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A significant sample of $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ events has been observed at STAR in $\sqrt{s}=200 \mathrm{GeV}$ transversely polarized $p p$ collisions, where an isolated $\pi^{0}$ is detected in the forward pseudorapidity range $2.65<\eta<3.9$ along with the forward-going proton $p$, which scatters with a near-beam forward pseudorapidity into Roman Pot detectors. The sum of the $\pi^{0}$ and the scattered proton energies is consistent with the incident proton energy of 100 GeV , indicating that no further particles are produced in this direction. It is postulated that the forward incident proton may have fluctuated into a $p+\pi^{0}$ system, with an angular momentum correlated with the initial proton spin. The backward-going proton interacts with the $p+\pi^{0}$ system, which then separates such that the $\pi^{0}$ has a transverse momentum of $\sim 2 \mathrm{GeV} / c$ and the proton has a transverse momentum of $\sim 0.2$ $\mathrm{GeV} / c$, while the backward proton shatters into the remaining particles $X$. Correlations between the $\pi^{0}$ and scattered proton will be presented, along with single-spin asymmetries which depend on the azimuthal angles of both the pion and the proton. This is the first time that spin asymmetries have been explored for this process, and a model to explain their azimuthal dependence is needed.
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Figure 1: Left: schematic of $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$. Right: schematic of detectors, the Forward Meson Spectrometer (FMS) for the $\pi^{0} \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ (red dashed arrows) and the Roman Pots (RP) for the proton (blue solid arrow).

## 1. Motivation

The transverse single-spin asymmetry, $A_{N}$, is an observable that probes the spin structure of the proton. It is defined via

$$
\begin{equation*}
A(\phi)=\frac{d \sigma^{\uparrow}(\phi)-d \sigma^{\downarrow}(\phi)}{d \sigma^{\uparrow}(\phi)+d \sigma^{\downarrow}(\phi)}=A_{N} \cos \phi \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $d \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\uparrow(\downarrow)}(\phi)$ is a differential cross section, e.g., for $\pi^{0}$ production, with azimuthal angle $\phi$, from a spin-up(down) proton $p^{\uparrow(\downarrow)}$ scattering off an unpolarized proton. The spin asymmetry $A(\phi)$ is modulated by $\cos \phi$, and the amplitude is denoted by $A_{N}$. If $\phi=0$ represents leftward $\pi^{0}$ production, then a positive $A_{N}$ indicates spin-up(down) proton scattering favors producing $\pi^{0}$ s to the left(right).
$A_{N}$ for forward $\pi^{0}$ s rises with Feynman- $x$ and is independent of center-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s}$ [1,2]; moreover, $A_{N}$ is systematically larger for isolated $\pi^{0}$ s than for those not as isolated [3, 4]. Several models have been proposed to explain the origin of this large $A_{N}$ [5-8], and although the most promising of these involves a novel twist-3 fragmentation process [8], the origin of the $\pi^{0}$ isolation dependence remains unclear.

A possible channel for isolated $\pi^{0}$ production is the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ process, as shown schematically in the left panel of figure 1. The forward polarized proton $p^{\uparrow}$ scatters off the backward proton $p$; the forward proton is deflected slightly with the production of a forward $\pi^{0}$, while the backward proton fragments into remnants denoted by $X$. By energy conservation, the sum of the deflected proton and forward $\pi^{0}$ energies is equal to or less than the incident proton energy, while the observed $\pi^{0}$ and proton transverse momentum sum should balance that of $X$.

Further study is needed to understand the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ underlying mechanism, and especially its spin dependence. One possible model assumes the $p^{\uparrow}$ fluctuates into a $p+\pi^{0}$ state, with the $\pi^{0}$ in the proton periphery; if the $\pi^{0}$ scatters off another proton such that the $p+\pi^{0}$ state separates, then the $\pi^{0}$ could scatter with a moderate $p_{T}$, while the proton recoils at near-beam rapidity. It is thought that the proton angular momentum in the peripheral region is likely dominantly from orbital angular momentum, rather than from parton spin [9]; assuming the orbital angular momentum of the peripheral $\pi^{0}$ correlates to the proton spin, measurements of spin asymmetries in the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow$ $p \pi^{0} X$ process could be sensitive to proton peripheral angular momentum.

## 2. Event Selection and Kinematics

The $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ process has recently been observed at STAR in transversely-polarized protonproton scattering at $\sqrt{s}=200 \mathrm{GeV}$ during the 2015 RHIC run. The $\pi^{0}$ is measured with the Forward Meson Spectrometer (FMS), a lead-glass electromagnetic calorimeter subtending the forward region $2.65<\eta<3.9$ [10], and the deflected proton with the Roman Pots (RP), hodoscopic siliconstrip trackers downstream of the FMS, at near-beam rapidity [11, 12]. The right panel of figure 1 shows the detectors, with overlaying $\pi^{0} \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ and proton trajectories.

The $\pi^{0}$ s were selected from each event's highest-energy photon pair, with a transverse momentum $p_{T}$ above the trigger threshold and energy $E_{1}+E_{2}>12 \mathrm{GeV}$. The invariant mass was constrained to the $\pi^{0}$ mass region and the photons' energy imbalance to $\left|E_{1}-E_{2}\right| /\left(E_{1}+E_{2}\right)<0.8$. The proton was required to be detected in at least 7 of the 8 available silicon tracking planes, within geometric acceptance cuts, along with a veto on activity in the RPs in the backwards beam direction.

The selected events included a large contribution from accidental coincidences, for example, two collisions occurring in a single proton bunch crossing, where one collision sent a $\pi^{0}$ to the FMS while the second one was elastic, sending a proton to the RPs. For many of these accidental coincidences, the sum of the $\pi^{0}$ and proton energies, $E_{\text {sum }}:=E_{\pi}+E_{p}$, is greater than the 100 GeV incident proton energy, which would violate energy conservation had the proton and $\pi^{0}$ originated from the same collision. The Beam Beam Counters (BBC), scintillators in both the forward and backward directions subtending $2.1<|\eta|<5$, were used with cuts set to reduce the level of accidental coincidences while minimizing the loss of $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ candidates. Moreover, evidence of hits in the backward BBC as well as in the central-rapidity Time Of Flight (TOF) detector was seen for all $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ events, indicating breakup of the backward-going proton.

The left panel of figure 2 shows a distribution of $E_{\text {sum }}$, and the right panel shows $E_{p}$ plotted on the vertical axis versus $E_{\pi}$ on the horizontal. The peak at $E_{s u m}=100 \mathrm{GeV}$ represents the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ signal region, since the incident proton has an energy of 100 GeV and, by energy conservation, nothing else scattered in the forward direction; it corresponds to the region between the dashed lines in the right panel. The width of the $100 \mathrm{GeV} E_{\text {sum }}$ peak is dominantly from the FMS energy resolution and an event selection of $90<E_{\text {sum }}<105 \mathrm{GeV}$ was used for asymmetry analysis event selection.

Since the RPs were designed to see elastic and diffractive-like events, the $E_{p}$ distribution has a large peak at $E_{p}=100 \mathrm{GeV}$, which manifests as a band that spans the full $E_{\pi}$ range. These events along with any others with $E_{\text {sum }}$ above the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ signal region are accidental coincidences, and their $E_{\text {sum }}$ distribution likely extends to low $E_{\text {sum }}$ as the dominant source of background under the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ peak. The aforementioned BBC cut was tuned to minimize the accidental coincidence background distribution and maximize the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ signal purity.

The resulting events have the following kinematics: the $\pi^{0}$ and proton transverse momenta respectively span $1<p_{T, \pi}<4 \mathrm{GeV} / c$ and $0.1<p_{T, p}<0.45 \mathrm{GeV} / c$, while their energies span $12<E_{\pi}<35 \mathrm{GeV}$ and $68<E_{p}<90 \mathrm{GeV}$. For about $2 / 3$ of the events, the $\pi^{0}$ and proton are observed back-to-back, with azimuthal angles $\phi_{\pi}$ and $\phi_{p}$ such that $\Delta \phi:=\phi_{\pi}-\phi_{p} \sim \pi$. While the FMS spans the full $2 \pi$ azimuth, the RP silicon tracking planes are positioned above and below the beam, and $\phi_{p} \sim 0$ and $\phi_{p} \sim \pm \pi$, respectively left and right, are outside the RP acceptance.


Figure 2: Left: distribution of summed $\pi^{0}$ and proton energies, $E_{\text {sum }}$, shown with the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ selection region. Right: proton energy on the vertical axis plotted against $\pi^{0}$ energy; the region between the dashed lines is the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ selection region.

There is a further limit on $\phi_{p}$, since the RPs are positioned downstream of a RHIC dipole magnet that bends the outgoing beam to the left. This magnet is tuned to bend beam-energy protons appropriately, so any scattered proton with $E_{p} \sim 100 \mathrm{GeV}$ is likely to pass within the horizontal extent of the RPs. The $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ events, however, have protons with $E_{p}<90 \mathrm{GeV}$, which are bent more leftward than the 100 GeV protons. Therefore the azimuthal acceptance is biased toward rightward-scattered protons: $\pi / 2<\left|\phi_{p}\right|<\pi$ for $90 \%$ of the events. Despite this bias, it is still possible to analyze spin asymmetries which depend on both $\phi_{\pi}$ and $\phi_{p}$; an upgraded RP system is required to characterize $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ events with full proton azimuthal acceptance.

## 3. Asymmetries

Spin asymmetries of the $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ process can be modulated by two possible azimuthal angles: $\phi_{\pi}$ and $\phi_{p}$. In general, asymmetries and cross sections can depend on the incident $p^{\uparrow}$ momentum vector $\vec{Z}$, the observed $\pi^{0}$ and proton momentum vectors, respectively $\vec{\Pi}$ and $\vec{P}$, and the $p^{\uparrow}$ spin pseudovector $\vec{S}$ with spin projection $s= \pm \hbar / 2$. Physically allowed terms must be Lorentz invariant and parity conserving, i.e. scalar, which can be formed by geometric products of momenta and spin. Asymmetry contributions must also depend on spin $s$ and be invariant under rotations. For inclusive $\pi^{0}$ production, the scalar $(\vec{Z} \times \vec{\Pi}) \cdot \vec{S} \propto s \cos \phi_{\pi}$ represents the $\pi^{0}$ transverse single-spin asymmetry $A_{N}$ of equation 1.1.

In $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$, the additional proton momentum allows for the construction of scalars which depend on both $\phi_{p}$ and $\phi_{\pi}$. Letting $\vec{L}_{\pi}:=\vec{Z} \times \vec{\Pi}$ and $\vec{L}_{p}:=\vec{Z} \times \vec{P}$, a possible scalar that satisfies the aforementioned requirements and depends on both $\phi_{p}$ and $\phi_{\pi}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\vec{L}_{\pi} \cdot \vec{L}_{p}\right)\left(\vec{L}_{p} \cdot \vec{S}\right) \propto s \cos \phi_{p} \cos \Delta \phi, \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which represents the transverse single-spin asymmetry of the $\pi^{0}$ within the scattering plane of the observed proton. Letting $A_{p \pi}$ denote the amplitude of this modulation, $\left|A_{p \pi}\right|$ is large when the


Figure 3: Transverse single-spin asymmetry in bins of $\cos \phi_{p} \cos \Delta \phi$. A linear fit is included, with constant term $R$ and slope $A$, and the resulting fit values in the upper right corner.
proton scatters left or right ( $\phi_{p} \sim 0$ or $\pi$ ) and when the $\pi^{0}$ is close to the proton scattering plane ( $\Delta \phi \sim 0$ or $\pi$ ). Other possible scalars were tested, but their measured asymmetries were consistent with zero.

Let $N^{\uparrow(\downarrow)}\left(\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}\right)$ denote the yield from a spin-up(down) proton which scatters to a $\pi^{0}$ and proton with respective azimuthal angles $\phi_{\pi}$ and $\phi_{p}$. With $P$ denoting the beam polarization, the single-spin asymmetry was measured following equation 1.1 as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A\left(\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}\right)=\frac{1}{P} \frac{N^{\uparrow}\left(\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}\right)-N^{\downarrow}\left(\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}\right)}{N^{\uparrow}\left(\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}\right)+N^{\downarrow}\left(\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}\right)} . \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Figure 3 shows $A\left(\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}\right)$ in bins of $\cos \phi_{p} \cos \Delta \phi$, including a linear fit with a slope that corresponds to the amplitude of the $\cos \phi_{p} \cos \Delta \phi$ modulation, $A_{p \pi}$, which evaluates to $-19 \% \pm 5.2 \%$. The fit's constant term $R$ is included to account for possible nonzero relative luminosity which would systematically shift all data points upward or downward across all $\cos \phi_{p} \cos \Delta \phi$ bins. The vertical error bars represent statistical uncertainty, and the horizontal error bars are the combined propagated $\pi^{0}$ and proton position uncertainties. The average beam polarization was $56.5 \%$ and its uncertainty propagates to a $3.1 \%$ systematic uncertainty on the asymmetry scale.

A complementary view of this asymmetry is shown in figure 4 , where the $\cos \phi_{\pi}$ modulation $\left(\pi^{0} A_{N}\right)$ is shown for $\pi^{0}$ s which scatter near the proton scattering plane (left panel), where $\Delta \phi$ is within $\pi / 6$ radians of 0 or $\pm \pi$, compared to the case where $\pi^{0}$ s scatter away from the proton scatter plane (right panel), where $|\Delta \phi \pm \pi / 2|<\pi / 6$. When the $\pi^{0}$ scatters near the proton scatter plane, it shows an asymmetry of $-20 \% \pm 5.7 \%$, whereas when the $\pi^{0}$ scatters out-of-plane, the asymmetry is nearly consistent with zero, at $4.5 \% \pm 3.8 \%$.

Projections of $A_{p \pi} \cos \phi_{p} \cos \Delta \phi$ onto $\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}$, and $\Delta \phi$ were used to assess the impact of the limited $\phi_{p}$ acceptance; these are projections of a 2 -dimensional asymmetry to 1 -dimensional asymmetries and can be cross-checked with the corresponding 1-dimensional asymmetries in the data. Assuming the nominal value of $A_{p \pi}=-0.19$, projections of $A_{p \pi} \cos \phi_{p} \cos \Delta \phi$ onto 1-dimensional asymmetries modulated by $\phi_{\pi}, \phi_{p}$, or $\Delta \phi$ agree with data only when the $\phi_{p}$ acceptance limitations are applied. While the 1 -dimensional asymmetries are dependent on the $\phi_{p}$ acceptance limitations, the 2-dimensional $A_{p \pi}$ asymmetry is not and seems to most closely match the data. Several


Figure 4: Transverse single-spin asymmetry in bins of $\cos \phi_{\pi}$ for $\pi^{0} s$ near the proton scattering plane (left) or away (right). A linear fit is included in each.
other possibilities were tested, such as the assumption that the asymmetry is just a $\pi^{0}$ single-spin asymmetry, however their projections do not agree with the data.

## 4. Summary

The $p^{\uparrow} p \rightarrow p \pi^{0} X$ process has been observed at STAR, and a $-19 \% \pm 5.2 \%$ asymmetry of the $\pi^{0}$ in the scattering plane of the proton is observed, via the modulation in equation 3.1. This effect may serve as a probe to the orbital angular momentum of fluctuated $\pi^{0}$ s in the proton periphery. As far as we know, the spin-dependence of this process has otherwise not yet been explored experimentally and a model is needed to understand it. Moreover, this process should be studied in more detail experimentally, with better azimuthal and kinematic coverage.
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