Recent developments in nucleon spin structure with focus on h_{1L}^2 and pretzelosity h_{1T}^2

D edicated to 65 anniversary of P rofessor K laus G œke?

H.Avakian¹, <u>A.V.E frem ov</u>^{2;a}, P.Schweitzer^{3;4}, A.M etz⁵, and T.Teckentrup³

 $^1\,$ Thom as Je erson N ational A coelerator Facility, N ew port N ew s, VA 23606, U S A .

- $^2\,$ Joint Institute for Nuclear R esearch, D ubna, 141980 R ussia
- ³ Institut fur Theoretische Physik II, Ruhr-Universitat Bochum, Germany

 $^4\,$ D epartm ent of P hysics, U niversity of C onnecticut, Storrs, C T 06269, U S A .

 5 D epartm ent of P hysics, B arton H all, Tem ple U niversity, P hiladelphia, PA 19122-6082, U S A .

Abstract. The leading twist transverse m on entum dependent parton distribution functions (TMDs) h_{1L}^2 and h_{1T}^2 , which is sometimes called \pretzelosity," are studied. For h_{1L}^2 we consider a \W andzura {W ilczek-type" approximation, which follows from QCD equations of motion upon the neglect of pure twist-3 terms and allows to express it in terms of transversity. On the basis of available data from HERMES we test the practical usefulness of this approximation and discuss how it can be further tested by future CLAS and COM PASS data. We review the theoretical properties of pretzelosity and observe an interesting relation valid in a large class of relativistic models: The di erence between helicity and transversity distributions, which is often said to be a 'm easure of relativistic e ects' in the nucleon, is nothing but the transverse m om ent of pretzelosity. We discuss prelim inary deuteron target data from COM PASS on the single spin asymmetry (SSA) in sem i-inclusive deep inelastic scattering (SID IS) related to pretzelosity, and make predictions for future experiments at JLab, COM PASS and HERMES.

1 Introduction

P rocesses like SID IS, hadron production in e⁺ e annihilations or the D rell{Y an process [1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16] factorize at leading twist [17,18,19,20] and allow to access inform ation on transversem on entum dependent fragm entation functions and TM D s [21,22]. The latter contain novel inform ation on the nucleon structure. In order to be sensitive to \intrinsic" transverse parton m om enta it is necessary to m easure adequate transverse m om enta in the nal state, for example, in SID IS the transverse m om enta of produced hadrons with respect to the virtual photon.

The eight leading-twist TMDs [9], and further subleading-twist structures [23,24] describe the structure of the nucleon in these reactions

$$\frac{f_{1T}^{a}; f_{1T}^{?a}; g_{1L}^{a}; g_{1T}^{a}; h_{1T}^{a}; h_{1T}^{?a}; h_{1}^{?a}; h_{1}^{?a}; e^{a}; g_{T}^{a}; h_{L}^{a}; \cdots}{\{z \atop tw ist-2}$$

$$\frac{f_{1T}^{a}; g_{1L}^{a}; g_{1L}^{a}; g_{1L}^{a}; h_{1L}^{a}; h_{1L}^{?a}; h_{1}^{?a}; h_{1}^{2}; \cdots}{\{z \atop tw ist-3}$$

$$(1)$$

[?] The main part of the work was written during visiting by one of us (AE) Institut fur Theoretische Physik II, Ruhr-Universitat Bochum. We thank Professor K laus Goeke for his encouragement, collaboration and support, congratulate him with 65 anniversary and wish him good health for many years.

^a e-m ail:efremov@theor.jinr.ru

W ill be inserted by the editor

which are functions of x and p_T^2 . (The dots denote thirteen further twist-3 TM D s. The renormalization scale dependence is not indicated for brevity.) Integrating over transverse momenta one is left with six independent \collinear" parton distribution functions (pdfs) [25,26]

$$\begin{array}{c} f_{1}^{a}(\mathbf{x}); \quad g_{1}^{a}(\mathbf{x}); \quad h_{1}^{a}(\mathbf{x}); \quad e^{a}(\mathbf{x}); \quad g_{T}^{a}(\mathbf{x}); \quad h_{L}^{a}(\mathbf{x}): \\ \hline tw ist-2 \quad tw ist-3 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} (2) \\ \end{array}$$

where we have $j(x) = {R \atop d^2 p_T j(x; p_T^2)}$ for $j = f_1^a; e^a; g_T; h_L$ while $g_1^a(x) = {R \atop d^2 p_T g_{1L}^a(x; p_T^2)}$ and $h_1^a(x) = {L \atop d^2 p_T fh_{1T}^a(x; p_T^2) + p_T^2 = (2M_N^2)h_{1T}^{?a}(x; p_T^2)g$.

The fragm entation of unpolarized hadrons is described in term s of two fragm entation functions, D $_{1}^{a}$ and H $_{1}^{?a}$, at leading-twist. In SID IS (with polarized beam s and/or targets, where necessary) it is possible to access information on the leading twist TM D s by measuring the angular distributions of produced hadrons. Some data on such processes are available [27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,4]. The fragm entation functions and TM D s in SID IS and other processes were subject to num erous studies in the literature [46,47,48,49,50,51,52,53,54,55,56,57,58,59,60,61,62,63,64,65,66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73]. This is true especially for the prom inent transversity distribution h $_{1}^{a}$ or the 'naively tim error reversal-odd' functions like the Sivers function $f_{1T}^{?a}$, the Boer{M ulders functions are $h_{1L}^{?a}$ and the C ollins fragm entation function H $_{1}^{?a}$.

The purpose of this lecture (based on the works [67,68]) is fourfold. First, we discuss whether some of the unknown TMDs could be approximated in terms of (possibly better) known ones. Second, we review what is known about h_{1T}^{2a} . Third, we mention the models these TMDs were calculated. Fourth, we present estimates for SSAs in which these functions enter, and discuss the prospects to measure these SSAs in experiments at Je erson Lab and COM PASS.

The process of SID IS is sketched in Fig.1. We denote the momenta of the target, incoming and outgoing lepton by P, 1 and 1⁰ and introduce $s = (P + 1)^2$, q = 1 ¹ with $Q^2 = q^2$. Then $y = \frac{P q}{P_1}$, $x = \frac{Q^2}{2Pq}$, $z = \frac{P P_h}{Pq}$, and $\cos = 1$ $\frac{2M_N^2 \times (1 y)}{sy}$ where denotes the angle between target polarization vector and momentum q of the virtual photon , see Fig. 1, and M_N is the nucleon m ass. The component of the momentum of the produced hadron transverse with respect to is denoted by Propagation and Propagation in the state of the st



LEPTON SCATTERING PLANE

$$\frac{d}{d} = F_{UU} + \cos(2)F_{UU}^{\cos(2)} + S_{L}\sin(2)F_{UL}^{\sin(2)} + S_{L}F_{LL} + S_{T}\cos(3)F_{LT}^{\cos(3)} + S_{T}\sin(3)F_{UT}^{\sin(3)} + \sin(3)F_{UT}^{\sin(3)} + \cdots$$
(3)

In F_{XY}^{weight} the index X = U (L) denotes the unpolarized (longitudinally polarized, helicity) beam .Y = U (L;T) denotes the unpolarized target (longitudinally, transversely with respect to the virtual photon polarized target). The superscript rem inds on the kind of angular distribution of the produced hadrons with no index indicating an isotropic -distribution.

Each structure function arises from a di erent TMD. The chirally even f's and g's enter the observables in connection with the unpolarized fragm entation function D_1^a , the chirally odd h's in connection with the chirally odd C ollins fragm entation function H_1^{2a}

$$F_{UU} / e_{a}^{2} f_{1}^{a} D_{1}^{a}; F_{LT}^{\cos(s)} / e_{a}^{2} g_{1T}^{2a} D_{1}^{a}; \qquad (4)$$

W ill be inserted by the editor

$$F_{LL} / e_a^2 g_1^a D_1^a; \qquad F_{UT}^{\sin(s)} / e_a^2 f_{1T}^{?a} D_1^a;$$
 (5)

$$F_{UU}^{\cos(2)} / e_{a}^{2} h_{1}^{2a} H_{1}^{2a}; F_{UT}^{\sin(+s)} / e_{a}^{2} h_{1}^{a} H_{1}^{2a}; \qquad (6)$$

$$F_{UL}^{\sin(2)} / e_{a}^{2} h_{1L}^{?a} H_{1}^{?a}; F_{UT}^{\sin(3 s)} / e_{a}^{2} h_{1T}^{?a} H_{1}^{?a};$$
(7)

M ore precisely, TM D s and fragm entation functions enter the respective tree-level expressions in certain convolution integrals, indicated by in (4-7), which entangle transverse parton m om enta from TM D s and fragm entation functions. (G oing beyond tree-level description requires introduction of soft factors [19,20] from which we refrain here.) In general, such convolution integrals cannot be solved, unless one weighs the D IS counts with an adequate power of transverse hadron m om entum [9].

2 W W -type approximation for $h_{1L}^{?}$ (x)

It is clear that there cannot be any exact relations am ong TM D s, because all TM D s are independent functions [23]. O ne m ay, how ever, nd approxim ate relations as follow s. From QCD equations of m otion (eom), one obtains am ong others the follow ing exact relations [8]

$$g_{1T}^{2(1)a}(x) \stackrel{\text{eom}}{=} x g_{T}^{a}(x) \quad x g_{T}^{a}(x); \qquad 2 h_{1L}^{2(1)a}(x) \stackrel{\text{eom}}{=} x h_{L}^{a}(x) \quad x h_{L}^{a}(x); \qquad (8)$$

with $h_{1L}^{?(1)a}(x) = \frac{R}{d^2 p_T} \frac{p_T^2}{2M_N^2} h_{1L}^{?a}(x;p_T^2), g_{1T}^{?(1)}$ analog, and $g_T^a(x), h_L^a(x)$ denoting pure twist-3 term s due to quark-gluon-quark correlations (and current quark m ass term s). In the next step, we recall the relations among the collinear pdfs (2) [26,75,76]

$$g_{\rm T}^{\rm a}({\rm x}) = \frac{Z_{\rm L}}{x} \frac{{\rm d}y}{y} g_{\rm L}^{\rm a}({\rm y}) + g_{\rm T}^{\rm 0a}({\rm x}); \quad h_{\rm L}^{\rm a}({\rm x}) = 2x \frac{Z_{\rm L}}{x} \frac{{\rm d}y}{y^2} h_{\rm L}^{\rm a}({\rm y}) + \tilde{h}_{\rm L}^{\rm 0a}({\rm x}); \quad (9)$$

where $g_T^{0a}(x)$, $\tilde{h}_L^{0a}(x)$ denote pure twist-3 (and mass) terms [77,78], though di erent ones than in (8). Eqs. (9) isolate \pure twist-3 terms" in the \twist-3" pdfs $g_T^a(x)$, $h_L^a(x)$, because in (2) the underlying \working de nition" of twist [79] (a pdf is \twist t" if its contribution to the cross section is suppressed, in addition to kinematic factors, by $1=Q^{t/2}$ with Q the hard scale) di ers from the strict de nition of twist (mass dimension of the operator minus its spin).

The remarkable observation is that $g_T^{0a}(x)$ is consistent with zero within error bars [80,81,82] and to a good accuracy

$$g_{T}^{a}(\mathbf{x}) \stackrel{WW}{=} \frac{Z_{1}}{x} \frac{dy}{y} g_{1}^{a}(\mathbf{y}) \quad (\text{exp.observation})$$
(10)

which is the W and zura W ilczek W) approximation", whose experimental status is demonstrated on Fig. 2.

Lattice QCD [83,84] and the instanton model of the QCD vacuum [85] support this observation. Interestingly the latter predicts also $\tilde{h}_{T}^{0a}(\mathbf{x})$ to be small [86], such that

$$h_{L}^{a}(\mathbf{x}) = 2\mathbf{x} \int_{\mathbf{x}}^{Z_{-1}} \frac{dy}{y^{2}} h_{1}^{a}(\mathbf{y}) \quad \text{(prediction)}. \tag{11}$$

On the basis of this positive experimental and theoretical experience one may suspect that the analog term s in the relations (8) could also be negligible. If true one would have

$$g_{1T}^{(1)a}(x) \stackrel{!?}{=} x \frac{\sum_{1}^{2} \frac{dy}{y}}{\sqrt{y}} g_{1}^{a}(y) ;$$
 (12)

$$h_{1L}^{?(1)a}(x) \stackrel{!?}{=} \hat{x}_{x} \frac{dy}{y^{2}} h_{1}^{a}(y);$$
 (13)

that could be satis ed with an accuracy similar to 10). This remains to be tested in experiment.

3

An immediate application (ortest) for the relations (12, 13) is provided by the following single/double spin asymmetries (SSA /D SA) in SID IS

$$A_{UL}^{\sin 2} / e_{a}^{2} h_{1L}^{2(1)a} H_{1}^{2a}; \qquad (14)$$

$$A_{LT}^{\cos(s)} / e_{a}^{2} g_{1T}^{2(1)a} D_{1}^{a}; \qquad (15)$$

where the Collins fragm entation function $H_1^{?a}$ [4,5,6] in (14) was determ ined very recently from SID IS data [32,33,34,36] on the SSA

$$A_{UT}^{\sin(+_{s})} / e_{a}^{2} h_{1}^{a} H_{1}^{?a}$$
(16)



Fig. 2. W W -approximation for $g_2(x) = \sum_a e_a^2 (g_1^{a}(x) - g_1^{a}(x))$ in comparison with E155 data [82].

together with e^+e^- annihilation data [40,41] giving rise to a rst but already consistent picture (0,61,62]. The D^a₁ in (15) is the unpolarized fragmentation function which enters, of course, also the respective denom inators in (14-16) that are proportional to $_a^2 e_a^2 f_1^a D_1^a$.

FinalHERMES [28,29,30] and prelim inary CLAS [37] data on (14) and prelim inary COM – PASS data [44] on (15) are available, such that set tests of the WW –type approximations (12, 13) are now or soon possible. A test of the approximation (12) was suggested in [66] along the lines of the study of the SSA (15) discussed previously also in [46].

In this lecture we present a test of the approximation (13). Under the assumption that this approximation works, we shall see that it yields results for the SSA (14) compatible with data [28,29,30]. From another point of view our work provides a rst independent cross check from SID IS for the emerging picture of H_1^2 [60,61,62]. The SSA (14) was recently studied in [65].

Am ong the eight structure functions in SID IS described in term s of twist-2 TM D s and fragmentation functions the SSAs (14, 15) are the only ones, for which W W -type approximations could be of use. Exact eom-relations exist for all eight twist-2 pdfs in (1). But the relations (8) are special in that they connect the respective TM D pdfs, namely g_{1T}^2 and h_{1L}^2 , to \collinear" twist-3 pdfs, namely g_T and h_L . Those in turn are related to twist-2 pdfs, g_1 and h_1 , by means of (experimentally established or theoretically predicted) W W -approximations (10, 11).

Experiments may or may not con m that the W W -type approximations 12, 13) work.

W hat would it mean if (12, 13) were found to be satis ed to within a very good accuracy? First, that would be of practical use for understanding and interpreting the rst data [28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42,43,44]. Second, it would call for theoretical explanations why pure twist-3 terms should be small. (Only for the smallness of the \collinear" pure twist-3 terms in (10, 11) lattice QCD [83,84] and/or instanton vacuum [85,86] provide explanations.)

W hat would it m ean if (12, 13) were found to work poorly? This scenario would be equally interesting. In fact, all TMDs in (1) are independent structures, and any of them contains di erent type of information on the internal structure of the nucleon. The m easurement of the com plete set of all eighteen structure functions available in SDD IS [7] is therefore indispensable for our aim to learn m ore about the nucleon structure.

O ne type of inform ation accessible in this way concerns e ects related to the orbital motion of quarks, and in particular correlations of spin and transverse momentum of quarks which are dom inated by valence quarks and hence play a more important role at large x. E g. it was shown that spin-orbit correlations may lead to signi cant contributions to partonic momentum and helicity distributions [70] in the large-x lim it. Spin-orbit correlations are presumably of similar importance for transversity, and crucial for h_{1L}^2 , which is a measure for the correlation of the transverse momentum of quarks in a longitudinally polarized nucleon.

3 P roperties and experim ental check of W W -type approxim ation for h_{11}^2

In order to model $h_{1L}^{2(1)a}(x)$ by means of the W W -type approximation (13) one inevitably has to use, in addition, models for the transversity pdf. Fig. 3a shows four dimension of the some error models: saturation of the Some bound §7] at the low initial scale of the leading order parameterizations [89] (choosing $h_1^u > 0$ and $h_1^d < 0$), the chiral quark soliton model (QSM) [88], the nonrelativistic model assumption $h_1^a(x) = g_1^a(x)$ at the low scale of the parameterization [89], and the hypercentral model [90]. All curves in Fig. 3 are leading-order evolved to 2:5 G eV² which is a relevant scale in experiment, see below.



F ig. 3. (a) Transversity, $xh_1^a(x)$, vs. x, from various models. (b) The ratio $h_{1L}^{?(1)a}(x)=h_1^a(x)$ vs. x in various models, with $h_{1L}^{?}$ estimated by means of the W W -type approximation (13). (c) $xh_{1L}^{?(1)a}(x)$ vs. x from the W W -type approximation (13) and $h_1^a(x)$ from Q SM [88], in comparison with $(\frac{1}{10})xh_1^a(x)$ from that model. All results here refer to a scale of 2.5 GeV^2 .

These (and many other [91,92]) models agree on that $h_1^u(x) > 0$ and $h_1^d(x) < 0$ with $h_1^d(x) j < h_1^u(x)$, though the predictions di er concerning the magnitudes, see F ig.3a.M odels in which antiquark distribution functions can be computed, e.g. [88], predict that the transversity antiquark pdfs are far sm aller than the quark ones.

Let us establish rst a robust feature of the relation 13), namely the ratio $R = h_{1L}^{2(1)a}(x) = h_{1}^{a}(x)$ exhibits little dependence on the transversity model, see Fig. 3b. A \universal" behaviour of this ratio at large x is not surprising. By inspecting (13) one can prove:

{ for x ! 1, it behaves like R (1 x),

{ a common feature:]Rj. 0:1.

In the following we will use the QSM [93,94], see Fig. 3c, which has several advantages: it describes the twist-2 pdfs $f_1^a(x)$ and $g_1^a(x)$ within (10{30}% accuracy [95], it is derived from the instanton vacuum model [96,97] which predicts the \collinear W W -type approximation" (11) to work well [86], and below we will use information on the Collinse ect from the analysis 61] where this model was used. This helps to minimize the model-dependence in our study. But we shall see that our conclusions do not depend on the choice of model.

The SSA as de ned in the HERMES experiment is given by

$$A_{UL}^{\sin 2} = \frac{P_{i} \sin (2_{i}) (N_{i} - N_{i})}{P_{i}^{\frac{1}{2}} (N_{i} + N_{i})} = \frac{R_{dy} (\cos (1 - y)) = Q^{4} F_{UL}^{\sin 2}}{dy [(1 - y + \frac{1}{2}y^{2})] = Q^{4} F_{UU}}$$
(17)

where N_i (N_i) denotes the number of events i with target polarization antiparallel (parallel) to the beam . Had the events in the numerator of (17) been weighted by $P_{h?}^2 = (M_N m_h)$ in addition to sin (2), the convolution integral could be solved in a model independent way with the result given in terms of the transverse moment of h_{1L}^2 and an analog moment for H_1^2 [9]. Including such an additional weightm akes data analysism ore di cult due to acceptance elects. O mitting it, how ever, forces one to resort to models.

Here we shall assume the distributions of transverse parton momenta to be Gaussian. Such an Ansatz satisfactorily describes data on many hard reactions [55], provided the transverse m om enta are much smaller than the hard scale of the process, i.e. $hP_{h?}i$ hQ i which is the case at HERMES. In fact, the z-dependence of $hP_{h?}i$ at HERMES [30] is well described in the Gauss Ansatz [58]. Of course, one has to keep in m ind that it is a crude approximation, and it is not clear whether it works also for polarized distribution and fragm entation functions. M oreover, since also unintegrated versions of (8) hold, this Ansatz cannot be equally valid for all TMD s.

W hat is convenient for our purposes is that the G auss A nsatz allow s to solve the convolution integral. U sing the W W -type approximation (13) with h_1^a (x) from the Q SM [88], and inform ation on the Collins e ect from $\{0, 61, 62\}$, we obtain the results shown in Fig. 4. The error bands of the theoretical curves release the present uncertainties in the quantitative understanding of the Collins e ect, see $\{7\}$ for explicit expressions and details.



F ig. 4. Longitudinal target SSA $A_{UL}^{\sin 2}$ as function of x. The proton (a, b) and deuterium (c,d) target data are from HERMES [28,30]. The theoretical curves are obtained using information on H₁[?] [61,62], predictions from the instanton vacuum model and chiral quark soliton model for h_L^a and h_1^a [86,88], and | this is crucial in our context | assuming the validity of the WW -type approximation (13). The shaded error bands are due to the uncertainties in H₁[?], see [67] for details.

O ur results shown in Fig.4 for pion production from proton and deuteron targets are consistent with the HERMES data [28,29,30], and do not exclude that (13) is a useful approximation.

Further insights are expected from the CLAS experiment at Je erson Lab, which promises higher statistics due to two orders of magnitude higher luminosity, and provides access to much larger x and larger z than HERMES and COMPASS. Large hzim ay also enhance the SSA due to Collins function $H_1^{?(1=2)a}(z) / zD_1^a(z)$, as observed in [61]. This makes CLAS an ideal experiment for studies of this SSA in particular and spin-orbit correlations in general. C om parison of the various data sets will also allow to draw valuable conclusions on the energy dependence of the process, possible power-corrections, etc.

The prelim inary data from CLAS [37] have shown non-zero SSAs for charged pions, and a compatible with zero within error bars result for ⁰. Within our approach it is possible to understand the results for ⁺ and ⁰, however, we obtain for an opposite sign compared to the data. In view of this observation, it is worth to look again on Fig. 4b which shows HERMES data on the -SSA. Does Fig. 4b hint at an incompatibility? Charged pions and in particular the may have sign i cant higher twist contributions, in particular from exclusive vector m esons and sem i-exclusive pion production at large z.

New data expected from CLAS with $E_{beam} = 6 \text{ GeV}$ [98], will increase the existing statistics by about an order of magnitude and more in portantly provide comparable to + sam ple of 0 events. Neutral pion sam ple is not expected to have any signi cant contribution from exclusive vector m esons, neither it is expected to have signi cant higher twist corrections due to sem iexclusive production of pions with large z [99], where the separation between target and current fragmentation is more pronounced. The JLab upgrade to 12 GeV [100] will allow to run at an order of magnitude higher lum inosity than current CLAS, providing a comprehensive set of single and double spin asymmetries covering a wide range in x and z. That will allow detailed studies of kinematic dependence of target SSA and clarify the situation.

COMPASS has taken data with a longitudinally polarized deuterium target which are being analyzed, and soon also a proton target will be used. The 160 GeV muon beam allows to extend the measurements of SSAs to smallx.W ith the cut $Q^2 > 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ the average hQ²i at

COM PASS is comparable to that at HERM ES. Therefore Fig.4 shows roughly our predictions for COM PASS.Onem ay expect $A_{UL}^{\sin 2}$ to be substantially sm aller than $A_{UT}^{\sin (+s)}$, especially at sm allx. It will be interesting to see whether these predictions will be con med by COM PASS.

4 W hat do we know about $h_{1T}^{?}$?

This TMD is de ned as the coe cient of the correlation $\frac{1}{M^2} [(S_T p_T) (p_T s_T) \frac{1}{2} p_T^2 (S_T s_T)]$, where S_T and s_T denote the spin vectors of proton and quark, which are transverse with respect to the virtual photon momentum. Let us sum marize brie y, what we know about pretzelosity.

- (1) It is chirally odd and so there is no gluon analog of pretzelosity¹.
- (2) It has a probabilistic interpretation [8].
- (3) At large-x it is predicted to be suppressed by $(1 \times y^2 \text{ com pared to } f_1^a(x) [70,71,72].$
- (4) It is expected to be suppressed also at sm all x compared to f_1^a .
- (5) It must satisfy the positivity condition [73]:

$$h_{1T}^{(1)a}(x;p_T^2) = \frac{1}{2} f_1^a(x;p_T^2) q^a(x;p_T^2) \text{ or } h_{1T}^{(1)a}(x)j = \frac{1}{2} f_1^a(x) q^a(x) : (18)$$

W ith the So er inequality $j_1^a(x) = \frac{1}{2} (f_1^a + g_1^a)(x)$ [87], we obtain the remarkable bound:

$$h_{1T}^{?(1)a}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{j} + h_{1}^{a}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{j} + f_{1}^{a}(\mathbf{x})$$
 (19)

(6) In the limit of a large number of colors N_c it was shown that for $xN_c = 0$ (1) and $p_1 = 0$ (1) (the same pattern holds also for antiquarks) [103]:

$$\frac{h_1^{2u} + h_1^{2d}}{h_1^{2u} + h_1^{2d}} = 0 \quad (1=N_c)$$
(20)

- (7) It requires the presence of nucleon wave-function components with two units orbital momentum di erence, e.g. s-d interference or quadratic in p-wave component [2].
- (8) In some sense it is easures' the deviation of the huckeon shape' from a sphere [104] (that is why it was called pretzelosity).
- (9) In simple (spectator-type) models, it has been related to chirally odd generalized parton distributions [101].
- (10) It was observed in the bag m odel [68] that

$$h_{1T}^{(1)a}(x) = g_1^a(x) \qquad h_1^a(x)$$
 (21)

and since the di erence of $q^a(x)$ and $h_1^a(x)$ is a measure for relativistic e ects in nucleon' [26] one may view the transverse moment of pretzelosity as a measure for relativistic e ects.

A n important question is: How general the relation (21)? It is clear that this relation cannot be strictly valid in QCD, where all TMD s are independent. How ever, could it nevertheless allow to gain a reasonable estimate for $h_{1T}^{2(1)}(x)$ in terms of transversity and helicity? Until claried by experiment, we can address this question only in models.

Interestingly, the relation (21) does not only hold in the bag model [68], but is found [68] to be satis ed also in the spectator model [05]. In fact, it was conjectured [68] that (21) could hold in a large class of relativistic quark models, which was subsequently con med in the constituent quark model [106] and the relativistic model of the proton [107] (but not in a

¹ A ctually, in the decom position of the gluon analog of the above correlator structure appears in R ef. [101] has been called $h_{1T}^{2\,g}$. (In R ef. [102] it was given a di erent name.) This gluon TM D, however, has di erent properties com pared to our quark pretzelosity. For example, the $h_{1T}^{2\,g}$ of [101] is odd' under tim e-reversal while $h_{1T}^{2\,a}$ with a = q; q is even'.

variant of the spectator m odel [108]). These are all quark m odels. The limitations of (21) are nicely illustrated in the 'quark target m odel' where in addition to quarks there are also gluons, and (21) is not satis ed [01]. Thus, the explicit inclusion of gluon degrees of freedom spoils this relation, i.e. it can be valid in ho-gluon-m odels' on ly.

It would be interesting and instructive to know the necessary and su cient conditions for the relation (21) to hold in a (quark) model.

5 Prelim inary COM PASS data & prospects at JLab

In SID IS pretzelosity gives rise (in combination with the Collins fragmentation function [5,4]) to the SSA

$$A_{UT}^{\sin(3)} = \frac{C_{Gauss}}{P^{a}} \frac{e_{a}^{2} x h_{1T}^{2}(1)a}{e^{a} x h_{1T}^{2}(1)a}(x) H_{1}^{2}(1)a(z)}$$
(22)

where we assumed the Gauss Ansatz, whose parameters are contained in the factor C_{Gauss} . This factor is a slow ly varying function of the Gauss model parameters and can be well approximated for practical purposes by its maximum C_{Gauss} . $C_{max} = 3 = (2 2)$, see for further details [68].

At COM PASS the sin (3 $_{\rm S}$) and other SSA swere measured on a deuteron target [44]. By saturating the positivity bound for the transverse moment of pretzelosity (point (5) in Sec. 4) we estimated [68] the maximum e ect for the SSA. We used the parameterizations §9,109], and for H $_1^2$ the information from [61,62].



F ig. 5. The transverse target SSA $A_{UT}^{\sin (3)}$ s) for deuteron estimated on the basis of the positivity bound vs.preliminary COM PASS data [44] for positive (a) and for negative (b) hadrons. (c) The same for the ⁺ production from proton in the kinematics of CLAS 12 as function of x (error projections from [100]). Solid curve presents the prediction of relativistic covariant model [107]. The shaded area is the region allowed by positivity (18).

The results are shown in Fig. 5a,b and compared to the prelim inary data [44].At sm all x the prelim inary data favor that pretzelosity does not reach the bound.W hether due to the expected suppression at sm all x or opposite signs of u and d- avors, see Sec. 3, cannot be concluded.

The important observation is that prelim in ary COM PASS data [44] do not exclude a sizeable e ect in the region x > 0:1, see Fig.5a,b, where JLab can measure with precision. This is demonstrated in Fig.5c showing the ⁺ SSA from a proton target in the kinematics of CLAS with 12 GeV beam upgrade (with error projections for 2000 hours run time [100]).

It could even more promising to look at SSAs due to Collins e ect, like $A_{UT}^{\sin (3 \ s)}$, in kaon production. The statistics for kaon production is lower than for pion production, but the SSA m ight be larger as it is suggested by a model [110] of the Collins function. W ith a R ICH detector at CLAS the kaon SSAs could be measured in the valence-x region [100].

6 Conclusions

The longitudinalSSAs in SID IS [28,29,30,31] were subject to intensive, early studies [47,48,49,50,51] that were based on assumptions concerning the avour dependence of H_1^2 [49,52,54] that turned

out not to be supported by data on the Collins e ect from SID IS with transverse target polarization [32,33,34,36] and e⁺ e -annihilations [40,41]. These data give rise to a new, consistent picture of H $_1^2$ [60,61,62] which invites reanalyses of longitudinal SSAs.

In this work we did this for $A_{UL}^{sin 2} / {}^{P}_{a} e_{a}^{2} h_{1L}^{2(1)a} H_{1}^{2a}$ from the particular point of view of the question whether there are useful, approximate relations among di erent TMDs. In fact, QCD equations of motion relate the TMDs entering this SSA to $h_{L}^{a}(x)$ and certain pure twist-3 (and quark mass) terms. Neglecting such terms yields an approximation for $h_{1L}^{2(1)a}$ similar in spirit to the WW -approximation for $g_{T}^{a}(x)$ that is supported by data.

O ur study reveals that data do not exclude the possibility that such W W -type approxim ations work. As a byproduct we observe that data on the two SSAs, $A_{UL}^{\sin 2}$ and $A_{UT}^{\sin (+s)}$, are compatible. This is important because both observables are due to (the same!) Collins e ect.

In Ref. [66] predictions for $A_{LT}^{\cos(s)} / \sum_{a}^{P} e_a^2 g_{1T}^{(1)a} D_1^a$ were m ade assuming the validity of a W W -type approximation for the relevant pdf. Comparing these predictions to preliminary COM PASS data [44] one arrives at the same conclusion. A loo here data do not exclude the possibility that the W W -type approximation works.

In order to m akem one de nite statem ents precise m easurem ents of these SSAs are necessary, preferably in the region around x 0.3 where the SSAs are largest. An order of m agnitude m ore data on target SSA expected from the CLAS upcom ing run [98] will certainly in prove our current understanding of this and other SSAs and shed light on spin-orbit correlations.

The value of precise $A_{UL}^{\sin 2}$ data should not be underestim ated. This SSA is in any case an independent source of information on the Collins e ect. An experimental con mation of the utility of the W W -type approximation (13), however, would mean that it is possible to extract information on transversity, via (13), from a longitudinally polarized target.

A nother subject of this lecture were the properties of the pretzelosity distribution function h_{1T}^2 , and the presentation of a study of this TMD in the bag model. In the bag and in some other quark models we observed an interesting relation, which can be sum marized for illustrative purposes by the following assertion:

That the di erence between the helicity and transversity distributions is `a m easure of relativistic e ects' is known since long ago [6] (and was also recognized in a bag model calculation). However, now we are in a position to make this statement more precise. This di erence is just $h_{1T}^{2(1)}$ which thus 'm easures' relativistic e ects in the nucleon, and vanishes in the non-relativistic lim it where helicity and transversity distributions become equal.

This relation is not supported in models with explicit gluon degrees of freedom [101], and, of course, cannot be true in QCD where all TMDs are linearly independent. Nevertheless, the relation (23), see Eq. (21) for its precise form ulation, could turn out to be a useful approxim ation. In view of the num erous novel functions involved, any well-motivated approximation is welcom e and valuable [69].

Besides being useful for extending our intuition on relativistic spin-orbit e ects in the nucleon [104,72], the relation (23) has also an important consequence on transversity. In all quark models where (23) holds, $h_{1T}^{?u}$ is negative. Since $g_1^u(x)$ is positive, this implies that $h_1^u(x) > g_1^u(x)$. For the d- avor signs are reversed, but in any case $j_1^a(x)j > jg_1^a(x)j$ which is con rm ed in models, e.g., 92,88].

In the bag model, the negative sign of $h_{1T}^{?\,u}$ arises because it is proportional to m inus the square of the p-wave component of the nucleon wave function. Thus, in models with no higher orbital momentum (d-wave, etc.) components, $h_{1T}^{?\,u}$ is manifestly negative ($h_{1T}^{?\,d}$ has opposite sign dictated by SU (6) symmetry, and predicted in large N $_{c}$ [103]).

This prediction can be tested at JLab.Since the production of positive pions from a proton target is dominated by the u- avor, one expects a negative $\sin (3 _s)$ SSA, see Fig.5.

Forthcom ing analyzes and experiments at COMPASS, HERMES and JLab [98,100] will provide valuable information on the pretzelosity distribution function, and will deepen our understanding of the nucleon structure.

A cknow ledgm ents

The work is supported by BM BF, Germ an {Russian collaboration (DFG-RFFI, 436 RUS 113/ 881/0), the EIIIHP project RII3-CT-2004-506078, the Grants RFBR 09-02-01149 and 07-02-91557, RF M SE RNP 2222.6546 (M IREA), the Heisenberg {Landau Program of JINR, the contract DE-AC 05-060 R 23177.

References

- 1. R.N.Cahn, Phys.Lett.B 78 (1978) 269
- 2. J.C. Collins, D.E. Soper and G. Sterm an, Nucl. Phys. B 250, 199 (1985)
- 3. D.W. Sivers, Phys. Rev. D 41, 83 (1990), Phys. Rev. D 43, 261 (1991)
- 4. A.V.Efremov, L.Mankiewicz and N.A.Tomqvist, Phys.Lett.B 284 (1992) 394
- 5. J.C. Collins, Nucl. Phys. B 396, 161 (1993) [arX iv:hep-ph/9208213]
- 6. J.C. Collins, S.F. Heppelm ann and G.A. Ladinsky, Nucl. Phys. B 420 (1994) 565
- 7. A.Kotzinian, Nucl. Phys. B 441 (1995) 234 [arX iv hep-ph/9412283]
- 8. P.J.M ulders and R.D. Tangerm an, Nucl. Phys. B 461 (1996) 197 and 484 (1997) 538E
- 9. D. Boer and P.J.Mulders, Phys. Rev. D 57, 5780 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9711485]
- 10. D. Boer, R. Jakob and P. J. Mulders, Nucl. Phys. B 504 (1997) 345 [arX iv hep-ph/9702281]
- 11. D. Boer, R. Jakob and P. J. Mulders, Phys. Lett. B 424 (1998) 143 [arX iv hep-ph/9711488]
- 12. D.Boer, Phys.Rev.D 60, 014012 (1999) [arX iv:hep-ph/9902255]
- 13. S.J.Brodsky, D.S.Hwang and I.Schm idt, Phys.Lett.B 530, 99 (2002) [arX iv hep-ph/0201296]; Nucl.Phys.B 642, 344 (2002) [arX iv hep-ph/0206259]
- 14. J.C. Collins, Phys. Lett. B 536, 43 (2002) [arX iv hep-ph/0204004]
- 15. A.V. Belitsky, X. Jiand F.Yuan, Nucl. Phys. B 656, 165 (2003) [arX iv hep-ph/0208038] X.D. Ji and F.Yuan, Phys. Lett. B 543, 66 (2002) [arX iv hep-ph/0206057]
 D. Boer, P.J. Muklers and F. Piilman, Nucl. Phys. B 667, 201 (2003) [arX iv hep-ph/0303034]
- 16. I.O. Cherednikov and N.G. Stefanis, Phys. Rev. D 77, 094001 (2008) [arX iv:0710.1955 [hep-ph]]; Nucl. Phys. B 802 (2008) 146 [arX iv:0802.2821 [hep-ph]]
- 17. A.V. Efrem ov and A.V. Radyushkin, JINR E2-11726 (1978), Theor. M ath. Phys. 44 (1981) 664 [Teor. M at. Fiz. 44 (1980) 157]
- 18. J.C. Collins and D.E. Soper, Nucl. Phys. B 193, 381 (1981) Erratum -ibid. B 213, 545 (1983)]
- 19. X.D. Ji, J.P.M a and F.Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 71, 034005 (2005) [arX iv hep-ph/0404183], Phys. Lett. B 597, 299 (2004) [arX iv hep-ph/0405085]
- 20. J.C. Collins and A. Metz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 252001 (2004) [arX iv hep-ph/0408249]
- 21. J.C. Collins, Acta Phys. Polon. B 34, 3103 (2003) [arX iv:hep-ph/0304122]
- 22. J.C. Collins, T.C. Rogers and A.M. Stasto, Phys. Rev. D 77, 085009 (2008)
- 23. K. Goeke, A. Metz and M. Schlegel, Phys. Lett. B 618, 90 (2005) [arXiv hep-ph/0504130]
- 24. A. Bacchetta, M. Diehl, K. Goeke, A. Metz, P.J. Mulders and M. Schlegel, JHEP 0702 (2007) 093 [arX iv hep-ph/0611265]
- 25. J.P.Ralston and D.E.Soper, Nucl. Phys. B 152 (1979) 109
- 26. R.L.Ja e and X.D.Ji, Nucl. Phys. B 375 (1992) 527, and Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 552 (1991)
- 27. M. A meodo et al. [European Muon Collaboration], Z. Phys. C 34 (1987) 277
- 28. A. Airapetian et al. [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 4047 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ex/9910062]; H.Avakian [HERMES Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 79, 523 (1999)
- 29. A. A irapetian et al. [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 64, 097101 (2001)
- 30. A . A irapetian et al. [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 562, 182 (2003)
- 31. H.Avakian et al. [CLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 69, 112004 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0301005]
- 32. A. A irapetian et al. [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 012002 (2005)
- 33. V.Y.Alexakhin et al. [COMPASS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 202002 (2005)
- 34. M. Diefenthaler, AIP Conf. Proc. 792 (2005) 933 [arX iv hep-ex/0507013].
- 35. I.M. Gregor [HERMES Collaboration], Acta Phys. Polon. B 36, 209 (2005)
- 36. E.S. Ageev et al. [COM PASS Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B 765 (2007) 31
- 37. H. Avakian, P. Bosted, V. Burkert and L. Elouadrhiri [CLAS Collaboration], A IP Conf. Proc. 792 (2005) 945 [arX iv nuclex/0509032]
- 38. A. A irapetian et al. [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 622, 14 (2005)

10

- 39. A. A irapetian et al. [HERMES Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 648 (2007) 164
- 40. K. Abe et al. Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 232002 (2006) [arX iv hep-ex/0507063]
- 41. A.Ogawa, M.Grosse-Perdekamp, R.Seidland K.Hasuko, arXiv hep-ex/0607014
- 42. A. Martin [COMPASS Collaboration], Czech. J. Phys. 56 (2006) F33 [arX iv hep-ex/0702002]; E.S. Ageev et al. [COMPASS Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. B 765 (2007) 31
- 43. L.L.Pappalardo [HERMES Collaboration], Eur.Phys.JA 38 (2008) 148; M.D iefenthaler [HER-MES Collaboration], arX iv:0706.2242 [hep-ex], and arX iv:hep-ex/0612010
- 44. A.Kotzinian [on behalf of the COM PASS collaboration], [arX iv:0705.2402 [hep-ex]]
- 45. R. Seidl, M. Grosse-Perdekamp and A. Ogawa [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D 78 (2008) 032011 [arXiv:0805.2975 [hep-ex]]
- 46. A.M. Kotzinian and P.J.Mulders, Phys. Rev. D 54 (1996) 1229 [arX iv hep-ph/9511420]
- 47. E. De Sanctis, W.D. Nowak and K.A. Oganessian, Phys. Lett. B 483, 69 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0002091]; K.A. Oganessian, N. Bianchi, E. De Sanctis and W.D. Nowak, Nucl. Phys. A 689, 784 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0010261]
- 48. M. Anselm ino and F. Murgia, Phys. Lett. B 483 (2000) 74 [arX iv hep-ph/0002120]
- 49. A.V. E from ov, K.G oeke and P.Schweitzer, Phys.Lett.B 522, 37 (2001) [arX iv hep-ph/0108213] and 544, 389E (2002)
- 50. A.V. E frem ov, K.G oeke and P.Schweitzer, Eur. Phys. J.C 24 (2002) 407 [arX iv hep-ph/0112166]; Phys. Lett. B 568 (2003) 63 [arX iv hep-ph/0303062]; Phys. Rev. D 67, 114014 (2003) [arX iv hep-ph/0208124]
- 51. B.Q.Ma, I.Schmidt and J.J.Yang, Phys. Rev. D 66, 094001 (2002) [arXiv hep-ph/0209114]
- 52. A. Bacchetta, R. Kundu, A. Metz and P.J. Mulders, Phys. Rev. D 65, 094021 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0201091]
- 53. F.Yuan, Phys.Lett.B 575, 45 (2003) [arX iv:hep-ph/0308157]
- 54. A.V. E frem ov, K.G oeke and P.Schweitzer, Eur. Phys. J.C 32 (2003) 337 [arXiv:hep-ph/0309209]
- 55. U.D 'A lesio and F.M urgia, Phys. Rev. D 70, 074009 (2004) [arX iv hep-ph/0408092]
- 56. M. Anselm ino, M. Boglione, U. D'Alesio, A. Kotzinian, F. Murgia and A. Prokudin, Phys. Rev. D 71 (2005) 074006 [arX iv hep-ph/0501196]
- 57. A.V. E frem ov, K.G oeke, S.M enzel, A.M etz and P.Schweitzer, Phys.Lett.B 612, 233 (2005) [arX iv hep-ph/0412353]
- 58. J.C. Collins, A.V. E frem ov, K.Goeke, S.Menzel, A.Metz and P.Schweitzer, Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 014021 [arX iv hep-ph/0509076]
- 59. J.C. Collins et al, Phys. Rev. D 73, 094023 (2006) [arX iv hep-ph/0511272]
- 60. W .Vogelsang and F.Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 72 (2005) 054028 [arX iv hep-ph/0507266]
- 61. A.V. Efremov, K. Goeke and P. Schweitzer, Phys. Rev. D 73, 094025 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0603054]
- 62. M. Anselm ino, M. Boglione, U. D'Alesio, A. Kotzinian, F. Murgia, A. Prokudin and C. Turk, Phys. Rev. D 75, 054032 (2007) [arX iv hep-ph/0701006]; M. Anselm ino, M. Boglione, U. D'Alesio, A. Kotzinian, F. Murgia, A. Prokudin and S. Melis, arX iv 0812.4366 [hep-ph]
- 63. S.Amold, A.V.E frem ov, K.Goeke, M.Schlegel and P.Schweitzer, arXiv:0805.2137 [hep-ph]
- 64. M. Anselmino et al., arXiv:0805.2677 [hep-ph]
- 65. L.P.G am berg, G.R.G oldstein and M.Schlegel, arX iv:0708.2580 [hep-ph] and Phys.Rev.D 77 (2008) 094016 [arX iv:0708.0324 [hep-ph]]
- 66. A. Kotzinian, B. Parsamyan and A. Prokudin, Phys. Rev. D 73, 114017 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0603194]
- 67. H. Avakian, A.V. E frem ov, K. Goeke, A. Metz, P. Schweitzer and T. Teckentrup, Phys. Rev. D 77,014023 (2008) [arXiv:0709.3253 [hep-ph]]
- 68. H. Avakian, A.V. Efremov, P. Schweitzer and F. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 78 (2008) 114024; arX iv:0805.3355 [hep-ph]; [arX iv:0808.3982 [hep-ph]]
- 69. A.M etz, P.Schweitzer and T.Teckentrup, arX iv:0810.5212 [hep-ph]
- 70. H.Avakian, S.J.Brodsky, A.Deur and F.Yuan, Nucl. Phys. B 802 (2008) 146 [arX iv:0705.1553 [hep-ph]]
- 71. S.J.Brodsky and F.Yuan, Phys. Rev. D 74 (2006) 094018 [arX iv hep-ph/0610236]
- 72. M. Burkardt, arX iv:0709.2966 [hep-ph]
- 73. A. Bacchetta, M. Boglione, A. Hennem an and P.J. Mulders, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 712 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9912490]
- 74. M.Diehland S.Sapeta, Eur. Phys. J.C 41, 515 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0503023]
- 75. S.W andzura and F.W ilczek, Phys. Lett. B 72 (1977) 195

- 76. For completeness we note that in the analog decomposition for e^a(x) one encounters, apart from a -function singularity at x = 0, pure twist-3 and mass-terms only, see A.V. E frem ov and P.Schweitzer, JHEP 0308 (2003) 006 [arX iv hep-ph/0212044] for a review
- 77. E.V. Shuryak and A.I. Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. B 201 (1982) 141
- 78. For a review on $g_2^a(x) = g_1^a(x) = g_1^a(x)$ see: R.L. Ja e, Comments Nucl Part. Phys. 19 (1990) 239
- 79. R.L.Ja e, in "The spin structure of the nucleon", edited by B.Frois, V.W. Hughes, N. de Groot (Singapore, W orld Scienti c, 1997), p. 42 [arXiv:hep-ph/9602236]
- 80. X. Zheng et al. [Je erson Lab Hall A Collaboration], Phys. Rev. C 70, 065207 (2004) [arXiv:nucl-ex/0405006]
- 81. M. Amarian et al. [Je erson Lab E 94-010 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 92 (2004) 022301 [arX iv hep-ex/0310003]
- 82. P.L.Anthony et al. E 155 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B 553 (2003) 18 [arX iv hep-ex/0204028]
- 83. M. Gockeler et al, Phys. Rev. D 63 (2001) 074506 [arX iv hep-lat/0011091]
- 84. M. Gockeler et al, Phys. Rev. D 72 (2005) 054507 [arX iv hep-lat/0506017]
- 85. J.Balla, M.V.Polyakov and C.W eiss, Nucl. Phys. B 510 (1998) 327 [arX iv hep-ph/9707515]
- 86. B.D ressler and M.V. Polyakov, Phys. Rev. D 61 (2000) 097501 [arX iv hep-ph/9912376]
- 87. J. So er, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 1292 [arX iv hep-ph/9409254]
- 88. P. Schweitzer, D. Urbano, M. V. Polyakov, C. Weiss, P.V. Pobylitsa and K. Goeke, Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 034013 [arX iv hep-ph/0101300]; K. Goeke et al., Acta Phys. Polon. B 32, 1201 (2001) [arX iv hep-ph/0001272]; M. Wakam atsu and T. Kubota, Phys. Rev. D 60, 034020 (1999) [arX iv hep-ph/9809443]
- 89. M. Gluck, E. Reya and A. Vogt, Eur. Phys. J. C 5, 461 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9806404];
 M. Gluck, E. Reya, M. Stratmann and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D 63, 094005 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0011215]
- 90. B. Pasquini, M. Pincetti and S. Bo, Phys. Rev. D 72, 094029 (2005) [arX iv hep-ph/0510376]; Phys. Rev. D 76, 034020 (2007) [arX iv hep-ph/0612094]; S. Bo and B. Pasquini, Riv. Nuovo C in .30 (2007) 387 [arX iv:0711.2625 [hep-ph]]
- 91. V. Barone, A. Drago and P.G. Ratclie, Phys. Rept. 359 (2002) 1 [arX iv hep-ph/0104283]
- 92. A.V. Efremov, O.V. Teryaev and P. Zavada, Phys. Rev. D 70 (2004) 054018 [arXiv:hep-ph/0405225]
- 93. D. Diakonov, V. Y. Petrov and P.V. Pobylitsa, Nucl. Phys. B 306, 809 (1988)
- 94. C.V. Christov et al., Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 37 (1996) 91 [arX iv hep-ph/9604441]
- 95. D. Diakonov et al., Nucl. Phys. B 480, 341 (1996) [arX iv hep-ph/9606314]; Phys. Rev. D 56, 4069 (1997) [arX iv hep-ph/9703420]; P.V. Pobylitsa et al., Phys. Rev. D 59, 034024 (1999) [arX iv hep-ph/9804436]
- 96. D. Diakonov and V.Y. Petrov, Nucl. Phys. B 245 (1984) 259; Nucl. Phys. B 272, 457 (1986)
- 97. D. D. jakonov, M. V. Polyakov and C. W eiss, Nucl. Phys. B 461, 539 (1996) [arX iv hep-ph/9510232]
 98. H. A vakian et al., JLab E 05-113, \Sem i-Inclusive P ion P roduction with a Longitudinally Polarized Target at 6 G eV ", JLab proposal
- 99. A. Afanasev, C.E. Carlson and C. Wahlquist, Phys. Lett. B 398 (1997) 393 [arXiv:hep-ph/9701215]
- 100. H. Avakian et al., JLab PR12-07-107, \Studies of Spin-O rbit Correlations with Longitudinally Polarized Target", JLab proposal H. Avakian, et al., JLab LOI12-06-108 (2008)
- 101. S.M eissner, A.M etz and K.Goeke, Phys.Rev.D 76, 034002 (2007) [arX iv hep-ph/0703176]
- 102. P.J.M ulders and J.Rodrigues, Phys. Rev. D 63, 094021 (2001) [arX iv hep-ph/0009343]
- 103. P.V. Pobylitsa, arX iv hep-ph/0301236
- 104. G.A. Miller, Phys. Rev. C 76 (2007) 065209 [arX iv:0708.2297 [nucl-th]]
- 105. R.Jakob, P.J.M ulders and J.Rodrigues, Nucl. Phys. A 626, 937 (1997) [arX iv hep-ph/9704335]; arX iv hep-ph/9707340
- 106. B.Pasquini, S.Cazzaniga and S.Bo, Phys.Rev.D 78 (2008) 034025 [arX iv:0806.2298 [hep-ph]] B.Pasquini, A IP Conf. Proc. 1056 (2008) 122 [arX iv:0807.2825 [hep-ph]]
- 107. A.V. E frem ov, P. Schweitzer, O.V. Teryaev and P. Zavada, arX iv 0812.3246 [hep-ph]
- 108. A.Bacchetta, F.Contiand M.Radici, Phys.Rev.D 78 (2008) 074010 [arX iv:0807.0323 [hep-ph]]; Phys.Rev.D 57, 1886 (1998)
- 109. S.K retzer, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 054001 [arX iv hep-ph/0003177]
- 110. A.Bacchetta, L.P.Gamberg, G.R.Goldstein and A.Mukherjee, Phys.Lett.B 659, 234 (2008) [arXiv:0707.3372 [hep-ph]] A.W.Schreiber, A.I.Signal and A.W.Thomas,