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## Analysis of longitudinal double-spin asymmetry

- SIDIS data generated with PYTHIA-6 : 5x41 GeV² and $18 \times 275 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
- Full reconstruction through GEANT simulation (ECCE July concept)
- DIS cuts: $\mathrm{Q}^{2}>1 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} ; 0.01<\mathrm{y}<0.95$ and $\mathrm{W}^{2}>10 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
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- SIDIS data generated with PYTHIA-6 : 5x41 GeV² and $18 \times 275 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
- Full reconstruction through GEANT simulation (ECCE July concept)
- DIS cuts: $Q^{2}>1 \mathrm{GeV}^{2} ; 0.01<y<0.95$ and $\mathrm{W}^{2}>10 \mathrm{GeV}^{2}$
- Weighting of events at parton level at NLO:

$$
1+\Lambda D(y) \frac{\Delta \otimes D^{q, g \rightarrow h}}{F_{U U}^{h}}
$$

- $\Lambda= \pm 1$ : relative beam helicity orientation
- $\Delta$ : DSSV14 helicity distributions
- $D^{q, g \rightarrow h}$ DSS14 pion and kaon fragmentation function
- Unpolarised Fưu: NNPDF30_nlo_as_0118 and DSS14 FFs
- Weighting only for pythia processes: 99, 131-136
- For ratio of longitudinal and transverse $\gamma^{*}$ cross section in D(y): Phys. Lett. B, 452:194-200, 1999
- $D(y)$ set to 1 for evaluation of systematics


## Analysis of longitudinal double-spin asymmetry

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =D(y) A_{1}^{h}\left(x_{B}, Q^{2}, z\right) \text {, }
\end{aligned}
$$

- Assume constant e and p beam polarisations of $70 \%$ with with $2 \%$ uncertainty
- $\mathrm{A}_{1} \rightarrow$ access to convolution of helicity distributions and FFs


## Generated and reconstructed $A_{1}(D(y)=1)$




## Systematic uncertainties
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## Asymmetries



## Influence of the magnetic field

- Kinematic coverage



## Influence of the magnetic field

- Statistical uncertainty



## Impact plots

Based on reweighing technique.


## Summary and conclusion for ECCE studies

- Proposed EIC detector appropriate for study of SIDIS and extraction of $A_{1}$ with broad kinematic coverage and good precision
- Lower magnetic field brings some advantage at low $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{B}}$ but 1.4 T or 3.0 T both appropriate

