

# Extracting azimuthal Fourier moments from sparse data

- Hermes **data is always statistics-limited**, because we always want to extract kinematic distributions in finer bins or more dimensions
    - ⇒ Azimuthal Fourier moments must be extracted from sparse distributions containing **bins with non-Gaussian statistics**
  - The **acceptance** can (and does!) cause a substantial **systematic bias** on observables extracted while integrating over kinematic variables on which that observable strongly depends. Examples:
    - $P_t$ -weighted transverse target spin asymmetries
    - DVCS beam charge asymmetries (see next page)
      - ⇒ Quantify ignorance of full kinematic dependence, propagate to result
      - ⇒ fit the full kinematic dependence on  $(x,y,z,P_t)$  using some standard set of **4D** orthogonal functions, then fold with known  $\sigma_{UU}(x,y,z,P_t)$
- Covariance matrix of fitted coefficients is propagated through folding

# Maximum-Likelihood fit: unpol. example

For ML fit of unpol. azimuthal moments, the event dist'n and PDF are

$$C N(x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) = \varepsilon(x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, z, P_t) \times \\ \left[ 1 + A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(\lambda_1, x, y, z, P_t) \cos\phi + A_{UU}^{\cos 2\phi}(\lambda_2, x, y, z, P_t) \cos(2\phi) \right] \\ \equiv F_{UU}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) \quad (\text{Probability Density Fun.})$$

Maximize Likelihood  
with respect to

parameter sets  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$ :  $\mathcal{L}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{N_x} F_{UU}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, x_i, y_i, z_i, P_{ti}, \phi_i, \phi_{Si})}{\mathcal{N}_{UU}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}$

The denominator fixes the normalization of the PDF as the parameter sets  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are stepped in the fit search:

$$\mathcal{N}_{UU}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \int dx dy dz dP_t d\phi d\phi_S F_{UU}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S)$$

Acceptance  $\varepsilon$  and azimuthally averaged cross section  $\underline{\sigma}_{UU}$  do not depend on the fitting parameter sets  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$

$\Rightarrow$  **they can be omitted in calculation of the numerator!!**

How can we conveniently evaluate the normalization integral?

# PDF Normalization: unpolarized case

Probability Density Function normalization:

$$\mathcal{N}_{UU}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \int dx dy dz dP_t d\phi d\phi_S \varepsilon(x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, z, P_t) \times \\ \left[ 1 + A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(\lambda_1, x, y, z, P_t) \cos\phi + A_{UU}^{\cos 2\phi}(\lambda_2, x, y, z, P_t) \cos(2\phi) \right]$$

**Solution:**

Use Monte Carlo integration method with azimuthal event weights.  
As Pythia MC events are distributed according to  $\varepsilon \underline{\sigma}_{UU}$ , PDF integral is

$$\mathcal{N}_{UU}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \sum_{j=1}^{N_{MC}} W_j^{MC} \left[ 1 + A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(\lambda_1, x_j, y_j, z_j, P_{tj}) \cos\phi_j + A_{UU}^{\cos 2\phi}(\lambda_2, x_j, y_j, z_j, P_{tj}) \cos(2\phi_j) \right]$$

**For efficiency:**

All factors in both likelihood product (expt'l events) and integral sum (MC events) can be tabulated for all events before starting the fit search

# Result of the fit

$$\sigma_{UU}(x, y, z, P_t, \phi) = \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, z, P_t) \times \left[ 1 + A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(\lambda_1, x, y, z, P_t) \cos\phi + A_{UU}^{\cos 2\phi}(\lambda_2, x, y, z, P_t) \cos(2\phi) \right]$$

The parameter sets  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  could be archived in the Durham data base, but we compare models to asymmetries in yields integrated over some variables:

$$\langle \cos\phi \rangle_{UU}^h(x) = \frac{\int dy dz dP_t \underline{\sigma}_{UU}^{Born}(x, y, z, P_t) A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(\lambda_1, x, y, z, P_t)}{\int dy dz dP_t \underline{\sigma}_{UU}^{Born}(x, y, z, P_t)}$$

This integral can be evaluated using  $\underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, z, P_t)$  from parton dist. funs and measured hadron multiplicities, or a Pythia MC event set generated in  $4\pi$ :

$$\langle \cos\phi \rangle_{UU}^h(x) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{N_{MC}} W_j^{MC} A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(\lambda_1, x_j, y_j, z_j, P_{tj})}{\sum_{j=1}^{N_{MC}} W_j^{MC}}$$

If the parameterization is linear in the fitted parameters, it is easy to propagate their covariance matrices through this sum

Exchange unknown systematic error for well-defined statistical uncertainty

# Maximum-likelihood fit: transverse-polarized case

Using the predetermined full kinematic dependence of the  $\cos(n\phi)$  moments, the event distribution and PDF for target polarization dist'n  $\rho(P)$ ,  $-1 < P < 1$ , is:

$$\begin{aligned} C N(P, x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) &= \rho(P) \varepsilon(x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, z, P_t) \times \\ &\left\{ 1 + A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(x, y, z, P_t) \cos\phi + A_{UU}^{\cos 2\phi}(x, y, z, P_t) \cos(2\phi) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + P [A_C(\lambda_1, x, y, z, P_t) \sin(\phi + \phi_S) + A_S(\lambda_2, x, y, z, P_t) \sin(\phi - \phi_S)] \right\} \\ &\equiv F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, P, x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) \end{aligned}$$

ML treats the target polarization  $P$  like any other (e.g., kinematic) variable.

Again the parameter-independent factor  $\varepsilon \underline{\sigma}_{UU}$  can be omitted in the numerator of the Likelihood:

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, P_i, x_i, y_i, z_i, P_{ti}, \phi_i, \phi_{Si})^{W_i}}{\mathcal{N}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)^{W_i}}$$

Here,  $W_i$  are event weights (from e.g. RICH PId)

The product in the denominator is independent of  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  and can be ignored in the likelihood maximization, if the whole data set has no net polarization:

$$\int dP P \rho(P) = 0$$

# PDF normalization: transverse-polarized case

In the PDF normalization integral, the integration over  $P$  factorizes:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{N}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= \int dP dx dy dz dP_t d\phi d\phi_S \rho(P) \varepsilon(x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, z, P_t) \times \\
 &\quad \left\{ 1 + A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(x, y, z, P_t) \cos\phi + A_{UU}^{\cos 2\phi}(x, y, z, P_t) \cos(2\phi) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + P [A_C(\lambda_1, x, y, z, P_t) \sin(\phi + \phi_S) + A_S(\lambda_2, x, y, z, P_t) \sin(\phi - \phi_S)] \right\} \\
 &= \int dP \rho(P) \cdot \int dx dy dz dP_t d\phi d\phi_S \varepsilon(x, y, z, P_t, \phi, \phi_S) \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, z, P_t) \times \\
 &\quad \left\{ 1 + A_{UU}^{\cos\phi}(x, y, z, P_t) \cos\phi + A_{UU}^{\cos 2\phi}(x, y, z, P_t) \cos(2\phi) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \frac{\int dP P \rho(P)}{\int dP \rho(P)} [A_C(\lambda_1, x, y, z, P_t) \sin(\phi + \phi_S) + A_S(\lambda_2, x, y, z, P_t) \sin(\phi - \phi_S)] \right\}
 \end{aligned}$$

This normalization integral is obviously independent of  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  if...

$$\int dP P \rho(P) = 0$$

If necessary, this might be arranged by scaling the weights of events recorded with one polarization sign.

# ML fit: DVCS beam-helicity asymmetry

The event distribution and PDF for beam polarization dist'n  $\rho(P)$ ,  $-1 < P < 1$ , is:

$$\begin{aligned} C N(P, x, y, t, \phi) &= \rho(P) \varepsilon(x, y, t, \phi) \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, t) \times \\ &\quad \{1 + P [A_1(\lambda_1, x, y, t) \sin(\phi) + A_2(\lambda_2, x, y, t) \sin(2\phi)]\} \\ &\equiv F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, P, x, y, t, \phi) \end{aligned}$$

Again the parameter-independent factor  $\varepsilon \underline{\sigma}_{UU}$  can be omitted in the numerator of the Likelihood:

$$\mathcal{L}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \prod_{i=1}^N \frac{F(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, P_i, x_i, y_i, t_i, \phi_i)^{W_i}}{\mathcal{N}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)^{W_i}}$$

Here,  $W_i$  are event weights (from e.g. RICH PID)

We will show the **normalization in the denominator** is independent of  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  and **can therefore be ignored** in the likelihood maximization **if either**:

-- the net target polarization for the whole data set is zero:

$$\int dP P \rho(P) = 0$$

-- or if the acceptance has no odd harmonics in  $\phi$ :

$$\varepsilon(x, y, t, \phi) = \varepsilon(x, y, t, -\phi)$$

# PDF normalization: DVCS beam-helicity case

In the PDF normalization integral, the integration over  $P$  factorizes:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) &= \int dP dx dy dt d\phi \rho(P) \varepsilon(x, y, t, \phi) \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, t) \times \\ &\quad \{1 + P [A_1(\lambda_1, x, y, t) \sin(\phi) + A_2(\lambda_2, x, y, t) \sin(2\phi)]\} \\ &= \int dP \rho(P) \cdot \int dx dy dt d\phi \varepsilon(x, y, t, \phi) \underline{\sigma}_{UU}(x, y, t) \times \\ &\quad \left\{ 1 + \frac{\int dP P \rho(P)}{\int dP \rho(P)} [A_1(\lambda_1, x, y, t) \sin(\phi) + A_2(\lambda_2, x, y, t) \sin(2\phi)] \right\}\end{aligned}$$

This normalization integral is independent of  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  if either...

$$\int dP P \rho(P) = 0$$

(If necessary, this can be arranged by scaling the weights of events recorded with one polarization sign)

or if...

$$\varepsilon(x, y, t, \phi) = \varepsilon(x, y, t, -\phi)$$

because its convolution with  $\sin(n\phi)$  again yields zero for the second term.



# Summary

- 
- An unknown systematic error from multi-dimensional correlations between acceptance and asymmetry is exchanged for a slightly larger but well-known statistical uncertainty
- All available information about the correlated kinematic dependence of the asymmetries can be extracted and available for formation of any projection of the result