What does the EMC-SRC Correlation tell us about isospin dependence (and origin) of the EMC Effect?
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EMC-SRC: First ~25 years

- EMC effect is a suppression of high-x part of nuclear quark distributions, whose shape is universal, but with a magnitude that depends on A.

- High momentum nucleons, well above $k_{\text{Fermi}}$, are associated with Short-Range Correlations (SRCs) and have a universal two-body nature associated with the strong, short-range components of the N-N interaction.
  - “Late” development: SRCs dominated by np pairs.

- Both effects assumed (and observed) to scale with nuclear density.
JLab EMC (SRC) Data

Consistent shape for all nuclei
(curves show shape from SLAC fit)

Measurements on $^3\text{He}$, $^4\text{He}$, $^9\text{Be}$, $^{12}\text{C}$

JA, D. Gaskell, spokespersons

If shape ($x$-dependence) is same for all nuclei, the slope ($0.35 < x < 0.7$) can be used to study dependence on $A$

Alternative to using suppression at $x=0.6$; more sensitive to normalization, requires $x=0.6$ data

Fractional modification goes like slope divided by baseline (no-EMC) ratio; typically ignored because $R_{\text{no-EMC}}=1$

J. Seely, et al., PRL103, 202301 (2009)
EMC-SRC correlation

SRCs are both short-distance and high-momentum components

Which matters for EMC effect?? (or neither, or some combination?)

J. Seely, et al., PRL 103, 202301 (2009)

L. Weinstein, et al., PRL 106, 052301 (2011)
JA, A. Daniel, D. Day, N. Fomin, D. Gaskell, P. Solvignon,
PRC 86, 065204 (2012)
EMC-SRC correlation

SRCs are both short-distance and high-momentum components

Which matters for EMC effect?? (or neither, or some combination?)
Short-distance behavior and the EMC effect

1. EMC effect driven by **average density** of the nucleons

If EMC effect and SRC contributions both scaled with density, it would explain the EMC-SRC correlation

**It would not explain the anomalous result for 9Be**

Note: in some cases, e.g. Frankfurt and Strikman review ('88), average density was used to represent probability of nucleon overlap – conceptually consistent with idea of large 9Be EMC effect
Short-distance behavior and the EMC effect

1. EMC effect, SRCs driven by **average density** of the nucleus

2. EMC effect is driven by **Local Density (LD)** – overlap of nucleons
   [J. Seely et al., PRL 103, 202301, 2009]
   SRC measurements probe **high-momentum nucleons (np pairs)**
   EMC effect driven by **high-density nucleon configurations (pairs, clusters)**

3. EMC effect driven by **High Virtuality (HV)** of the nucleons
   [L. Weinstein et al, PRL 106, 052301,2011]
   SRC measurements directly probe **high-momentum nucleons**
   EMC effect driven by off-shell effects in **high-momentum nucleons**

Initial comparison of HV/LD explanations of EMC-SRC correlation:
Two Hypotheses for EMC-SRC correlation

HV: OK linear correlation ($\chi^2_v=1.26$)  
Fair extrapolation to deuteron:  
$EMC(^2H) = -0.058 \pm 0.036$

# of nucleons at high momentum (relative to $^2H$)

Two Hypotheses for EMC-SRC correlation

**LD:** Good linear correlation ($\chi^2_v=0.64$)
Good extrapolation to deuteron:
EMC($^2$H) = -0.012 ± 0.033

**HV:** OK linear correlation ($\chi^2_v=1.26$)
Fair extrapolation to deuteron:
EMC($^2$H) = -0.058 ± 0.036

# of nucleons at high momentum (relative to $^2$H)

# of nucleons in small-sized configurations


LD picture: Estimate #/NN pairs based on measured np (SRC) pairs.
Better fit, but not conclusive. Want more light nuclei, better precision, larger N/Z range
New (but related) approach

If EMC effect due to high-momenta (our HV hypothesis), can extract universal modification of $(F_2^p + F_2^n) / F_2^d$ in a deuteron

$$F_{univ}^{HV} = \frac{(\sigma_A / \sigma_D) - (Z - N) F_2^p}{(A/2)a_2 - N}$$

For isoscalar nuclei, simplifies to $(R_{EMC} - 1)/(a_2 - 1)$

More detailed way of looking at EMC-SRC correlation (and isospin structure of EMC effect)
If EMC effect due to high-momenta (our HV hypothesis), can extract universal modification of \((F_{2p}+F_{2n})/F_{2d}\) in a deuteron

\[
F_{\text{univ}}^{\text{HV}} = \frac{(\sigma_A/\sigma_D) - (Z - N) \frac{F_{2p}^p}{F_{2d}^d} - N}{(A/2)a_2 - N}
\]

Observation of universal function shows data are consistent with the HV picture. But how much better is this than an isospin-independent picture?

Define similar function under assumption that all NN pairs contribute with no isospin dependence:

\[
F_{\text{univ}}^{\text{LD}} = \frac{R_{\text{EMC}} - 1}{R_{2N} \frac{A(A-1)}{2ZN} - 1}
\]

*Note: As in B. Schmookler, et al., we removed isoscalar corrections from the data set and apply a unified correction [different from Barak’s correction, but very similar for \(x<0.7\)]*

*We use SLAC+JLab (Hall C) data; have not included new CLAS results.*
Comparison to Nature result

\[ F_{uviv}^{HV} = \frac{\left( \frac{\sigma_A}{\sigma_D} \right) - (Z - N) \frac{F_2^P}{F_2^d}}{(A/2) a_2} - N \]
HV picture: np-dominance generates predictable isospin dependence of EMC effect

LD picture: EMC effect from short-distance pairs, assumed to be isospin independent

Both pictures give a good description of the data in terms of a universal modification
HV picture: EMC effect from np-SRC, generates known isospin dependence

LD picture: Driven by short-distance pairs, assumed to be isospin independent

As in 2012 EMC-SRC test, somewhat better description in isospin-independent LD picture
Proton vs neutron EMC effect

If np-dominated SRCs generate the EMC effect, then larger fraction of high-momentum protons in neutron-rich nuclei generate larger EMC effect for protons.

Plot EMC and SRC ratios “per-proton” or “per neutron” rather than usual per-nucleon ratios: Saturation of neutron EMC effect and increase of proton EMC ratios taken as evidence for larger EMC effect in proton.

Definition of the EMC slope

Slope = 0.409
Definition of the EMC slope

Slope = 0.409
\[ R_{\text{no-EMC}} = 1 \]
\[ \text{Slope}/R_{\text{no-EMC}} = 0.409 \] - “The EMC effect”

Cross section ratio (per nucleus)
Slope = 40.3
\[ R_{\text{no-EMC}} = 98.5 \]
\[ \text{Slope}/R_{\text{no-EMC}} = 0.409 \]
20% drop at \( x=0.6 \) is same in both cases
Definition of the EMC slope

Different “EMC” ratios for Au

The conclusion that the EMC effect differs for protons and neutrons comes from changing the definition of the EMC ratios without updating the measure of the size of the effect.

While the slope scales with the normalization, the EMC effect is generally taken as fractional modification of the nuclear pdf which does not change.
Final issue on proton vs neutron EMC effect

Nuclear cross section ratios, however normalized, yield the cross section for scattering from all of the protons and neutrons

Rescaling by N or Z instead of A is simply a renormalization. It’s impact is completely independent of the physics of the EMC effect - isospin independent, driven by np pairs, or even coming entirely from protons or neutrons

Our conclusion from the EMC-SRC data:
- No indication that HV (isospin-dependent EMC) picture gives better explanation
- LD (isospin-independent) fits data somewhat better (~2 sigma level)

No data provide clear indication of isospin-dependence in the EMC effect
Flavor/Isospin dependence of the EMC effect?

- Historically assumed that EMC effect is identical for proton and neutron

- Becoming hard to believe, at least for non-isoscalar nuclei
  - Recent calculations show difference for u-, d-quark, as result of scalar and vector mean-field potentials in asymmetric nuclear matter
    [I. Cloet, et al, PRL 109, 182301 (2012); PRL 102, 252301 (2009)]
  - EMC-SRC correlation + n-p dominance of SRCs suggests enhanced EMC effect in minority nucleons
    - In $^3$H, np-dominance suggests single proton generates same high-momentum component as two neutrons $\rightarrow$ larger proton EMC effect in ‘high-virtuality’ picture
  - $^{48}$Ca, $^{208}$Pb expected to have significant neutron skin: neutrons preferentially sit near the surface, in low density regions

  All of these imply increased EMC effect in minority nucleons

- The fact that the (limited) data show no indication of this is, in my mind, very puzzling

  A dependence (isospin dependence) of $R=\sigma_L/\sigma_T$ ??

  (probably not)
A major caveat...

Discussion generally assumes a single origin for EMC effect

In the rest frame convolution formalism, the average removal energy, not just the overall binding energy, is relevant. The EMC effect scales with average removal energy, as does the contribution of SRCs which contribute a large part of the removal energy. So it’s not purely an exotic density- or virtuality-driven effect, but appears to be mix of binding corrections and something more exotic.

The binding calculations of Kulagin & Petti explain half of the EMC effect, and the effect is correlated with the presence of SRCs. This suggests that the remaining half is also correlated with SRCs, although the evaluation of the removal energy is model dependent and uncertain.

NOTE: removal energy depends on n vs. p → should have same isospin dependence as “high-virtuality” model, approximately scale with <KE> estimates.