Measurement of Direct-Photon Cross Section and Double-Helicity Asymmetry at $\sqrt{s} = 510$ GeV in $p + \bar{p}$ Collisions
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We present measurements of the cross section and double-helicity asymmetry $A_{LL}$ of direct-photon production in $\bar{p} + p$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 510$ GeV. The measurements have been performed at midrapidity ($|\eta| < 0.25$) with the PHENIX detector at the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider. At relativistic energies, direct photons are dominantly produced from the initial quark-gluon hard scattering and do not interact via the strong force at leading order. Therefore, at $\sqrt{s} = 510$ GeV, where leading-order-effects dominate, these measurements provide clean and direct access to the gluon helicity in the polarized proton in the gluon-momentum-fraction range $0.02 < x < 0.08$, with direct sensitivity to the sign of the gluon contribution.

In polarized-proton collisions, spin-asymmetry measurements are sensitive to the polarized partonic structure of the proton and allow the investigation of its spin decomposition. Determining how fundamental properties of a particle such as spin comprise its constituents is of great importance in understanding quantum chromodynamics (QCD). Perturbative QCD (pQCD) has been successful in describing unpolarized cross sections while spin-dependent observables have historically offered additional insights. Polarized deep-inelastic scattering (DIS) has shown that only part of the proton spin is carried by quarks. A large fraction of the proton spin was suggested to be carried by gluons $[1,2]$. DIS is sensitive to gluons only through high-order interactions and the polarized gluon distribution is significantly less constrained compared to the unpolarized gluon due to the (so far) limited kinematic coverage of polarized data. At the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC), gluons are accessible at leading order in the hard scattering. Measurements of the double-helicity asymmetry ($A_{LL}$) are directly sensitive to the polarized gluon distribution via longitudinally polarized $\bar{p} + p$ collisions. Recent RHIC measurements of $\pi^0$ and jets at $\sqrt{s} = 62.4$ and 200 GeV $[6,10]$ that were included in global analyses have shown the first direct evidence of nonzero gluon-spin contributions to the spin of the proton $[11,12]$ in the gluon momentum fraction ($x$) range larger than 0.05. Measurements at the higher energy of $\sqrt{s} = 510$ GeV $[13,14]$ have confirmed the nonzero gluon polarization and extended the minimum $x$ reach to $\approx 0.01$. Recent analysis by the Jefferson Lab Angular Momentum (JAM) Collaboration showed that the two scenarios of positive and negative gluon-spin contributions are indistinguishable from each other based on the existing data $[15,10]$. This can be resolved using direct-photon production in $\bar{p} + p$ scattering, which is linearly sensitive to gluon helicity.

Direct photons are all those photons that are not coming from decays of final-state hadrons. The quark-gluon Compton process $qg \rightarrow q\gamma$ in proton-proton collisions at RHIC is the dominant contributor to the direct photons with transverse momentum larger than 5 GeV/$c$. Unlike hadrons and jets, direct photons do not involve color interactions in the final state. Therefore, they provide a direct probe to the initial state of colliding protons. The double-helicity asymmetry of direct-photon production in longitudinally polarized $\bar{p} + p$ collisions is sensitive to both the sign and magnitude of the gluon-spin contributions to the proton spin. For this reason, $A_{LL}$ was thought to be a golden channel to access the gluon spin in the 1992 RHIC-spin proposal $[14,15]$. In this Letter, we report the first measurements of this observable.

The data were collected in 2013 with the PHENIX detector at RHIC $[19]$ at $\sqrt{s} = 510$ GeV within pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 0.25$. We have extracted the inclusive and isolated direct-photon cross sections and $A_{LL}$ of isolated photons. The primary detector for this measurement is an electromagnetic calorimeter (EMCal) $[20]$ comprising two subsystems, a six-sector lead-scintillator (PbSc) detector, of which four are on the west arm and two on the east arm, and a two-sector lead glass (PbGl) detector on the east arm, each located 5 m radially from the beam line. Each sector covers a range of $|\eta| < 0.35$ and 22.5° in azimuth $\phi$. The EMCal has fine granularity with each tower covering $\Delta\eta \times \Delta\phi 

$
ments. The energy calibration of each tower is obtained from the reconstructed $\pi^0$ mass.

The beam-beam counters (BBC) [21] cover $3.1 < |\eta| < 3.9$ and are located at $\pm 144$ cm from the interaction point along the beam line. The BBCs measure the longitudinal collision vertex and provide a minimum-bias trigger. The BBCs are also used as a luminosity ($L$) monitor. Events with high-$p_T$ photons are selected by an EMCal-based trigger requiring a minimum energy deposit of 3.7 GeV in an overlapping tile of $4 \times 4$ towers of the EMCal in coincidence with the minimum-bias trigger. The cross-section ($A_{LL}$) analysis uses an integrated luminosity of 11 (108) pb$^{-1}$ with a $z$-vertex requirement of 10 (30) cm around the nominal interaction point. The photon-reconstruction and analysis method used here is similar to the previous PHENIX measurement at $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV [22, 23].

Photons are identified by a shower-profile requirement that was calibrated using test-beam data, identified electrons, and decay photons from identified $\pi^0$. The method rejects $\approx$50% of hadrons depositing $E > 3$ GeV in the EMCal and accepts $\approx$98% of real photons. The time-of-flight (ToF) of particles is measured relative to the photon signal in the EMCal. A ToF requirement [ToF]$ < 10$ ns is used to reduce pileup events due to high collision rate (the average number of BBC triggered events per beam crossing varied in the range 0.04–0.17). A minimum-energy requirement $E_{\text{min}} > 0.3$ GeV is applied for the EMCal clusters to reduce the background noise. The charged-particle veto of the photon sample is based on tracks in the drift chambers [24].

The experimental challenge in this measurement is the large photon background from hadron decays, primarily from $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ ($\approx$80% of the decays) and $\eta \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ ($\approx$15%). Photon candidates that form a pair with another photon in the mass range 110 < $M_{\gamma \gamma} < 160$ MeV/c$^2$ ($M_{\pi^0}\pm3\sigma$) with $E_\gamma > 300$ MeV are tagged as $\pi^0$ decay photons. A fiducial region for direct-photon candidates excludes 10 (12) towers (0.1 rad) from the edges of the PbSc (PbGl). Partner photons are accepted over the entire detector to improve the probability of observing both decay photons from the $\pi^0$. This method overestimates $\approx$8% more yield of photons from $\pi^0$ decays, $\gamma_{\pi^0}^{\text{inc}}$, due to combinatorial background. A $p_T$-dependent correction is estimated from the fit of the background under the $\pi^0$ peak in the two-photon invariant-mass distribution. The inclusive direct-photon yield is then determined as

$$\gamma_{\text{dir}}^{\text{iso}} = \gamma_{\text{total}}^{\text{iso}} - \left(1 + R_{\gamma\pi^0}^{\text{miss}} + R_{\pi^0}^{\text{miss} + \delta_{\pi^0}/\pi^0}\right) \gamma_{\pi^0}^{\text{inc}}, \quad (1)$$

where we subtract the reconstructed inclusive photons from $\pi^0$ decay ($\gamma_{\pi^0}^{\text{inc}}$), those missing their partner photons ($R_{\pi^0}^{\text{miss} + \delta_{\pi^0}/\pi^0}$) and photons from other hadron decays ($\delta_{\pi^0}/\pi^0$) from the total inclusive photon sample ($\gamma_{\text{total}}^{\text{iso}}$). If a partner photon of a $\pi^0$ decay is missed, it will not be reconstructed in the $\pi^0$ mass peak window. The ratio of $\pi^0$ decay photons that missed their partner photons to those that were reconstructed, $R_{\gamma\pi^0}^{\text{miss}}$, is estimated using a single $\pi^0$ simulation with photon shower and detector geometry. The $\delta_{\pi^0}/\pi^0$ is calculated by $\xi$, $\omega$, $\eta$ over $\pi^0$ ratios based on the previous $\sqrt{s} = 200$ GeV measurement [25]: $\delta_{\pi^0}/\pi^0 \approx 0.28$, with $\delta_{\pi^0}/\pi^0 \approx 0.21$ and $\delta_{\pi^0}/\pi^0 \approx 0.035$. A Pythia [25] simulation showed that the variation of these ratios is less than 10% between 200 GeV and 510 GeV within $6 < p_T < 30$ GeV/c. The difference is accounted for by assigning a systematic uncertainty.

In addition, we also measured the isolated direct-photon cross section with isolation criteria on the photon candidates, which can largely reduce the contributions from parton fragmentation and hadron decays. For any other particles within a cone of radius $r_{\text{cone}} = \sqrt{(\delta_\eta)^2 + (\delta_\phi)^2}$ of the signal photon, the sum of their energies is required to be less than 10% of the energy of the signal photon: $E_{\text{cone}} < 0.1E_\gamma$. The energies of the neutral particles that pass charge-veto criteria were measured by the EMCal with a minimal threshold of 300 MeV. The momenta of the charged particles were measured by the drift chambers with a minimal threshold of 200 MeV/c. The efficiency of isolation criteria due to limited detector acceptance was corrected by using Pythia-simulated direct-photon events with the same isolation criteria as in the data. Similar to Eq. (1), the isolated direct-photon yield can be expressed as

$$\gamma_{\text{dir}}^{\text{iso}} = \gamma_{\text{total}}^{\text{iso}} - \gamma_{\pi^0}^{\text{iso}} - \left(R_{\gamma\pi^0}^{\text{miss}} + V\delta_{\pi^0}/\pi^0\right) \gamma_{\pi^0}^{\text{isopair}}, \quad (2)$$

where $\gamma_{\pi^0}^{\text{iso}}$ is the $\pi^0$ tagged-photon yield when each of the $\pi^0$ decay photons passes the isolation requirement. $\gamma_{\pi^0}^{\text{isopair}}$ is the yield when a photon from a $\pi^0$ decay passes the isolation requirement while its partner photon energy is not included in the isolation-cone energy sum. Therefore, $R_{\gamma\pi^0}^{\text{miss, isopair}}$ represents the yield of $\pi^0$ decay photons that are missing the energy of their partner photons. Similarly, the term $\delta_{h/\pi^0}^{\text{isopair}}$ corrects for the photons from other hadron decays that pass the isolation requirement while the energy of the partner photon is not included in the isolation cone energy sum. To include the effect that one of the decay photons is vetoed by its partner decay photon due to isolation criteria, we use single $\eta$ and detector simulations to calculate the ratio of $\eta$ decay photons with and without isolation criteria, $V = \gamma_{\eta}^{\text{iso}}/\gamma_{\eta}^{\text{inc}}$, which varies from 0.01 to 0.1 depending on $p_T$.

The direct-photon cross section is calculated as

$$E \frac{d^3\sigma}{dp^3} = \frac{1}{L} \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi p_T} \cdot \frac{1}{\Delta p_T \Delta y} \cdot \frac{r_{\text{pileup}} \cdot \gamma_{\text{dir}}}{\epsilon}, \quad (3)$$
where ε includes corrections for the detector acceptance, photon reconstruction efficiency, trigger efficiency, and detector smearing effects and ǫ_{pileup} is the correction for the pileup effects due to the large signal-integration time of the EMCal coupled with the high collision rate. It is approximately 0.8 (0.9) for inclusive (isolated) direct photons. The correction is obtained by a logarithmic extrapolation of the number of photons per event to zero event rate. The Λ is the integrated luminosity used for the analyzed data, and Δy is the rapidity range.

The main systematic uncertainty sources are from the global energy scale of tuning the π± mass-peak position and energy nonlinearity of the EMCal response at high p_T. These are calculated by a single π± or photon generator with a fast detector simulation and depending on p_T were determined to be 14%–19% (7%–13%) for the inclusive (isolated) direct-photon cross section. The systematic uncertainties due to π± yield extraction and relative fractions of other hadron decays over π± are 2%–12% (0.5%–2.5%) and 5%–14% (0.4%–6.0%) for the inclusive (isolated) direct-photon cross section. These contributions for the isolated direct-photon cross section are relatively small compared to the inclusive case as the isolation requirement largely reduces these backgrounds. The loss of photons from conversions in the material before the EMCal is estimated using a single-photon generator plus full GEANT detector simulation [29]. The material of the vertex tracker [30] leads to a (12.8 ± 1.9)% probability for a photon to convert. This systematic uncertainty only contributes to the west arm, because in 2013 the east arm did not have a vertex-tracker installed. Conversions in other materials lead to photon losses of (3±1)% in the PbSc and (4.5±1.3)% in the PbGl. When calculating the direct-photon yield in Eq. [1] and Eq. [2], we vary the photon-conversion rate by its systematic uncertainty to get 1%–8% relative uncertainties of the direct-photon yield. The uncertainties from the EMCal detector resolution of 2%–8% and trigger of 2%–4.5% are also taken into account. Other uncertainties, including geometrical acceptance, trigger efficiencies, and pileup effect, are in total less than 7%.

Figure 1(a) shows the measured inclusive direct-photon cross section at midrapidity in p+p collisions at √s = 510 GeV compared with NLO pQCD calculations [27] [28] using NNPDF3.0 parton-distribution functions (PDF) [31] [32] and Glück-Reya-Vogt (GRV) frag-
The double-helicity asymmetry is defined as

\[ A_{LL} = \frac{\Delta \sigma}{\sigma} = \frac{\sigma_{++} - \sigma_{+-}}{\sigma_{++} + \sigma_{+-}}, \tag{4} \]

where \( \sigma_{++} \) (\( \sigma_{+-} \)) is the cross section for the same (opposite) helicity proton-proton collisions. This can be rewritten in terms of particle yield and beam polarizations:

\[ A_{LL} = \frac{1}{P_B P_Y} \frac{N_{++} - RN_{+-}}{N_{++} + RN_{+-}} \tag{5} \]

where \( N_{++} \) \( (N_{+-}) \) is the number of isolated direct photons from the collisions with the same (opposite) helicities. \( P_B \) \( (P_Y) \) are the polarizations for the blue (yellow) proton beams, and the average values in 2013 were 0.55 \((0.57)\) \( [39] \). \( R = (L_{++}/L_{+-}) \) is the relative luminosity that is measured by the BBC. The systematic contribution of \( R \) to \( A_{LL} \) was found to be \( 3.8 \times 10^{-4} \) \( [39] \).

The asymmetry was calculated for photon candidates that passed the same time-of-flight, minimum-energy, and isolation requirements as in the cross-section analysis. A z-vertex requirement of 30 cm is used for the asymmetry measurement. The asymmetry contribution for background photons from \( \pi^0 \)’s decay was calculated from the sideband regions (47–97 MeV/c\(^2\) and 177–227 MeV/c\(^2\)) below and above the \( \pi^0 \) mass peak (112–162 MeV/c\(^2\)) using the inclusive photon sample due to the limited statistics in the isolated photon sample. The asymmetry for other hadron decays (mostly \( \eta \) decays) was taken as \( A^0_{LL} \) from previous PHENIX measurements at \( \sqrt{s} = 200 \text{ GeV} \) \( [3] \) by assuming \( x_T \) scaling. The difference in \( A^0_{LL} \) between 200 GeV and 510 GeV for a given \( x_T \) is expected to be much smaller than the experimental uncertainty of the 200 GeV result which was used to assign a systematic uncertainty \( [11] \) \( [12] \). The background-corrected asymmetry can be calculated as

\[ A_{LL}^{\text{dir}} = A_{LL}^{\text{total}} - r_{x^0} A^0_{LL} - r_h A^+_{LL} \]

where \( r_{x^0} \) \((10\%-14\%)\) and \( r_h \) \((0.6\%-1.4\%)\) are background fractions of \( \pi^0 \) and other hadron-decay photons, respectively. We used a bunch-shuffling technique which assigned a random spin polarization to each bunch and examined the distribution of resulting asymmetries to ensure there were no false asymmetries arising from unknown systematic effects \( [6] \). The data were divided into subgroups according to the bunch spin patterns that were used to fill the RHIC rings, and calculated asymmetries were found to be consistent.

Figure 2 shows the double-helicity asymmetry of isolated direct-photon production in longitudinally polarized proton-proton collisions at \( \sqrt{s} = 510 \text{ GeV} \) for \( 6 < p_T < 20 \text{ GeV}/c \). The corresponding gluon momentum fraction is \( x \approx 2p_T/\sqrt{s} \). In the asymmetry measurement, systematic effects are largely canceled. The systematic uncertainties in Fig. 2 include point-to-point uncertainties from background estimation and false asymmetries in the background due to pileup effects at low \( p_T \). The NLO pQCD calculation was obtained using the DSSV14 polarized PDFs, the NNPDF3.0 unpolarized PDFs and the GRV FF \( [33] \). The calculation is in good agreement with the results, within experimental uncertainties.

The two dashed curves in Fig. 2 come from the global analysis of the JAM Collaboration \( [15] \) \( [16] \). They found there are two distinct sets of solutions for the polarized gluon PDF, \( \Delta g \), which differ in sign. Even though the solutions with \( \Delta g < 0 \) violate the positivity assumption, \( |\Delta g| < g \), all previous data cannot exclude those solutions due to the mixed contributions from quark-gluon and gluon-gluon interactions. However, the direct-photon \( A_{LL} \) comes mainly from the quark-gluon interactions and has \( \chi^2 = 4.7 \) and 12.6 for 7 data points for the \( \Delta g > 0 \) and \( \Delta g < 0 \) solutions, respectively, with the difference of 7.9 between \( \chi^2 \) values implying that the negative solution is disfavored at more than 2.8\( \sigma \) level.

In summary, PHENIX has measured the cross section of direct photons at midrapidity in \( \bar{p} + \bar{p} \) collisions at \( \sqrt{s} = 510 \text{ GeV} \). The NLO pQCD calculations are consistent with the results except at lower \( p_T \) where the calculations underestimate the inclusive direct-photon cross section. With isolation criteria, the partonic level calculation is in better agreement with the measurement. This is the first measurement of the \( A_{LL} \) of direct photons, which is sensitive to the polarized-gluon distribution inside the proton. Our data are well consistent with the positive gluon-spin contributions and strongly disfavor the negative gluon-spin scenario, that the previously published data were unable to resolve.
FIG. 2. Double-helicity asymmetry $A_{LL}$ vs $p_T$ for isolated direct-photon production in polarized $p+p$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 510$ GeV at midrapidity. Vertical error bars (boxes) represent the statistical (systematic) uncertainties. The systematic uncertainties for $p_T < 10$ GeV/c are smaller than the marker size. Not shown are a $3.9 \times 10^{-3}$ shift uncertainty from relative luminosity and a 6.6% scale uncertainty from polarization. The DSSV14 and JAM22 calculations are shown with 1σ uncertainty bands obtained from MC replicas \[11, 15, 40, 41\]. JAM22 calculations are based on PDF sets from the global analysis of the JAM Collaboration \[16\], and the code to calculate the asymmetries was provided by W. Vogelsang.
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