

Flavor decomposition of the elastic nucleon electromagnetic form factors

G.D. Cates,¹ C.W. de Jager,² S. Riordan,³ and B. Wojtsekhowski^{2,*}

¹University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903

²Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, Newport News, VA 23606

³University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003

(Dated: March 21, 2022)

The u - and d -quark contributions to the elastic nucleon electromagnetic form factors have been determined using experimental data on G_E^n , G_M^n , G_E^p , and G_M^p . Such a flavor separation of the form factors became possible up to 3.4 GeV^2 with recent data on G_E^n from Hall A at JLab. At a negative four-momentum transfer squared Q^2 above 1 GeV^2 , for both the u - and d -quark components, the ratio of the Pauli form factor to the Dirac form factor, F_2/F_1 , was found to be almost constant, and for each of F_2 and F_1 individually, the d -quark portions of both form factors drop continuously with increasing Q^2 .

PACS numbers: 14.20.Dh, 13.40.Gp, 24.70.+s, 25.30.Bf

Electron-nucleon scattering has been extensively studied in two cases. The first case is in elastic scattering which is characterized by the electromagnetic form factors [1]. The second case is in deep inelastic scattering (DIS) characterized by the structure functions which exhibit Bjorken scaling [2]. The study of the proton form factors in elastic scattering by Hofstadter *et al.* provided some of the first information on the size of the proton and the distribution of charge and magnetization [3]. Deep inelastic scattering resulted in the discovery of quarks at the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center (SLAC) [4], and also taught us about the nucleon's spin structure [5]. Elastic and deep inelastic scattering provide complementary information: elastic scattering reveals features of transverse structure, and DIS provides information regarding the longitudinal momentum distributions of the quarks. Taken together, elastic and the deep inelastic scattering can both be understood within the broader framework of generalized parton distributions which facilitate a tomographic picture of the nucleon [6].

Experimental data on the proton Dirac form factor F_1^p [7] have been found to be in fair agreement with a scaling prediction based on perturbative QCD (pQCD), $F_1^p \propto Q^{-4}$ [8], where Q^2 is the negative four-momentum transfer squared. However, it has been argued that pQCD is not applicable for exclusive processes at experimentally accessible values of momentum transfer [9]. Indeed, experimental results from Thomas Jefferson Laboratory (JLab) [10] for the ratio of the proton Pauli form factor F_2^p and the Dirac form factor F_1^p have been found to be in disagreement with the suggested scaling $F_2^p/F_1^p \propto 1/Q^2$ [8]. These same data, however, are in reasonable agreement with an updated pQCD prediction $Q^2 F_2/F_1 \propto \ln^2[Q^2/\Lambda^2]$ [11] even at modest Q^2 of several GeV^2 . Here Λ is a soft scale parameter related to the size of the nucleon. The prediction has the important feature that it includes components of the quark wave function with nonzero orbital angular momentum.

In view of these facts it is of significant interest to look

for the origin of the observed Q^2 -dependence of F_2^p/F_1^p . We report here on the flavor-separated form factors for the up and down quarks up to $Q^2 = 3.4 \text{ GeV}^2$. When considering the ratio F_2/F_1 for the d and u -quark contributions to the nucleon form factors, we find their Q^2 dependencies to be surprisingly constant. However, when combined in the proton form factors, they give the appearance of the onset of scaling. It is interesting to note that the authors of [11] did not expect the asymptotic predictions for the form factors to work at a few GeV^2 and considered that “... the observed consistency might be a sign of precocious scaling as a consequence of delicate cancellations in the ratio”.

In the one-photon exchange approximation, the amplitude for electron-nucleon elastic scattering can be written $M^{\text{EM}} = -(4\pi\alpha/Q^2)l^\mu J_\mu^{\text{EM}}$, where α is the fine structure constant, $l^\mu = \bar{e}\gamma^\mu e$ is the leptonic vector current, and

$$J_\mu^{\text{EM}} = \langle p(n) | (\frac{2}{3}\bar{u}\gamma_\mu u + \frac{1}{3}\bar{d}\gamma_\mu d) | p(n) \rangle \quad (1)$$

is the hadronic matrix element of the electromagnetic current operators for the proton (neutron). Here, the neglect of heavier quarks in this context is supported by experimental data on parity non-conserving polarized electron scattering from the proton [12]. While we can not evaluate the matrix elements of $\bar{u}\gamma_\mu u$ and $\bar{d}\gamma_\mu d$ explicitly, from symmetry considerations we know that the matrix element shown in Eq. 1 must have the form (considering the proton for definiteness)

$$J_\mu^{\text{EM}} = \bar{p}(k') \left[\gamma_\mu F_1^p(Q^2) + \frac{i\sigma^{\mu\nu}q_\nu}{2M} F_2^p(Q^2) \right] p(k), \quad (2)$$

where $p(k)$ and $\bar{p}(k')$ are the proton Dirac spinors for the initial and final momenta k and k' , respectively. The definition of the neutron form factors $F_1^n(Q^2)$ and $F_2^n(Q^2)$ follows similarly.

The JLab data for G_E^p/G_M^p from Refs. [10] were used to plot $S_p \equiv Q^2 F_2^p/F_1^p$ in the upper panel of Fig. 1, which also shows the prediction [11] at $\Lambda = 300 \text{ MeV}$. Data




FIG. 1: The ratio of the Pauli and Dirac form factors, multiplied by Q^2 , $S = Q^2 F_2 / F_1$, vs. the negative four-momentum transfer squared Q^2 . The upper panel shows S_p for the proton and S_n for the neutron using data from Refs.[13-18], as well as the curves of the prediction [11]: $\ln^2[Q^2/\Lambda^2]$ for $\Lambda=300$ MeV which is normalized to the data at 2.5 GeV^2 . The bottom panel shows the individual flavor quantities S_u and S_d for the u and d quarks, respectively.

on G_E^n/G_M^n for the neutron up to $Q^2=3.4$ GeV^2 were recently published by Riordan *et al.* [13]. For the first time, it is possible to examine the behavior of the neutron ratio F_2^n/F_1^n in the same Q^2 range as that where the interesting behavior was first seen for the proton [10]. Using the data of Riordan *et al.* as well as those of Refs.[14-18], we also show in Fig. 1 the quantity $S_n \equiv Q^2 F_2^n / F_1^n$. Scaling of S_n is clearly not evident at the lower Q^2 values shown, although the data do not rule out this type of behavior at a moderately higher Q^2 .

Thus far, by discussing $F_1^{p(n)}$ and $F_2^{p(n)}$ we are explicitly examining the behavior of the matrix element of the electromagnetic operators ($\frac{2}{3}\bar{u}\gamma_\mu u + \frac{-1}{3}\bar{d}\gamma_\mu d$) in the proton (neutron). If we assume charge symmetry (thus implying $\langle p|\bar{u}\gamma_\mu u|p\rangle = \langle n|\bar{d}\gamma_\mu d|n\rangle$), it is possible to perform a flavor decomposition of the form factors $F_1^{p(n)}$ and $F_2^{p(n)}$, and construct form factors corresponding to the matrix elements of $\bar{u}\gamma_\mu u$ and $\bar{d}\gamma_\mu d$ individually [19]. Here we use the relations

$$F_{1(2)}^u = 2F_{1(2)}^p + F_{1(2)}^n \quad \text{and} \quad F_{1(2)}^d = 2F_{1(2)}^n + F_{1(2)}^p.$$

In what follows, we use the convention that $F_{1(2)}^u$ and $F_{1(2)}^d$ refer to the up and down quark contributions to the Dirac (Pauli) form factors of the proton. At $Q^2=0$,

the normalizations of the Dirac form factors are given by: $F_1^u(0) = 2$ ($F_1^d(0) = 1$) so as to yield the normalization of 2 (1) for the u (d)-quark distributions in the proton. The normalizations of the Pauli form factors at $Q^2=0$ are given by $F_2^q(0) = \kappa_q$, where κ_u and κ_d can be expressed in terms of the proton (κ_p) and neutron (κ_n) anomalous magnetic moments as

$$\kappa_u \equiv 2\kappa_p + \kappa_n = +1.67 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_d \equiv \kappa_p + 2\kappa_n = -2.03.$$

Having defined the flavor-separated Dirac and Pauli form factors, we can also define the quantities

$$S_u \equiv Q^2 F_2^u / F_1^u \quad \text{and} \quad S_d \equiv Q^2 F_2^d / F_1^d,$$

which we have plotted in the bottom panel of Fig. 1. Each individual data point corresponds to an experimental result on G_E^n/G_M^n from Refs.[13-18]. Only the uncertainties in the ratio G_E^n/G_M^n are included in the error bars of the flavor-separated results because the other form factors (calculated with the Kelly fit [20]) are known to much higher accuracy, albeit dependent on the particular parameterization chosen. The behavior we see is completely different from that of the proton and the neutron. There is a striking lack of saturation, and indeed the variation of S_u and S_d with Q^2 appears to be quite linear. It is interesting also that the slope associated with the d quark is about six times larger than that of the u quark. When we consider the matrix elements of $\bar{u}\gamma_\mu u$ and $\bar{d}\gamma_\mu d$ individually, the relationship between the Pauli and the Dirac amplitudes is quite different from when we consider the sum of the amplitudes that results in the full hadronic matrix element (Eq. 2).

While it is instructive to plot S_u and S_d so that we can compare them directly with the widely discussed S_p for the proton, the inclusion of the factor of Q^2 masks the detailed behavior as Q^2 approaches zero. We thus plot in the top two panels of Fig. 2 the quantities $\kappa_u^{-1} F_2^u / F_1^u$ and $\kappa_d^{-1} F_2^d / F_1^d$. Here, a second aspect of the behavior of the flavor decomposed form factors appears that is quite intriguing. These ratios are relatively constant for Q^2 greater than ~ 1 GeV^2 , but have a more complex behavior for lower values of Q^2 . This might be interpreted as a transition between a region where the virtual photon coupling to the three-quark component in the wave function dominates (higher Q^2) and a region where the inclusion of a coupling to a five-quark component is essential (lower Q^2). We note also that the ratio F_2/F_1 for the proton does not show a different behavior above and below 1 GeV^2 as one can see in the bottom panel of Fig. 2. The calculation of the form factors in a relativistic constituent quark model (RCQM) [21] (shown by the blue curves in Fig. 2) deviates considerably from the data which illustrates the discriminating power of the flavor separated form factors. The empirical Kelly fit (which predates Ref. [13]), corresponds to the black curves, and is in reasonable agreement with the data, particularly at lower Q^2 .




FIG. 2: The ratios $\kappa_d^{-1} F_2^d / F_1^d$, $\kappa_u^{-1} F_2^u / F_1^u$ and $\kappa_p^{-1} F_2^p / F_1^p$ vs. momentum transfer Q^2 . The data and curves are described in the text.

The form factors F_1^u , F_1^d , F_2^u and F_2^d are shown in Fig. 3, all multiplied by Q^4 for better clarity in the high- Q^2 range. The values are given in Table I.

TABLE I: The flavor contributions to the proton form factors, obtained using G_E^n / G_M^n form factor data from Refs.[13-18] and the Kelly fit [20] for the other form factors. The Q^2 values are given in GeV^2 .

Q^2	Ref.	F_1^u	F_1^d	F_2^u	F_2^d
0.30	[17]	1.075(6)	0.505(12)	0.716(6)	-0.995(12)
0.45	[18]	0.853(6)	0.377(12)	0.515(6)	-0.777(12)
0.50	[14]	0.789(6)	0.332(12)	0.473(6)	-0.708(12)
0.50	[16]	0.789(4)	0.340(7)	0.463(4)	-0.713(7)
0.59	[17]	0.695(6)	0.283(13)	0.394(6)	-0.617(13)
0.67	[15]	0.628(6)	0.249(12)	0.342(6)	-0.552(12)
0.79	[17]	0.544(8)	0.206(15)	0.283(8)	-0.467(15)
1.00	[16]	0.434(5)	0.154(10)	0.211(5)	-0.357(10)
1.13	[18]	0.379(3)	0.124(5)	0.183(3)	-0.298(5)
1.45	[18]	0.290(3)	0.093(6)	0.128(3)	-0.213(6)
1.72	[13]	0.2257(22)	0.0529(43)	0.1103(22)	-0.1429(43)
2.48	[13]	0.1380(18)	0.0278(35)	0.0632(18)	-0.0707(35)
3.41	[13]	0.0851(12)	0.0131(24)	0.0370(12)	-0.0337(24)

Up to $Q^2 \approx 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ there is a constant scaling factor of ~ 2.5 for F_1 and ~ 0.75 for F_2 , between the u - and




FIG. 3: The Q^2 -dependence for the u - and d -contributions to the proton form factors (multiplied by Q^4). The data points are explained in the text.

d -quark contributions. Above 1 GeV^2 the d -quark contributions to both nucleon form factors multiplied by Q^4 become constant in contrast to the u -quark contributions which continue to rise. These experimental results are in qualitative agreement with the predictions for the moments of the generalized parton distributions reported in Ref. [22]. It is interesting to note that the d -contributions correspond to the flavor that is represented singly in the proton, whereas the u -contributions correspond to the flavor for which there are two quarks. In the framework of Dyson-Schwinger equation calculations, the reduction of the ratios F_1^d / F_1^u and F_2^d / F_2^u at high Q^2 is related to diquark degrees of freedom [23]. The reduction of these ratios has the immediate consequence that S_p has its observed shape despite the fact that S_u and S_d are almost linear with Q^2 .

Another representation of the Dirac form factor is the infinite momentum frame density, ρ_D , given by the expression $\rho_D(b) = \int (QdQ/2\pi) J_0(Qb) F_1(Q^2)$ [24], where J_0 is the zeroth order Bessel function and b is the impact parameter. The faster drop off of the d -quark form factors in Fig. 3 implies that the u quarks have a significantly tighter distribution than the d quarks in impact-parameter space, as was noticed in Ref. [25].

In summary, we have performed a flavor separation of the elastic electromagnetic form factors of the nucleon. We find that for large Q^2 the d -quark contributions to both proton form factors are reduced relative to the u -quark contributions. We find also that the Q^2 -dependencies of the flavor-decomposed quantities S_u and S_d are relatively linear in contrast to the more complicated behavior of S_p and S_n . This linearity is due to the fact, as yet unexplained, that the ratios F_2^u / F_1^u

and F_2^d/F_1^d are constant within experimental errors for $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$. At $Q^2 < 1 \text{ GeV}^2$, however, these same ratios show significant variation. Given the linearity of S_u and S_d , it is quite clear that the precocious scaling of the proton form factors and the consistency of the proton data with the updated pQCD description of Ref. [11] are the result of the different behaviors of the u - and d -quark contributions to the proton form factors. Further measurements of G_E^n/G_M^n [26] will allow us to extend the flavor decomposition to $Q^2=10 \text{ GeV}^2$ and to explore the Q^2 range over which the apparent constant behavior of F_2^u/F_1^u and F_2^d/F_1^d persists.

This work was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy. Jefferson Science Associates, LLC, operates Jefferson Lab for the U.S. DOE under U.S. DOE contract DE-AC05-06OR23177.

* Corresponding author: bogdanw@jlab.org

- [1] M.N. Rosenbluth, Phys. Rev. **79**, 615 (1950).
 [2] J.D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. **179**, 1547(1969).
 [3] E.E. Chambers and R. Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. **103**, 1454 (1956).
 [4] M. Breidenbach *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23**, 935 (1969).
 [5] J. Ashman *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 206**, 364 (1988); K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 26 (1997); K. Ackerstaff *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 404**, 383 (1997); A. Airapetian *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 442**, 484 (1998); P.L. Anthony *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 493**, 19 (2000); X. Zheng *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 065207 (2004).
 [6] D. Muller *et al.*, Fortsch. Phys. **42**, 101 (1994); X. Ji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 610 (1997); A.V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. **B 380**, 417 (1996).
 [7] R.G. Arnold *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 174 (1986);
 A.F. Sill *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 29 (1993).
 [8] G.P. Lepage and S.J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 545 (1979); **43**, 1625(E) (1979).
 [9] Nathan Isgur and C.H. Llewellyn Smith, Phys. Lett. **B 217**, 535 (1989).
 [10] M.K. Jones *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1398 (2000); O. Gayou *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **64**, 038202 (2001); O. Gayou *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 092301 (2002); A. Puckett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 242301 (2010).
 [11] A.V. Belitsky, Xiangdong Ji, and Feng Yuan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 092003 (2003).
 [12] K.A. Aniol *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 509**, 211 (2001); K.A. Aniol *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **69**, 065501 (2004); F.E. Maas *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 022002 (2004); F.E. Maas *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 152001 (2005); D.S. Armstrong *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 092001 (2005); K.A. Aniol *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 022003 (2006) K.A. Aniol *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B 635**, 275 (2006); A. Acha *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 032301 (2007).
 [13] S. Riordan *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 262302 (2010).
 [14] H. Zhu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 081801 (2001).
 [15] J. Bermuth *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **564B**, 199 (2003).
 [16] G. Warren *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 042301 (2004).
 [17] D.I. Glazier *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J A **24**, 101 (2005).
 [18] B. Plaster *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 025205 (2006).
 [19] G.A. Miller, B.M.K. Nefkens, and I. Slaus, Phys. Rep. **194**, 1 (1990).
 [20] J.J. Kelly, Phys. Rev. C **70**, 068202 (2004).
 [21] H.H. Matevosyan, A.W. Thomas, G.A. Miller, Phys. Rev. C **72**, 065204 (2005); private communication (2009).
 [22] M. Diehl *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **39**, 1 (2005).
 [23] C.D. Roberts *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **ST 140**, 53 (2007); I.C. Cloët *et al.*, Few-Body Systems **46**, 1(2009).
 [24] G.A. Miller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 112001 (2007).
 [25] G.A. Miller and J. Arrington, Phys. Rev. C **78**, 032201 (2008).
 [26] G.D. Cates, S. Riordan, B. Wojtsekhowski *et al.*, JLab experiment E12-09-016.