Unresolved Questions in Cold Nuclear Matter

C-J. Naïm

Anaheim Convention Center, Anaheim (CA, USA)

The 11th biennial workshop of the APS Topical Group on Hadronic Physics (GHP2025)

March 10, 2025

Center for Frontiers in Nuclear Science

Stony Brook University

Proton-Proton Collisions

At large momentum transfer in pp, scale $Q \gg \Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}} \approx 200$ MeV

$$\mathrm{pp} \to \gamma^\star/Z^0 \to \ell^+\ell^- + \mathrm{X} \quad \text{(Drell-Yan)}$$

Factorization of cross section = approximation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma_{\mathrm{pp}}}{\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}Q} = \sum_{i,j} \int \mathrm{d}x_1\, f_i^{\mathrm{p}}(x_1,\mu) \int \mathrm{d}x_2\, f_j^{\mathrm{p}}(x_2,\mu) \frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(x_1,x_2,\mu')}{\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}Q} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\mathrm{p}}^n}{Q^n}\right)$$

- $\hat{\sigma}_{ij}$: Partonic cross section calculable in perturbation theory
- x_1, x_2 : Fraction of momentum carried by the parton in the proton
- $f_{i,j}$: Parton Distribution Function (PDF), **universal**

Proton-Nucleus Collisions

Cross section in pA collisions assuming collinear factorization:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma_{\mathrm{pA}}}{\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}Q} = \sum_{i,j} \int \mathrm{d}x_1\, f_i^{\mathrm{p}}(x_1,\mu) \int \mathrm{d}x_2\, f_j^{\mathrm{A}}(x_2,\mu) \frac{\mathrm{d}\hat{\sigma}_{ij}(x_1,x_2,\mu')}{\mathrm{d}y\,\mathrm{d}Q} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\mathrm{A}}^n}{Q^n}\right)$$

- Probing the PDF of a nucleus (without nuclear effects):

$$f_i^{\mathrm{A}} = Z f_i^{\mathrm{p}} + (A-Z) f_i^{\mathrm{n}}$$

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{pA}} = Z\sigma_{\mathrm{pp}} + (A-Z)\sigma_{\mathrm{pn}} \approx A\sigma_{\mathrm{pp}}$$

- Investigating nuclear effects via:

$$R_{\mathrm{pA}} \equiv \frac{1}{A}\frac{\mathrm{d}\sigma_{\mathrm{pA}}}{\mathrm{d}\sigma_{\mathrm{pp}}} \approx 1$$

Nuclear parton distribution functions (nPDF)

- EMC effect discovered in 1983 in DIS on nuclear targets
- **PDF is modified in nuclei** : $f_j^{p/A} \neq f_j^p$



- The nuclear modification factor depends on x

nPDF and data-sets

Historically, nPDFs were mainly extracted from DIS data

	EPS09	DSSZ	nCTEQ	EPPS16	EPPS21
e-DIS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
ν-DIS		✓		✓	✓
Drell-Yan pA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
RHIC hadrons	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LHC data pA (QED)				✓	✓
Drell-Yan πA				✓	✓
LHC data pA (D mesons)					✓

- Recent hA collision data included to:
  - Extend the explored x range
  - Access gluon nPDF more directly

$\rightarrow$ **Possible biases from additional nuclear effects**

nPDF and data-sets



- nCTEQ15WZ and EPPS21 use heavy quark data in pA

$\rightarrow$ **Strongly impacting $R_g^{\mathbf{A}}$**

nPDF Scaling

$$R_{pA}^{nPDF}(x, Q^2, \sqrt{s}) \equiv R_{pA}(x, Q^2) \text{ should scale as a function of } \sqrt{s}$$



- Nuclear dependence for J/ψ and Drell-Yan production

  Arleo Naïm Platchkov 1810.05120

- No scaling as a function of $\sqrt{s}$ observed

$\rightarrow$ **Exploring beyond nPDF effects!**

Exploring beyond nPDF effects

The nuclear medium affects hard processes differently.

- $\mathrm{hA} \to \gamma^* + \mathrm{X}$ (DY)
  - **Initial-state interactions**
- $\mathrm{eA} \to e + h + \mathrm{X}$ (SIDIS)
  - **Final-state interactions**



- $\mathrm{hA} \to c\bar{c}(\to J/\psi) + \mathrm{X}$ (Quarkonia)
  - **Initial- and final-state interactions**

How does the nuclear medium affect particle production?

Energy loss effects

Energy loss effects have successfully described nuclear data

DY



J/ψ



J/ψ



- E866 and ALICE J/ψ suppression, $\langle\epsilon\rangle_{\text{FCEL}} \propto \sqrt{\hat{q}L}/M \cdot E$

  Arleo Peigné 1204.4609, 1212.0434, Arleo Kolevatov Peigné Rustamova 2003.06337

- E906 DY suppression, $\langle\epsilon\rangle_{\text{LPM}} \propto \alpha_s \hat{q}\, L^2$

  Arleo Naïm Platchkov 1810.05120

$\rightarrow$ What about other effects?

Transverse Momentum Broadening

Broadening effects have successfully described nuclear data



- J/ψ, ψ', Υ and DY data: a factor of 400 in beam energy!
- Broadening analysis reveals **universal scaling** across energies

Arleo Naïm 1810.05120

nPDF including the energy loss effect

A global exhaustive fit: the (only) future path?



Avez Arleo work ongoing

- Global fit including nPDF and energy loss from J/ψ suppression
- Significative impact on the shadowing amplitude

$\rightarrow$ Shadowing would be no more than 10-20% at $x \sim 10^{-5}$

Challenges in constraining gluon shadowing

Constraints on gluon shadowing from LHC pA data

- Limited experimental data for quarkonia and D-mesons
- Challenges in distinguishing shadowing from other nuclear effects
- Including energy loss in the global fit drastically reduces the shadowing amplitude by 10-20% at $x \sim 10^{-5}$

Ultra-peripheral collisions (UPC):



$\rightarrow J/\psi$ production in UPCs to probe gluon shadowing

Shadowing amplitude

J/ψ production in UPCs: a direct probe of R_g



Guzey CFNS cold QCD workshop (2025)

- Strong nuclear suppression of coherent J/ψ photoproduction in Pb-Pb UPC@LHC due to large gluon shadowing at small x

  Guzey Kryshen Strikman Zhalov 1305.1724, Guzey Zhalov 1307.4526

- EPPS21, nCTEQ15HQ, nNNPDF3.0 use heavy quarks in pPb

  $\rightarrow$ A shadowing amplitude up to 60% at $x \sim 10^{-5}$?

Nuclear absorption

Multiple scattering of $Q\bar{Q}$ bound state within the nucleons



- The typical size of a heavy nucleus is $L \sim 10$ fm
- J/ψ is mainly produced **outside** the nucleus at large y

$\rightarrow$ No J/ψ absorption at LHC forward data

Energy loss or nuclear absorption?

The absorption of quarkonia remains an open question

- $\sigma_{\text{abs}}^{J/\psi} \sim \mathbf{3} - 10$ mb: extracted using pA at $y \sim 0$
  $\rightarrow$ **probably overestimated**

  Lourenco Vogt Woehri 0901.3054, Arleo Tram 0612043
- **Energy loss alone coherently explains** J/ψ suppression in pA
- Possible shadowing effects in nuclear matter: 10%, 20% or more?
- What remains of the role of absorption, $\sigma_{\text{abs}}^{J/\psi} \ll 3$ mb?

$\rightarrow$ Comparison: J/ψ suppression in eA vs pA collisions
The suppression should not be universel

Nuclear Data Challenges

Numerous nuclear data available, from fixed-target to LHC

- Difficult to interpret due to **multiple effects**
- Need to isolate specific effects through **golden observables**
- Importance of **global approaches** (global fits)
- Critical to estimate the **precise contribution of shadowing**!

→ The cold QCD effects are the primary source of uncertainties in the interpretation of AA collisions

Golden observables?

- $\mathcal{R} = R_{\mathsf{pA}}^{J/\psi} / R_{\mathsf{pA}}^{\psi} \sim S\left(\sigma_{\mathrm{abs}}^{J/\psi}, \mathrm{L_A}\right) / S\left(\sigma_{\mathrm{abs}}^{\psi}, \mathrm{L_A}\right)$
  - Mid rapidity region, small $\sqrt{s}$
  - Independent of shadowing: $Q^2_{J/\psi} \sim Q^2_{\psi}$
  - Independent of FCEL: $\langle \epsilon \rangle_{\mathsf{FCEL}} \propto 1/M_{\perp}$

- $\mathcal{R} = R_{\mathsf{pA}}^{J/\psi} / R_{\mathsf{pA}}^{\Upsilon}$
  - Weak shadowing dependence, strong sets correlations
  - Probe of the mass dependence of FCEL

- Transverse momentum broadening $\Delta p_{\perp}^2$ in eA and pA collisions
  - Independent of shadowing
  - Independent of energy loss

- J/ψ production
  - Test the non-universality of J/ψ suppression in eA and pA
  - Strong test of $\langle \epsilon \rangle_{\mathsf{FCEL}}$ vs $\langle \epsilon \rangle_{\mathsf{LPM}}$, + possible nuclear abs.
  - In eA, $\langle \epsilon \rangle_{\mathsf{LPM}} \to 0$ at large $\sqrt{s}$

Key Questions in Nuclear Collisions

White paper in preparation:
Nuclear Cold QCD: Review and Future Strategy

1. **Energy Loss Mechanisms**
   - Initial-state (DY), final-state (SIDIS)
   - Initial/final-states (Quarkonia)

2. **Final-State Interactions**
   - Nuclear absorption, comovers

3. **Shadowing vs. Saturation**
   - Shadowing amplitude
   - Distinction between leading-twist shadowing and gluon saturation

CFNS Cold QCD workshop

Global Insights and Future Directions

- **Nuclear data reveal a scaling violation** as a function of x
  - R_{pA} is not universal
  - Collinear factorization is not satisfied
- **Shadowing uncertainty** impacts all data interpretation
- **Energy loss** is key to describing the data

- **Strategy to address the three questions:**
  - Assess the limitations of hA data for nPDF studies
  - Enhance global fits by incorporating nuclear effects
  - Strongly constrain shadowing using future EIC DIS data
  - Identify and measure the key observables

No need for more data, but better data AND stronger collaboration between phenomenologists and experimentalists