fragment emission

The decay or fragmentation of the spectator (the excited nucleus) is characterized by a process of multi-fragment emission originating from two distinct sources, each with its own temperature [35]. These sources differ from the

two-component distributions typically observed in charged particles. The local region associated with  $eN$  scattering serves as the hot source, exhibiting a high temperature, while another portion within the spectator acts as a cold source with a lower temperature. Both sources exist in their respective equilibrium states and contain several nucleons that are treated as contributors.

Each contributor, denoted as the  $i$ -th element in either the cold (hot) source, contributes an amount  $N_{iL}$  ( $N_{iH}$ ) to the overall multiplicity  $N_F$  of all nuclear fragments [36]. It is assumed that  $N_i$  ( $N_{iL}$  or  $N_{iH}$ ) follows an exponential distribution:

$$f_{N_i}(N_i) = \frac{1}{\langle N_i \rangle} \exp\left(-\frac{N_i}{\langle N_i \rangle}\right), \quad (13)$$

where the parameter  $\langle N_i \rangle$  is the average of  $N_i$ . The sum of the contributions of  $m_j$  ( $j = L$  or  $H$ ) contributors is an Erlang distribution, given by

$$f_{N_F,E}(N_F) = \frac{N_F^{m_j-1}}{(m_j-1)!\langle N_i \rangle^{m_j}} \exp\left(-\frac{N_F}{\langle N_i \rangle}\right) \quad (14)$$

with the average of  $N_F$  to be

$$\langle N_F \rangle = \int N_F f_{N_F,E}(N_F) dN_F = m_j \langle N_i \rangle. \quad (15)$$

The sum of the contributions of the cold and hot sources are a two-component Erlang distribution, which is

$$f_{N_F,2E}(N_F) = \frac{k_L N_F^{m_L-1}}{(m_L-1)!\langle N_{iL} \rangle^{m_L}} \exp\left(-\frac{N_F}{\langle N_{iL} \rangle}\right) + \frac{(1-k_L) N_F^{m_H-1}}{(m_H-1)!\langle N_{iH} \rangle^{m_H}} \exp\left(-\frac{N_F}{\langle N_{iH} \rangle}\right) \quad (16)$$

with

$$\langle N_F \rangle = \int N_F f_{N_F,2E}(N_F) dN_F = k_L m_L \langle N_{iL} \rangle + (1-k_L) m_H \langle N_{iH} \rangle. \quad (17)$$

Here,  $k_L$  ( $1-k_L$ ) denotes the contribution fraction of the cold (hot) source.

In  $eA$  collisions, we define the direction of the incoming nucleus along the  $Oz$  axis. Consequently, the reaction plane corresponds to the  $xOz$  plane. This establishes a three-dimensional Cartesian coordinate system for analysis. A general thermal and statistical model can be employed to describe nuclear fragment emissions within the rest frame of each considered source. Subsequently, one can derive both transverse momentum ( $p_T$ ) and angular ( $\theta$ ) distributions of nuclear fragments in either laboratory or center-of-mass reference frames [37].

Typically, the excitation degree of the spectator remains relatively low; thus, temperatures during nuclear fragmentation are on the order of several MeV or slightly higher. The classical ideal gas model may be utilized to characterize both  $p_T$  and  $\theta$  distributions for these nuclear fragments. In relation to their respective rest frames—cold or hot sources—the  $x$ -component momentum  $p_x$ , alongside  $y$ -component momentum  $p_y$ , and  $z$ -component momentum  $p_z$ , adheres to Gaussian distribution patterns:

$$f_{p_{x,y,z}}(p_{x,y,z}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_p} \exp\left(-\frac{p_{x,y,z}^2}{2\sigma_p^2}\right), \quad (18)$$

where  $\sigma_p = \sigma_{pL} = \sqrt{m_F T_L}$  ( $\sigma_p = \sigma_{pH} = \sqrt{m_F T_H}$ ) is the width of momentum distribution of nuclear fragments emitted from the cold (hot) source,  $T_L$  ( $T_H$ ) is the temperature of the cold (hot) source, and  $m_F$  is the mass of the considered nuclear fragment.

Naturally, the transverse momentum  $p_T = \sqrt{p_x^2 + p_y^2}$  obeys the Rayleigh distribution, given by

$$f_{p_T,R}(p_T) = \frac{p_T}{\sigma_p^2} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T^2}{2\sigma_p^2}\right) \quad (19)$$

with

$$\langle p_T \rangle = \int p_T f_{p_T, R}(p_T) dp_T = \sigma_p \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}. \quad (20)$$

Considering the two-temperature case, one has

$$f_{p_T, 2R}(p_T) = \frac{K_L p_T}{\sigma_{pL}^2} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T^2}{2\sigma_{pL}^2}\right) + \frac{(1-K_L)p_T}{\sigma_{pH}^2} \exp\left(-\frac{p_T^2}{2\sigma_{pH}^2}\right) \quad (21)$$

with

$$\langle p_T \rangle = \int p_T f_{p_T, 2R}(p_T) dp_T = [K_L \sigma_{pL} + (1-K_L) \sigma_{pH}] \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}. \quad (22)$$

Here,  $K_L$  ( $1-K_L$ ) denotes the contribution fraction of the cold (hot) source. The values of  $k_L$  and  $K_L$  in the expressions of  $N_F$  and  $p_T$  distributions may be different due to different event samples.

In laboratory or center-of-mass reference frames, it is approximately true that per nucleon momentum conservation holds for nuclear fragments relative to incoming nuclei; hence one finds that  $p_T = p \sin \theta \approx p\theta$ , where  $p$  represents the momentum associated with any given nuclear fragment under consideration. The angular distribution obeys approximately the Rayleigh form:

$$f_{\theta, R}(\theta) \approx \frac{\theta}{\sigma_\theta^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\theta^2}{2\sigma_\theta^2}\right) \quad (23)$$

with

$$\langle \theta \rangle = \int \theta f_{\theta, R}(\theta) d\theta \approx \sigma_\theta \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}. \quad (24)$$

Here  $\sigma_\theta = \sigma_p/p = \sigma_{pL}/p = \sigma_{\theta L}$  ( $\sigma_\theta = \sigma_p/p = \sigma_{pH}/p = \sigma_{\theta H}$ ) is the width of angular distribution of nuclear fragments emitted from the cold (hot) source. Considering the two-temperature case, one has

$$f_{\theta, 2R}(\theta) \approx \frac{K_L \theta}{\sigma_{\theta L}^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\theta^2}{2\sigma_{\theta L}^2}\right) + \frac{(1-K_L)\theta}{\sigma_{\theta H}^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\theta^2}{2\sigma_{\theta H}^2}\right) \quad (25)$$

with

$$\langle \theta \rangle = \int \theta f_{\theta, 2R}(\theta) d\theta \approx [K_L \sigma_{\theta L} + (1-K_L) \sigma_{\theta H}] \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}. \quad (26)$$

If we consider the relativistic ideal gas model [38, 39], Eqs. (18), (19), and (21) can be written as the following forms [40]

$$f_{p_{x,y}}(p_{x,y}) = C_{x,y}(T) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_x^2 + p_y^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T}\right) dp_z dp_{y,x},$$

$$f_{p_z}(p_z) = C_z(T) \int_0^{\infty} p_T \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T}\right) dp_T, \quad (27)$$

$$f_{p_T}(p_T) = C_T(T) p_T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T}\right) dp_z, \quad (28)$$

$$f_{p_T}(p_T) = K_L C_T(T_L) p_T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T_L}\right) dp_z$$

$$+ (1-K_L) C_T(T_H) p_T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T_H}\right) dp_z. \quad (29)$$

Here,  $C_{x,y,z,T}(T)$  are the normalization related to the temperature  $T$ , which result in  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f_{p_{x,y,z,T}}(p_{x,y,z,T}) dp_{x,y,z,T} = 1$ . Correspondingly, Eqs. (23) and (25) are rewritten as

$$f_{\theta}(\theta) \approx C_{\theta}(T)\theta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T}\right) dp_z, \quad (30)$$

$$f_{\theta}(\theta) \approx K_L C_{\theta}(T_L)\theta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T_L}\right) dp_z \\ + (1 - K_L)C_{\theta}(T_H)\theta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T_H}\right) dp_z, \quad (31)$$

where  $C_{\theta}(T)$  represents the normalization associated with the temperature  $T$ , leading to the condition  $\int_0^{\pi} f_{\theta}(\theta)d\theta = 1$ . Deriving specific arithmetic or functional expressions for  $\langle p_T \rangle$  and  $\langle \theta \rangle$  from Eqs. (28)–(31) can be cumbersome; however, a numerical method may be employed if necessary.

Alternatively, within the framework of the relativistic ideal gas model [38, 39], in terms of rapidity  $y$  and a constrained rapidity range  $[y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$ , Eqs. (10)–(14) can be reformulated as indicated in [40],

$$f_{p_{x,y}}(p_{x,y}) = C_{x,y}(T) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sqrt{p_x^2 + p_y^2 + m_F^2} \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} \cosh y \times \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_x^2 + p_y^2 + m_F^2} \cosh y}{T}\right) dy dp_{y,x}, \\ f_{p_z}(p_z) = C_z(T) \int_0^{\infty} p_T \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + p_z^2 + m_F^2}}{T}\right) dp_T, \quad (32)$$

$$f_{p_T}(p_T) = C_T(T)p_T \sqrt{p_T^2 + m_F^2} \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} \cosh y \times \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + m_F^2} \cosh y}{T}\right) dy, \quad (33)$$

$$f_{p_T}(p_T) = K_L C_T(T_L)p_T \sqrt{p_T^2 + m_F^2} \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} \cosh y \times \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + m_F^2} \cosh y}{T_L}\right) dy \\ + (1 - K_L)C_T(T_H)p_T \sqrt{p_T^2 + m_F^2} \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} \cosh y \times \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + m_F^2} \cosh y}{T_H}\right) dy, \quad (34)$$

$$f_{\theta}(\theta) \approx C_{\theta}(T)\theta \sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + m_F^2} \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} \cosh y \times \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + m_F^2} \cosh y}{T}\right) dy, \quad (35)$$

$$f_{\theta}(\theta) \approx K_L C_{\theta}(T_L)\theta \sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + m_F^2} \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} \cosh y \times \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + m_F^2} \cosh y}{T_L}\right) dy \\ + (1 - K_L)C_{\theta}(T_H)\theta \sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + m_F^2} \int_{y_{\min}}^{y_{\max}} \cosh y \times \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{p^2\theta^2 + m_F^2} \cosh y}{T_H}\right) dy. \quad (36)$$

The values of  $\langle p_T \rangle$  and  $\langle \theta \rangle$  from Eqs. (33)–(36) can be obtained by a numerical method, if necessary.

The cold source has the capacity to evaporate light fragments while leaving behind heavier ones due to its low excitation but large volume. In contrast, because of its high excitation and small volume, the hot source can only emit light fragments and not heavy ones. This implies that light fragments are emitted at two distinct temperatures, whereas heavy fragments are exclusively emitted at low temperature. In a special scenario where both cold and hot sources possess identical temperatures, they effectively merge into a single entity. For multi-fragment emission processes occurring in  $eA$  collisions, it is advisable to initially apply a single temperature distribution. Should this approach prove inadequate in the high  $p_T$  ( $\theta$ ) region, one might consider incorporating contributions from an additional temperature.

### C. Discussion

It is important to note that there exists no clear boundary between soft and hard processes. More broadly speaking, in the present work, regardless of the type of parton involved, processes characterized by low momentum transfer are generally classified as soft or first process, while those with high momentum transfer are categorized as hard or second process; however, both types represent violent deep inelastic scattering events. If necessary, experimental measurements can be further divided into results from additional processes based on momentum transfer—such as three-processes or four-processes—although this may introduce more parameters into the analysis. At energies accessible at current accelerators and colliders, two process classifications are typically sufficient unless extremely high momentum transfers are encountered. In certain cases where high momentum transfer does not occur, one might rely solely on the soft process for data fitting. It is noteworthy that the terminology employed in this work regarding soft and hard processes may differ from some existing literature [41–45], which often refers to both types simply as hard process. Furthermore, this study utilizes a methodology grounded in statistical physics that diverges from quantum chromodynamics (QCD).

At EIC energies (the center-of-mass energy  $\sqrt{s} \approx 20 - 140$  GeV for  $eN$  collisions [46]), a significant portion of deep inelastic scattering is dominated by small Bjorken- $x$  physics [47–50]. Specifically speaking, interactions between electrons and partons become increasingly relevant under these conditions. Notably at low photon virtualities and within large nuclei environments—the fraction of soft process associated with low momentum transfer becomes predominant; conversely at large photon virtualities—the contribution from hard process characterized by high momentum transfer takes precedence [51]. Meanwhile, at small- $x$ , the phenomenon of gluon saturation, driven by the rapid increase in gluon density [52], will enhance the fraction of low momentum transfer process while naturally reducing the fraction of high momentum transfer process. The outcome of this comprehensive interplay indicates that gluon saturation physics plays a critical role in the physical framework we are investigating, which pertains to the first process.

As an application of our hybrid model, we summarize here our previous work [27], which analyzed the multiplicity distributions of charged particles produced in  $e^+p$  collisions. The relevant data were collected using a multipurpose magnetic detector (ZEUS) operational at the Hadron-Electron Ring Accelerator (HERA) located at Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron (DESY) [53]. In ZEUS Collaboration experiments, the beam energy for  $e^+$  is 27.5 GeV and for protons it is 820 GeV, corresponding to  $\sqrt{s} \approx 300$  GeV [54, 55]. The ZEUS data samples are categorized into four groups based on different selection criteria: (i) in the Breit frame with bins defined by  $2E_B^{\text{cr}}$ ; where the Breit frame is characterized by conditions ensuring that the momentum of exchanged virtual bosons is purely spacelike and  $E_B^{\text{cr}}$  represents available energy within this region [53]; (ii) in bins based on invariant mass ( $M_{\text{eff}}$ ) within the Breit frame; (iii) in hadronic center-of-mass frame with bins determined by  $\gamma^*p$  center-of-mass energy ( $W$ ), where  $\gamma^*$  denotes virtual photons exchanged during  $e^+p$  collisions; and (iv) again within hadronic center-of-mass frame but classified according to  $M_{\text{eff}}$ .

Based on these four types of data samples measured from  $e^+p$  collisions at DESY-HERA by ZEUS Collaboration [53], our previous work successfully fitted charged particle multiplicity distributions using a single-component Erlang distribution [27]. Tables 1 and 2 summarize the values of the parameters  $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$  and  $m_1$  obtained from these fits. Notably, there is no contribution from the second process. It can be observed that  $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$  increases with rising values of  $2E_B^{\text{cr}}$ ,  $M_{\text{eff}}$ , and  $W$  in both the Breit frame and hadronic center-of-mass frame, while  $m_1$  remains approximately invariant across the corresponding data samples. In  $eN$  collisions, the number of participating partons is relatively small; conversely, a significant number of remaining partons act as spectators. The parameters characterizing multiple particle production at the EIC could be preliminarily constrained by data collected at DESY-HERA.

At energies around a few GeV, our recent work [56, 57] employed the single-component Erlang distribution to study squared momentum transfer spectra for light mesons such as  $\pi^0$ ,  $\pi^+$ ,  $\eta$ , and  $\rho^0$ . These mesons were produced in  $\gamma^*p \rightarrow \text{meson}+N$  process during  $ep$  collisions measured at Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility (Jefferson Laboratory or JLab) [58–61]. Additionally, we examined squared momentum transfer spectra for  $\eta$  and  $\eta_0$ ,



generated in process where  $\gamma^*p \rightarrow \eta(\eta_0)+p$  occurred during  $ep$  collisions conducted at Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility (CEBAF) [62], Daresbury Laboratory electron synchrotron (NINA) [63], Cambridge Electron Accelerator (CEA) [64], Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) [65], DESY [66], and Wilson Laboratory Synchrotron (WLS) [67]. Our findings indicate that related experimental data can be effectively fitted using the hybrid model. The value of  $M_1$  ranges from 3 to 5—lower than that observed ( $m_1 = 6 - 11$ ) at an energy of  $\sqrt{s} = 300$  GeV. Herein we estimate that  $M_1 = m_1$ , with average transverse momenta given by  $\langle p_T \rangle \approx (0.4 - 1.2)$  GeV/ $c$ , and for this same event sample we find that  $\langle p_{t1} \rangle \approx (0.4 - 1.2)\langle n_{i1} \rangle$  GeV/ $c$  [56, 57]. The parameters derived from low-energy measurements provide valuable references for future analyses involving  $eN$  or  $eA$  collisions at EIC.

Table 1. Values of  $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$  and  $m_1$  for the fit [27] to data samples selected by  $2E_B^{\text{cr}}$  and  $M_{\text{eff}}$  in the Breit frame [53].

$2E_B^{\text{cr}}$ (GeV)	$\langle n_{i1} \rangle$	$m_1$	$M_{\text{eff}}$ (GeV)	$\langle n_{i1} \rangle$	$m_1$
1.5–4	0.38	6	1.5–4	0.43	9
4–8	0.54	6	4–8	0.65	9
8–12	0.70	6	8–12	0.90	9
12–20	0.87	6	12–20	1.12	9
20–30	1.04	6			
30–45	1.21	6			
45–100	1.45	6			

Table 2. Values of  $\langle n_{i1} \rangle$  and  $m_1$  for the fit [27] to data samples selected by  $M_{\text{eff}}$  and  $W$  in the hadronic center-of-mass frame [53].

$M_{\text{eff}}$ (GeV)	$\langle n_{i1} \rangle$	$m_1$	$W$ (GeV)	$\langle n_{i1} \rangle$	$m_1$
1.5–4	0.44	10	70–100	1.68	6
4–8	0.70	9	100–150	1.94	6
8–12	0.80	11	150–225	2.23	6
12–20	1.15	10			
20–30	1.47	10			

The pseudo(rapidity) distributions of final-state particles have been investigated in our earlier work [68], which confirms the effectiveness of the two-cylinder model within the hybrid framework. In  $pp$  collisions across an energy range from  $\sqrt{s} = 24$  to 63 GeV [69], the charged particle pseudorapidity distributions indicate that for low multiplicity events ( $n_{ch} = 2 - 4$ ), the string lengths are  $L_{y_P} = L_{y_T} = 3.20 - 3.40$ , corresponding to soft processes, while for high multiplicity events ( $n_{ch} = 20 - 24$ ), they are  $L_{y_P} = L_{y_T} = 2.00 - 2.80$ , indicative of hard processes. Furthermore, within this energy range, we observe a rapidity gap  $\Delta y = 0.8 - 1.2$  between projectile and target strings in low multiplicity events, whereas  $\Delta y = 0$  is noted in high multiplicity scenarios. These parameters reflect the penetrability of the collision system during soft processes, characterized by significant rapidity shifts, and stopping power during hard processes, marked by minimal rapidity shift.

In  $e^+e^-$  annihilations over an energy range from  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  to 34 GeV [70], charged particle rapidity distributions reveal that both string lengths satisfy  $L_{y_P} = L_{y_T} = 1.72 - 2.20$ , with a gap of  $\Delta y = 0.4 - 0.6$ . At an energy level of  $\sqrt{s} = 29$  GeV, as multiplicities increase, both  $L_{y_P}$  and  $L_{y_T}$  decrease while  $\Delta y$  increases correspondingly. Additionally, as particle or quark jet sizes grow larger, there is a continued decrease in both string lengths; however, no clear trend emerges for changes in  $\Delta y$ . Once again, these parameters elucidate aspects related to collision system penetrability and stopping power across different interaction types. Moreover, lighter mass particles and quark jets tend to achieve higher velocities more readily than heavier counterparts—resulting in greater rapidity shifts overall. The findings mentioned here also offer valuable insights relevant to analyzing  $eN$  collisions at EIC experiments, though our earlier

work [68] did not specifically address on pseudo(rapidity) distributions in  $ep$  collisions.

One may compare the multi-particle production and multi-fragment emission in  $eA$  collisions. These two processes exhibit similarities, namely, both possess a two-temperature structure, and the two-component Erlang distribution can be employed to describe their multiplicity distributions. The distinction lies in that the transverse momentum distribution of multiple particles can also be characterized by a two-component Erlang distribution, whereas the transverse momentum distribution of multiple fragments can be described using a two-component Rayleigh distribution when applying the classical ideal gas model.

We would like to emphasize the differences in the underlying physics. The two-component distribution for multi-particle production arises from two types of events: soft excitation process occurs during violent collisions between electron and partons, which are primarily sea quarks and/or gluons; hard scattering process takes place during more intense collisions between electron and partons, typically valence quarks. In contrast, the two-component distribution for multi-fragment emission is present within similar types of events. Specifically, within an excited nucleus, regions not involved in  $eN$  scattering act as cold sources while those engaged in  $eN$  scattering serve as hot sources.

It is essential to discuss what constitutes leading charged particles in high-energy collisions. Although there are varying perspectives on leading charged particles within the community, we have a specific designation for this article. We contend that in very forward/backward pseudorapidity regions, the yield of charged baryons significantly exceeds that of charged mesons. The excess portion of charged baryons originates from those baryons that pre-exist in both projectile and target nuclei. Therefore, when referring to leading charged particles in this article, we specifically mean leading charged baryons such as protons rather than mesons (e.g.  $\pi^\pm$ ,  $K^\pm$ ), leptons (e.g.  $e^\pm$ ), and neutrons.

The radial isotropic flow effect is not excluded from the transverse momentum distribution due to its very small value or near-zero contribution in extremely low-energy collisions. Generally, radial flow occurs in large collision systems, where the interaction between the projectile and target leads to an expansion of the collision system. In  $eN$  or  $eA$  collisions, one may consider the radial flow effect to be negligible. Furthermore, transverse anisotropic flows such as elliptic flow exert a minimal influence that does not necessitate consideration in the transverse momentum distribution.

In addition to the effects of leading charged particles and various flows, we can also examine other nuclear effects. Nuclear clusters, such as  $\alpha$ -clusters, can impact the multiplicity  $N_F$  distribution of nuclear fragments with a given charge  $Z$ . Consequently, this can affect the average value of  $\langle N_F \rangle$ . However, it is important to note that nuclear clusters do not significantly alter the distribution laws for  $p_T$  and  $\theta$  of nuclear fragments. The situations regarding other nuclear effects—such as projectile penetration, target stopping power, shadowing over subsequent nucleons, and correlations between pairs of nucleons—are analogous to those associated with nuclear clusters.

Moreover, we have employed the concept of temperature within high-energy collisions. For individual events, it is indeed true that these systems are so small that applying temperature concepts may be unsatisfactory. Fortunately, high-energy collisions represent high-throughput experiments; thus statistical distributions are derived from numerous events. From a grand canonical ensemble perspective, statistical laws become recognizable and applicable under temperature considerations. At minimum, temperature  $T$  reflects the average kinetic energy across multiple particles which can be extracted from  $\langle p_T \rangle$ , as discussed in related references. [31, 32, 71].

### III. SUMMARY

In summary, the application of a hybrid model for  $eA$  collisions at the EIC allows us to predict the bulk properties of multi-particle production and multi-fragment emission in these collisions through statistical distribution laws involving two components. The production of multiple particles occurs via two distinct processes: soft excitation and hard scattering, which are categorized as different types of events. In contrast, multiple fragments are emitted from two localized regions within the excited nucleus—namely, low and high temperature sources—which are classified under the same type of event. The proposed physical framework and mathematical expressions for  $eA$  collisions build upon

our previous research.

The multiplicity and transverse momentum distributions of charged particles produced in  $eA$  collisions can be effectively described by a two-component Erlang distribution derived from a multi-source thermal model. The number of participants involved in the soft excitation process is relatively small due to only an electron and a limited number of partons (primarily sea quarks and/or gluons) participating in these collisions. Conversely, during hard scattering process, there are typically only 2 participants: an electron and one parton (usually a valence quark). Consequently, each participant's contribution during the soft process is naturally less significant than that observed in the hard process.

Similarly, the multiplicity distribution of nuclear fragments emitted in  $eA$  collisions can also be characterized by a two-component Erlang distribution. Both contributors from low- and high-temperature sources remain limited due to the constrained volume available within the excited nucleus. Furthermore, both transverse momentum and angular distributions for nuclear fragments approximately follow a two-component Rayleigh distribution; each component aligns with predictions made by classical ideal gas model. Relativistic forms for transverse momentum and angular distributions concerning nuclear fragments will also be accessible for validation through future studies on  $eA$  collisions at EIC.

### Acknowledgments

The work of the Shanxi Group was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12147215, the Shanxi Provincial Basic Research Program (Natural Science Foundation) under Grant No. 202103021224036, and the Fund for Shanxi “1331 Project” Key Subjects Construction. The work of K.K.O. was supported by the Agency of Innovative Development under the Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Innovations of the Republic of Uzbekistan within the fundamental project No. F3-20200929146 on analysis of open data on heavy-ion collisions at RHIC and LHC.

### ORCID

Fu-Hu Liu, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2261-6899>

Khusniddin K. Olimov, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1879-8458>

- 
- [1] A. De Falco (for ALICE Collab.), *J. Phys. G* **38**, 124083 (2011).
  - [2] S. Bhattacharjee and P. K. Haldar, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **39**, 2430003 (2024).
  - [3] N. Thongyoo, P. Srisawad, K. Tomuang, P. Sittiketkorn, P. Chaimongkon, Y. L. Yan, A. Limphirat, C. Kobdaj, S. Sombun and Y. P. Yan, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **38**, 2350045 (2023).
  - [4] D. Diakonov and V. Petrov, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 266–282 (1994).
  - [5] D. Kharzeev, E. Levin and K. Tuchin, *Phys. Rev. C* **75**, 044903 (2007).
  - [6] Z. Ong, P. Agarwal, H. W. Ang, A. H. Chan and C. H. Oh, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **38**, 2350014 (2023).
  - [7] F. Gulminelli, *Nucl. Phys. A* **791**, 165–179 (2007).
  - [8] P. Hillmann, K. Käfer, J. Steinheimer, V. Vovchenko and M. Bleicher, *J. Phys. G* **49**, 055107 (2022).
  - [9] F. Gelis and R. Venugopalan, *Acta Phys. Polon. B* **37**, 3253–3314 (2006).
  - [10] S. Gautam, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **48**, 3 (2012).
  - [11] V. Kaur and S. Kumar, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **312**, 082028 (2011).
  - [12] A. D. Sood and R. K. Puri, *Phys. Rev. C* **79**, 064618 (2009).

- [13] A. D. Sood and R. K. Puri, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **15**, 899–910 (2006).
- [14] J. Singh, R. K. Puri and J. Aichelin, *Phys. Lett. B* **519**, 46–49 (2001).
- [15] G. M. S. Vasconcelos (for STAR Collab.), *J. Phys. G* **37**, 094034 (2010).
- [16] M. Gazdzicki, *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **43**, 791–802 (2012).
- [17] A. Nandi, L. Kumar and N. Sharma, *Phys. Rev. C* **102**, 024902 (2020).
- [18] P. Agostini, T. Altinoluk and N. Armesto, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 760 (2021).
- [19] E. K. G. Sarkisyan and A. S. Sakharov, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **828**, 35–41 (2006).
- [20] E. K. G. Sarkisyan and A. S. Sakharov, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **70**, 533–541 (2010).
- [21] E. K. G. Sarkisyan, A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo and A. S. Sakharov, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 054046 (2016).
- [22] A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo, E. K. G. Sarkisyan and A. S. Sakharov, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 3147 (2014).
- [23] E. K. G. Sarkisyan, A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo and A. S. Sakharov, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 011501 (2016).
- [24] E. K. Sarkisyan-Grinbaum, A. N. Mishra, R. Sahoo and A. S. Sakharov, *EPL* **127**, 62001 (2019).
- [25] A. N. Mishra, A. Ortiz and G. Paić, *Phys. Rev. C* **99**, 034911 (2019).
- [26] P. Castorina, A. Iorio, D. Lanteri, H. Satz and M. Spousta, *Phys. Rev. C* **101**, 054902 (2020).
- [27] F. H. Liu, *Nucl. Phys. A* **810**, 159–172 (2008).
- [28] F. H. Liu, Y. Q. Gao, T. Tian and B. C. Li, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **50**, 94 (2014).
- [29] J. Cleymans and D. Worku, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **48**, 160 (2012).
- [30] M. Ajaz, A. M. Khubrani, M. Waqas, Z. Yasin, B. J. Mughal, S. Hassan, S. Ali, and M. K. Suleymanov, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **37**, 2250098 (2022).
- [31] F. G. Gardim, G. Giacalone, M. Luzum and J. Y. Ollitrault, *Nat. Phys.* **16**, 615–619 (2020).
- [32] G. Giacalone, A matter of shape: seeing the deformation of atomic nuclei at high-energy colliders, Ph.D. thesis, Université Paris-Saclay, France (2021), arXiv:2101.00168 [nucl-th] (2021).
- [33] F. H. Liu, *Phys. Rev. C* **66**, 047902 (2002).
- [34] F. H. Liu, *Phys. Rev. C* **78**, 014902 (2008).
- [35] F. H. Liu and Y. A. Panebratsev, *Phys. Rev. C* **59**, 941–946 (1999).
- [36] F. H. Liu, Q. W. Lü, B. C. Li and R. Bekmirzaev, *Chin. J. Phys.* **49**, 601–620 (2011).
- [37] F. H. Liu, Y. Q. Gao and H. R. Wei, *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2014**, 293873 (2014).
- [38] J. L. Synge, *The Relativistic Gas* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1957).
- [39] C. D. Dermer, *Astrophys. J.* **280**, 328–333 (1984).
- [40] P. P. Yang, Q. Wang, F. H. Liu, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **58** 2603–2618 (2019).
- [41] H.-C. Schultz-Coulon, Hard processes in electron-proton scattering, in *Proc. XXIII Int. Conf. Phys. Coll.*, Zeuthen, Germany, 26–28 June 2003, eds. S. Riemann and W. Lohmann (Deutsches Elektronensynchrotron, DESY, Zeuthen, Germany, 2003), eConf C030626, pp. 270–284, arXiv:hep-ex/0310010 (2003).
- [42] B. Blok, L. Frankfurt and M. Strikman, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 114009 (2009).
- [43] H. Khanpour, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 054007 (2019).
- [44] F. Hautmann, Z. Kunszt and D. E. Soper, *Nucl. Phys. B* **563**, 153–199 (1999).
- [45] U. D’Alesio, L. Maxia, F. Murgia, C. Pisano and S. Rajesh, *JHEP* **03**, 037 (2022).
- [46] R. A. Khalek, A. Accardi, J. Adam, D. Adamiak, W. Akers, M. Albaladejo, A. Al-bataineh, M. G. Alexeev, F. Ameli, P. Antonioli et al., *Nucl. Phys. A* **1026**, 122447 (2022).
- [47] M. Klein, Future low  $x$  physics and facilities, in *Multiparticle Dynamics: Proc. XXXI Int. Symp. Multipart. Dyn.*, Dantong, China, September 1–7, 2001, eds. Y. T. Bai, M. L. Yu and Y. F. Wu (World Scientific, 2002), pp. 449–454, arXiv:hep-ph/0112333 (2001).
- [48] M. Lomnitz and S. Klein, *Phys. Rev. C* **99**, 015203 (2019).
- [49] X. Li, I. Vitev, M. Brooks, L. Cincio, J. M. Durham, M. Graesser, M. X. Liu, A. Morreale, D. Neill, C. da Silva, W. E. Sondheim and B. Yoon, *EPJ Web Conf.* **235**, 04002 (2020).

- [50] X. Li, *EPJ Web Conf.* **296**, 16001 (2024).
- [51] H1 Collab. (S. Aid et al.), *Phys. Lett. B* **358**, 412–422 (1995).
- [52] L. Frankfurt, M. Strikman and C. Weiss, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **55**, 403–465 (2005).
- [53] ZEUS Collab. (S. Chekanov et al.), *JHEP* **06**, 061 (2008).
- [54] ZEUS Collab. (M. Derrick et al.), *Z. Phys. C* **69**, 607–620 (1996).
- [55] ZEUS Collab. (I. Abt et al.), *JHEP* **04**, 070 (2008).
- [56] Q. Wang, F. H. Liu and K. K. Olimov, *Front. Phys.* **9**, 792039 (2021).
- [57] Q. Wang, F. H. Liu and K. K. Olimov, *Universe* **9**, 342 (2023).
- [58] CLAS Collab. (I. Bedlinskiy et al.), *Phys. Rev. C* **90**, 025205 (2014).
- [59] CLAS Collab. (K. Park et al.), *Eur. Phys. J. A* **49**, 16 (2013).
- [60] CLAS Collab. (I. Bedlinskiy et al.), *Phys. Rev. C* **95**, 035202 (2017).
- [61] CLAS Collab. (S. A. Morrow et al.), *Eur. Phys. J. A* **39**, 5–31 (2009).
- [62] CLAS Collab. (T. Hu et al.), *Phys. Rev. C* **102**, 065203 (2020).
- [63] P. J. Bussey, C. Raine, J. G. Rutherglen, P. S. L. Booth, L. J. Carroll, P. R. Daniel, A. W. Edwards, C. J. Hardwick, J. R. Holt, J. N. Jackson et al., *Phys. Lett. B* **61**, 479–482 (1976).
- [64] D. Bellenger, S. Deutsch, D. Luckey, L. S. Osborne and R. Schwitters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 1205–1208 (1968).
- [65] R. Anderson, D. Gustavson, J. Johnson, D. Ritson, W. G. Jones, D. Kreinick, F. Murphy and R. Weinstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 384–386 (1968).
- [66] W. Braunschweig, W. Erlewein, H. Frese, K. Lübelmeyer, H. Meyer-Wachsmuth, D. Schmitz, A. S. von Dratzig and G. Wessels, *Phys. Lett. B* **33**, 236–240 (1970).
- [67] J. Dewire, B. Gittelman, R. Loe, E. C. Loh, D. J. Ritchie and R. A. Lewis, *Phys. Lett. B* **37**, 326–328 (1971).
- [68] F. H. Liu, *Can. J. Phys.* **80**, 533–540 (2002).
- [69] R. Campanini, Selected results on multihadron production at ISR energies, In *Advanced Series on Directions in High Energy Physics, vol. 2, Hadronic Multiparticle Production*, ed. P. Carruthers (World Scientific, 1988), pp. 119–152.
- [70] M. Derrick and S. Abachi, Particle production in continuum  $e^+e^-$  annihilation at high energy, In *Advanced Series on Directions in High Energy Physics, vol. 2, Hadronic Multiparticle Production*, ed. P. Carruthers (World Scientific, 1988), pp. 57–118.
- [71] M. Waqas, G. X. Peng, M. Ajaz, A. Haj Ismail, Z. Wazir and L. L. Li, *J. Phys. G* **49**, 095102 (2022).