# Contents

1 Meeting minutes: 11-20-13		eting minutes: 11-20-13	1
	1.1	Formalism	1
	1.2	Event selection	1
	1.3	R2 Extraction method	1
	1 4	Observations	2

# 1 Meeting minutes: 11-20-13

# 1.1 Formalism

Using the form of the double-differential Cross-section for single-pion Electroproduction(2 d.o.f.), we can formalize the following for double-charged-pion Electroproduction:

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{dX^{ij}d\phi^j}\right)^h = A^{ij} + B^{ij}\cos\phi^j + C^{ij}\cos2\phi^j + hPD^{ij}\sin\phi^j \qquad (1.1.1)$$

where

- ij = index over Varset, Variable (3x5 matrix)
- $R2^{ij}_{\alpha} \doteq [A^{ij}, B^{ij}, C^{ij}, D^{ij}] \equiv [R_T + \epsilon_L R_L, R_{LT}, R_{TT}, R_{LT'}]$
- $\bullet \ R2^{ij}_{\alpha} = f(Q^2,W,X^{ij})$

For convenience, I define the following:

$$f^h(X^{ij}, \phi^j) \doteq \left(\frac{d\sigma}{dX^{ij}d\phi^j}\right)^h$$
 (1.1.2)

# 1.2 Event selection

- 1. eid
- 2. efid
- 3. momcorr
- 4. MM Cuts

#### 1.3 R2 Extraction method

Of the methods listed earlier:

- 1. Fit  $f^h(X^{ij}, \phi^j)$  to extract 'R2'
- 2. Calculate Asymmetry  $\doteq f^{h=+} f^{h=-}$  and then extract  $D^{ij}$

3.  $\int f^h(X^{ij},\phi^j) * (\cos\phi/\cos2\phi/\sin\phi)d\phi$  to extract  $B^{ij}/C^{ij}/D^{ij}$ 

Method 3. is used, which even at the level of algorithmic detail is listed below. NOTE that when multiplying by  $\sin \phi$ , the sign of the polarization is explicity used

For every q2wbin:

- 1. h5[pol] where pol  $\in \{POS, NEG, UNP, AVG\}; pol \neq AVG$
- 2.  $h5m[pol,pob] = h5[pol] \cdot h5f[pob]$ 
  - $pob \in \{A,B,C,D\}$ ;  $pol \neq AVG$
  - h5f[pob]:
    - For every bin i, h5f[pob](i) = f[pob](i)
    - $f[pob] \in \{N.A., \cos \phi, \cos 2\phi, \frac{\text{sign}(pol)}{\text{sin } \phi}\}$
- 3.  $hR2\_Xij[pol,pob] = h5m[pol,pob]$  Project on to  $X^{ij}$ ;  $pol \neq AVG$
- 4.  $hR2\_Xij[pol=AVG,pob] = (hR2\_Xij[pol=POS,pob] + hR2\_Xij[pol=NEG,pob])/2$

#### 1.4 Observations

- $\bullet$  Focussed only on <B/C/D>\_1THETA
- Top 1:2:3:4 used

#### Consistencies(C):

- 1.  $\langle B/C \rangle [pos] = \langle B/C \rangle [neg] = \langle B/C \rangle [unp]$
- 2. EF-C[unp]  $\approx$  SF-C[unp]

Feedback To ensure that this consistency is not due to Hole-Filling, see how well EC-C[unp] agrees with SF-C[unp]

# Inconsistencies(I):

- 1. EF-D[unp]  $\neq 0$ 
  - (a) D[pos] = -D[neg]
  - (b) D[unp] = D[pos]
- 2. SF-D[unp]  $\neq 0$ 
  - (a)  $SF-D[unp] \neq EF-D[unp]$
- 3. SF-B[unp]  $\neq$  EF-B[unp]