# Computing the perturbative gluon condensate

G.Grunberg

Centre de Physique Theorique de l'Ecole Polytechnique (CNRSUMR C7644), 91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France E-mail: georges.grunberg@cpht.polytechnique.fr

A bstract: The normalization of the gluon condensate and of renormalon-related power corrections in QCD is computed under the assumption that their \perturbative" part dominates over any eventual extra contribution from the non-trivial vacuum. The calculation is performed in the infrared nite coupling framework, assuming an infrared xed point is present in the perturbative coupling down to low values of N<sub>f</sub>. The freezing perturbative coupling is reconstructed using a Banks-Zaks expansion approach. Parameter-free predictions of the low energy moments of the coupling, which determ ine the process-independent part of the power corrections, are obtained for a num ber of choices of the running coupling.

Research supported in part by the EC program \Training and M obility of Researchers", Network \QCD and Particle Structure", contract ERBFM RXCT 980194.

# C ontents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	A fram ework for the IR nite coupling approach to power correc- tions	2
3.	R econstructing the IR nite perturbative coupling: a Banks-Zaks expansion approach	4
4.	R esults	7
5.	D iscussion and conclusions	11

# 1. Introduction

Recent years have witnessed a rapid development of the area covering the borderline between \perturbative" and \non-perturbative" physics in QCD. In particular, perturbative ideas have been pushed increasingly far towards the low-energy frontier to deal with the phenom enology of power corrections. Still in these advances the normalization of power corrections is usually considered as an incalculable \nonperturbative" parameter, to be tted from the data. This has been the situation ever since their original introduction [1] by Shifm an, Vainshtein and Zakharov (SVZ). In this note, I suggest a possibility to compute these parameters from st principles, for the limited class of \renorm alon-related" power corrections which include in particular the \gluon condensate". Am ong the various methods [2] devised to deal with these contributions, the \infrared nite coupling" approach [3, 4, 5] stands out as a particularly attractive scheme. A fram ework where this approach can be justied has recently been suggested [6], and the possibility of a calculation of power corrections from perturbative input has been pointed out. The aim of this paper is to in plem ent the latter suggestion. A fter a brief review (section 2) of the infrared (IR) nite coupling approach and of the proposal in [6], a method to construct the IR nite coupling from the Banks-Zaks expansion is described in section 3. The results for the power corrections are given in section 4, and further discussed in section 5 which also contains the conclusions.

# 2. A fram ework for the IR nite coupling approach to power corrections

In this approach the power corrections are parametrized in term of low energy moments of a \non-perturbative" coupling a = a + a assumed to be IR nite, where a (a - a) is the \perturbative part", and  $a a \non-perturbative"$  modication needed to make a IR nite. A lthough the approach can also deal with M inkowskian quantities, consider as a simple example the case of an Euclidean observable D (Q<sup>2</sup>) in the \single dressed gluon exchange approximation" [7, 8]

$$D(Q^{2}) = \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{dk^{2}}{k^{2}} a(k^{2}) \frac{k^{2}}{Q^{2}}$$
(2.1)

where  $(k^2=Q^2)$ , the \loop m on entum distribution function" [2], is known [9] from the relevant single dressed gluon diagram s. Introducing an IR cut-o  $_{\rm I}$  to separate long and short distances, the right hand side is approximated at large  $Q^2$  by

$$D (Q^{2})' c_{n} \frac{n(1)}{Q^{2n}} + \frac{Z^{1}}{\frac{2}{1}} \frac{dk^{2}}{k^{2}} a(k^{2}) \frac{k^{2}}{Q^{2}}$$
(2.2)

with  $_{n}(_{I}) = \frac{R}{0} \frac{2}{k^{2}} \frac{dk^{2}}{k^{2}} a(k^{2}) k^{2n}$ , where I assumed that  $(k^{2}=Q^{2})' c_{n} (k^{2}=Q^{2})^{n}$  at low  $k^{2}$  and the contribution of the a piece has been neglected above  $_{I}$ . These steps can now be justified with the following two crucial assumptions:

i) The perturbative part a of the coupling reaches a non-trivial IR xed point at low scales and is IR nite by itself, without the need for an hypothetical a contribution. This statement is likely to be correct for N<sub>f</sub> slightly below 16.5 where the perturbative coupling has a Banks-Zaks xed point [10, 11, 12] beyond one-loop, and I assum e it is still true down to N<sub>f</sub> = 0. This assumption is supported [13, 14, 15] by the behavior of the Banks-Zaks expansion for som e QCD e ective charges.

A ctually, the previous statem ent must be correct within a range N<sub>f</sub> < N<sub>f</sub> < 16.5 which de nes the \conform alwindow " where the perturbative coupling is IR nite and causal [16, 6]. W ithin the conform alwindow, there is by de nition no a term, and we have

$$D (Q^2) = D_{PT} (Q^2)$$
 (2.3)

with

$$D_{\frac{PT}{PT}}(Q^{2}) = \frac{Z_{1}}{0} \frac{dk^{2}}{k^{2}} a(k^{2}) = \frac{k^{2}}{Q^{2}}$$
(2.4)

At large  $Q^2$ , one obtains as in eq.(2.2)

$$D_{\frac{PT}{PT}}(Q^{2})' \frac{C_{\frac{PT}{T}}(1)}{Q^{2n}} + \frac{z^{1}}{\frac{2}{1}} \frac{dk^{2}}{k^{2}} a(k^{2}) \frac{k^{2}}{Q^{2}}$$
(2.5)

with the normalization of the power correction

$$C_{PT}(I) = c_n \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{dk^2}{k^2} a(k^2) k^{2n}$$
 (2.6)

given by a low energy m om ent of the perturbative coupling. Since the latter is no m ore causal below N<sub>f</sub> (even if it still IR nite there), eq.(2.3) cannot be correct anym ore for N<sub>f</sub> < N<sub>f</sub>, where the \conform alw indow am plitude" D<sub>PT</sub> (Q<sup>2</sup>) is expected to have unphysical Landau singularities in the (com plex) Q<sup>2</sup> plane. W e m ust therefore have

$$D (Q^{2}) = D_{PT} (Q^{2}) + D_{NP} (Q^{2})$$
(2.7)

where<sup>1</sup> the \genuine non-perturbative piece"  $D_{NP}(Q^2)$  cancels the Landau singularities present in  $D_{PT}(Q^2)$ . In the standard IR nite coupling approach this piece would correspond to the contribution of the a part of the coupling in eq.(2.1). Since the existence of such a term is quite hypothetical, I shall not assume that the  $D_{NP}(Q^2)$  piece is related to a (universal) non-perturbative QCD coupling. Still at large  $Q^2$  this piece m ay contribute a \non-perturbative component"  $C_{NP}$  to the O (1=Q<sup>2n</sup>) power correction

$$D_{\overline{NP}}(Q^2) ' \frac{C_{NP}}{Q^{2n}}$$
 (2.8)

so that below N  $_{\rm f}\,$  we have

D (Q<sup>2</sup>) ' 
$$D_{PT}(Q^2) + \frac{C_{NP}}{Q^{2n}}$$
 (2.9)

henœ

$$D(Q^{2})' \frac{C(1)}{Q^{2n}} + \frac{Z^{1}}{\frac{2}{1}} \frac{dk^{2}}{k^{2}} a(k^{2}) \frac{k^{2}}{Q^{2}}$$
(2.10)

with

$$C(_{I}) = C_{PT}(_{I}) + C_{NP}$$
 (2.11)

ii) The second crucial assumption I shall make is that the <code>\non-perturbative"</code> component  $C_{NP}$  can in fact be neglected (for not too small <sub>I</sub>) in eq.(2.11). This assumption, which actually takes the exact counterpart of the SVZ hypothesis [1] that the <code>\genuine non-perturbative piece"</code>  $C_{NP}$  dom inates over the <code>\perturbative"</code> uctuations, can be justiled [6] in a number of ways. One is to observe that  $C_{NP}$ , which vanishes identically for  $N_f < N_f < 16.5$  within the conform alwindow, may still be small for  $N_f < N_f$  below the conform alwindow, provided  $N_f$  is close enough to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> If  $D_{PT}(Q^2)$  is interpreted as the analytic continuation in N<sub>f</sub> of the full conform alwindow am plitude, the decom position eq.(2.7) is general [16, 6] and valid beyond the single dressed gluon approximation of eq.(2.1).

 $N_{f}$ . In [16, 6], it was found that in fact  $4 < N_{f} < 6$ , which makes it at least plausible the neglect of  $C_{NP}$  at the \real life" QCD value  $N_f = 3$ . Another (m ore drastic) possibility is that the power corrections in  $D_{\overline{PT}}(Q^2)$  and  $D_{\overline{NP}}(Q^2)$  do not match (even though at low Q<sup>2</sup> the two components cancel their mutual Landau singularities below the conform al window), i.e. that the power corrections are either entirely \perturbative" and contribute only to  $D_{\frac{P}{T}}(Q^2)$ , or entirely \non-perturbative" and contribute only to  $D_{NP}(Q^2)$ . This would mean that  $C_{NP} = 0$  even below  $N_f$ , and only the C<sub>PT</sub> component is present, for those condensates (like the gluon condensate) which do not vanish within the conform alwindow, whereas  $C_{NP} \in 0$  below  $N_{f}$  only for those condensates (like the quark condensate) which vanish identically within the conform alwindow, and therefore have no  $C_{PT}$  component. In such a case, the neglect of  $C_{NP}$  would be justified at all  $N_{f}$ 's for the \conform alwindow type" of power corrections. Anyway, the working hypothesis in the following shall be that one can compute the bulk of the latter type of power corrections from eq.(2.6) alone. In this way, the IR nite coupling approach not only nds a natural fram ework, but its predictiveness is enhanced since there is not any more any \non-perturbative" free parameter and the normalization of power corrections can be computed, as we dem onstrate in the next section (in this sense the approach goes beyond the operator product expansion even when applied to Euclidean quantities).

# 3. Reconstructing the IR nite perturbative coupling: a Banks-Zaks expansion approach

Even though the perturbative coupling appears to have an R xed point for large enough N<sub>f</sub> beyond two-bop, this is not always manifest when one decreases N<sub>f</sub>. For instance, the Banks-Zaks xed point at two-bop relies on having  $_1 < 0$ , which is not realized for N<sub>f</sub> < 8. Then one might rescue the xed point with a negative three-bop term, but even this feature is usually lost at N<sub>f</sub> = 3.0 n the other hand, as mentioned in section 2, the Banks-Zaks expansion does signal in a num ber of cases the persistence of the xed point even down to N<sub>f</sub> = 2. This observation suggests the following strategy: try to reconstruct the IR nite coupling, and eventually supply the missing higher order terms in the beta function (a), given the IR xed point Banks-Zaks expansion. This is an expansion in powers of the distance 16:5 N<sub>f</sub> from the top of the conform alwindow, which is proportional to  $_0$ . The solution a = a () of the equation

(a) = (a; ) = 
$$_{0} a^{2} _{1} a^{3} _{2} a^{4} _{3} a^{5} + :::= 0$$
 (3.1)

in the limit  $_0$  ! 0, with  $_i$  (i 1) nite is obtained as a power series

$$a = a() = +_{1}^{2} + _{2}^{3} + ::: (32)$$

where

The expansion parameter [12] is  $\frac{8}{321}$  (16:5 N<sub>f</sub>) =  $\frac{0}{1;0}$ . The  $_{ijj}$ , which are N<sub>f</sub>-independent (but scheme dependent for i > 1), are defined by  $_1 = _{1;0} + _{1;1} _{0}$  ( $_{1;0} = \frac{107}{16}$ ,  $_{1;1} = \frac{19}{4}$ ),  $_2 = _{2;0} + _{2;1} _{0} + _{2;2} _{0}^{2}$  (I assume  $_2$  is at most quadratic in N<sub>f</sub>, hence in  $_0$ ) and  $g_1, g_2$  are given in eq.(3.6). G iven the know ledge of the 3-loop beta function in (e.g.) the  $\overline{MS}$  scheme,  $_{2;0}$  can be obtained [17] from a one-loop calculation of a (see eq.(4.2)). I shall also use the related expansion for the critical exponent

$$= () = \frac{0}{0} (a; )$$
(3.4)

$$= _{1,0} ^{2} (1 + g_{1} + g_{2} ^{2} + ...)$$
 (3.5)

where

$$g_{1} = {}_{1;1} \\ g_{2} = g_{1}^{2} + \frac{{}_{3;0}}{{}_{1;0}} \qquad \frac{{}_{2;0}}{{}_{1;0}}$$
(3.6)

The  $g_1$ 's are scheme independent [12], and [13]  $g_2 = 8.89$ .

The method relies on the di erential equation [12] for a ()

$$\frac{0}{0}$$
 [ (a;)] = () $\frac{da}{d}$  (3.7)

where (a; ) is the  $N_f$  dependent part of the beta function, after splitting o the = 0 (i.e.  $N_f = 16.5$ ) piece (a;0)

(a; ) (a; 0) (a; ) (3.8)

Its expansion in powers of a is

$$(a; ) = _{1;0} a^{2} [1 + _{1;1}a + (_{2;1} + _{2;2} _{0})a^{2} + :::]$$
(3.9)

Eq.(3.7) follows by taking the total derivative with respect to f of the relation (a; ) = 0 which defines the xed point a ()

$$\frac{@}{@a}(a;)\frac{da}{d} + \frac{@}{@}(a;) = 0$$
(3.10)

and using eq.(3.4) and  $\frac{\theta}{\theta}$  (a; ) =  $\frac{\theta}{\theta}$  [ (a; )] (eq.(3.8)).

It is convenient to introduce the function (a), which is the inverse of the Banks-Zaks function a (): for given a, (a) is the value of (i.e.  $ofN_f$ ) where (a; ) = 0. The know ledge of (a) and of (a; ) determine (a;0), hence the full beta function. Indeed using eq.(3.8) the condition [a; (a)] = 0 becomes

$$(a;0) = (a) [a; (a)]$$
 (3.11)

Hence

$$(a;) = (a) [a; (a)] (a;)$$
 (3.12)

In term of (a) eq.(3.7) reads

$$\frac{@}{@} [ (a; )]_{\pm} = \frac{()}{\frac{d}{da}}$$
(3.13)

Eq.(3.13) gives a constraint on (a; ) given the Banks-Zaks functions () and a(). This constraint is not su cient to determ ine (a; ) (and the beta function) without further assumptions. In the following I shall assume that (a; ) =  $_0$  (a) is independent of , i.e. that the beta function coe cients are at most linear in N  $_f$  (or  $_0$ ): this amounts to an approximation, in the spirit of the Banks-Zaks approach, where one keeps only the leading = 0 term in an expansion of (a; ) in powers of (in particular, one neglects the  $_{2:2}$   $_0$  term in eq.(3.9)). Then eq.(3.13) gives

$$_{0}(a) = \frac{[(a)]}{\frac{d}{da}}$$
(3.14)

and from eq.(3.12) one gets

(a; ) = [ (a) ] 
$$\frac{[ (a)]}{\frac{d}{da}}$$
 (3.15)

U sing the Banks-Zaks expansions of the xed point a () and of the critical exponent () truncated to a given order as input, eq.(3.15) yields a corresponding im proved" approximation to the beta function, which displays a built-in xed point at a = a ().

In this approach, the leading order (LO) approximation thus gives (a) = a and  $[(a)] = {}_{1,0} a^2$ . The next-to-leading order (NLO) approximation uses the NLO Banks-Zaks expansions of the xed point and of the critical exponent: (a) is then obtained by inverting eq.(3.2) (with  $_2 = 0$ ), i.e. solving for in  $a = + {}_1 {}^2$  and reporting in eq.(3.15), with () =  ${}_{1,0} {}^2(1 + g_1)$ . The next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) approximation uses the NNLO Banks-Zaks expansions of the xed point (which requires the know ledge of  ${}_{2,1}$ ) and of the critical exponent (eq.(3.2) and (3.5)), etc...

The approximation can be further systematically improved by including the know ledge of the known N<sub>f</sub>-dependent terms in the beta function. For instance, if the three-loop  $_2$  coe cient is known, one can include the know ledge  $^2$  of the term quadratic in  $_0$  in  $_2$  with the ansatz

$$(a; ) = _{0}(a) + {}^{2}_{1:0} {}^{2}_{2:2} a^{4}$$
(3.16)

where  $_{0}(a)$  (a;0) is independent of (the know ledge of  $_{2;0}$  and  $_{2;1}$  is contained in the NLO and NNLO terms in the Banks-Zaks expansion of a , as mentioned above). Eq.(3.13) then xes  $_{0}(a)$  from

$$_{0}(a) + 2 \quad {}^{2}_{1;0} \quad {}^{2}_{2;2} a^{4} \quad (a) = \frac{[(a)]}{\frac{d}{da}}$$
(3.17)

which yields (a; ), hence from eq. (3.12)

(a; ) = [ (a) ] 
$$\frac{[ (a)]}{\frac{d}{da}}$$
  $^{2}_{1;0}$   $^{2}_{2;2}$   $a^{4}$  [ (a)  $^{2}_{1;1}$  (3.18)

### 4. Results

The \coupling" appearing in eq.(2.4) should be viewed as a physical, gauge-independent quantity, just as the observable D ( $Q^2$ ) to which it is directly related. In the IR nite coupling approach, it is also assumed to be universal, i.e. the same for all observables. The existence of such an object is still speculative. It is attractive to identify this coupling to the \skeleton coupling" [7, 8, 18] associated to a (yet hypothetical)  $Q^2$  by the \pinch technique" construction [19, 20]. The pinch coupling is presently known only at one-loop, where it is related to the  $\overline{M}$  S coupling by

$$a(k^2) = a_{\overline{MS}}(2) + b_0 log(k^2 = 2) 5 = 3 + d_1 a_{\overline{MS}}(2) + ... (4.1)$$

with  $d_1$  pinch = 1. An alternative suggestion [3] is to use the \gluon brem sstrahlung coupling" [21], also known to the one-loop level eq.(4.1) with  $d_1$  prem s = 1 <sup>2</sup>=4. Since the full three-loop beta function coe cient (hence <sub>2</sub>) is not yet known for these two couplings, I shall apply the method of section 3 in the NLO approximation described there. A ctually, since the Banks-Zaks expansion of the critical exponent is known [13] up to NNLO (eq.(3.5)), and may be reliable [6] even down to N<sub>f</sub> = 3, I shall go half-way towards the NNLO approximation, and use eq.(3.5) in eq.(3.15), while still using eq.(3.2) (with <sub>2</sub> = 0) to x (a). The input scheme dependent numerical values following from eq.(4.1) and the relation [17]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>A ctually, given that 0 < a < a = 0 (), this term is e ectively of the same order as the <sub>3;1</sub>  $a^5$  term in (a; ) (eq.(3.9)), and should be taken as input only together with the latter, i.e. at the NNNLO level.

$$d_1 = \frac{2;0 \quad \frac{M S}{2;0}}{1;0}$$
(4.2)

are  $[18] \frac{270}{170}$  pinch = 2:61 and  $\frac{270}{170}$  prem s = 2:61 +  $\frac{2}{4}$  = 5:08. Hence 1 pinch = 2:14 while 1 prem s = 0:33 (a smaller correction!). It follows from eq.(32) that at N<sub>f</sub> = 3 the IR xed point a = 0:299 for the gluon brem sstrahlung coupling, smaller then the corresponding value a = 0:578 for the pinch coupling which is subject to rather large uncertainties.

A sa third alternative, Iwould like to suggest the \universal coupling" introduced in [12], because of its simplicity. It is de ned<sup>3</sup> by the condition  $_i = 0$  for all i's, i.e. a () , and therefore its beta function can be expressed entirely in term of the critical exponent

$$(a; ) = (a ) (a)$$
  
=  $(_{0} a^{2} + _{1;0} a^{3})(1 + g_{1} a + g_{2} a^{2} + ...)$  (4.3)

At N<sub>f</sub> = 3 the IR xed point is a = = 0:336. The scale is xed knowing that  $\frac{2;0}{1;0}$  juniversal =  $_{1;1}$  (from  $_1$  = 0), which determines (eq.(4.2)) d<sub>1</sub> juniversal =

1:137, and the natural assumption that the term proportional to  $_0$  in eq.(4.1) is the same.

The brem sstrahlung coupling beta function at N<sub>f</sub> = 3 is shown in Fig.1. Note the negative ultraviolet xed point at a ' 0:17. It corresponds to a zero of the critical exponent eq.(3.5) at ' 0:15, and is a necessary condition for the scenario in [6] to determ ine the bottom N<sub>f</sub> of the conform alwindow from the condition () = 1, which yields N<sub>f</sub> ' 4 if one uses eq.(3.5). The resulting running coupling is shown in Fig.2, where I used  $\frac{MS}{S}$  (M<sub>Z</sub>) = 0:117 as input (eq.(4.1) yields the corresponding input value of the brem sstrahlung coupling).

It is then straightforward to compute the rst few low energy moments of the coupling

$$a_{2n 1} (I) \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} n \frac{dk^{2}}{k^{2}} \frac{k^{2}}{\frac{2}{1}} a(k^{2})$$
(4.4)

In term of the beta function they are given by

$$a_{2n 1}(I) = \int_{a}^{Z} n \frac{da}{(a)} a \exp[n (a; a_{I})]$$
(4.5)

where

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>I assume linear N<sub>f</sub> dependence. O there is the more general solution (a; ) = (a) (a ) +  $_1$  (a) (a )<sup>2</sup> + ....



Figure 1: The brem sstrahlung coupling beta function (N  $_{\rm f}$  = 3).



Figure 2: The brem saturahlung coupling (N<sub>f</sub> = 3,  $\frac{M_S}{s}$  (M<sub>Z</sub>) = 0.117).

(a; a<sub>I</sub>) 
$$\frac{Z_{a_{I}}}{a_{I}} \frac{dx}{dx} = \log \frac{k^{2}}{\frac{2}{I}}$$
 (4.6)

is the solution of the renormalization group equation with  $a_I$  a( $\frac{2}{I}$ ). Taking  $I = \frac{2G}{s} eV$ , one gets the results in Table 1 if  $\frac{M}{s} M_Z = 0.117$  and those in Table 2 if  $\frac{M}{s} M_Z = 0.120$ . Note the sensitivity to the high energy input value of s.

These results are subjected to theoretical uncertainties, stemming from the magnitude of the IR values of the coupling which should induce seizable higher order corrections. The convergence of the Banks-Zaks expansion is bad in the pinch coupling case (which has a large IR value), and the know ledge of the 3-loop beta function coe cient and of  $_2$  is essential for a more reliable prediction. The situation looks better for the universal coupling" and the brem sstrahlung coupling. To assess the convergence of the results for the moments in the NLO approximation

where one uses only the rst two terms in the Banks-Zaks expansion of (eq.(3.5)) are quoted within parenthesis in the tables.

The n = 0 m on ent gives the process-independent part of the norm alization of the 1=Q power corrections. If one uses the gluon brem sstrahlung ansatz for the coupling, the predicted value is in qualitative agreement with the experimentally determined [5] one ( $a_0$  ' 0:14 0:17), although it should be remembered that the latter depends on the way the \perturbative part" of the amplitude (the piece above

I in eq.(2.10)) is handled, as well as upon extra assumptions in the case of non-inclusive M inkowskian observables. The n = 3 m om ent gives the normalization of the \gluon condensate"

$$< - {s \over -3} G^2 > {}_{I} = {3 \over 2^2} a_3 (I_{I}) {}_{I}^4$$
 (4.7)

Note the de nition used here involves an arbitrary  $\mathbb{R}$  cut-o  $_{\rm I}$ , as necessary in the case of renorm alon-related power corrections. If one wants to compare<sup>4</sup> to the e ective phenom enological SVZ de nition [1], one can just compute the integral in eq.(2.4) (which does not depend on  $_{\rm I}$ ) for any given Euclidean observable where the gluon condensate gives the leading power correction, and t the result with the SVZ ansatz. For instance, for the Adler D function

D (Q<sup>2</sup>) ' a (Q<sup>2</sup>) + 
$$\frac{2^2}{3}\frac{1}{Q^4} < \frac{s}{-s}G^2 >$$
 (4.8)

where the  $\frac{2}{3}^2$  factor is the leading order coe cient function. Similarly, the SVZ condensate <  $-sG^2$  > could be de ned from the basic observable  $a_3(_1)$  (eq.(4.4) with n=2), where the IR cut-o \_\_\_\_\_ now plays the role of the high energy scale Q, by

$$a_{3}(_{I})' a(_{I}^{2}) + \frac{2^{2}}{3}\frac{1}{\frac{4}{1}} < -sG^{2} >$$
 (4.9)

For  $_{\rm I} = 2 \,{\rm GeV}$ , eq.(4.9) yields  $< -{\rm s} \,{\rm G}^2 > ' 0.05 \,{\rm GeV}^4$  for  ${\rm M}^{\rm M} {\rm S} \,{\rm M}_{\rm Z}$ ) = 0.117, which boks reasonable compared to the standard SVZ value. However, this comparison is actually devoid of signi cance due to the following intriguing fact: varying the scale  $_{\rm I}$  in eq.(4.9), one nds the discrepancy  $a_3(_{\rm I}) = a(_{\rm I}^2)$  between  $a_3(_{\rm I})$  and its lowest order perturbative approximation  $a(_{\rm I}^2)$  decreases much shower then the inverse fourth power of  $_{\rm I}$ ! A similar result is obtained if one uses eq.(4.8) (with the \loop momentum distribution function" (k  $^2=Q^2$ ) taken from [9]). Since the (principal value regulated) Borel sum of the perturbative series associated to the observables  $a_3(_{\rm I})$  (or D (Q<sup>2</sup>)) are known [22, 23] to di er from the exact values by just such an O (1=  $\frac{4}{1}$ ) (resp. O (1=Q<sup>4</sup>)) correction, one is bound to conclude that the naive treatment of approximating the Borel sum by its leading order term does not

 $<sup>^4\,{\</sup>rm I}\,{\rm am}\,$  indebted to A L M ueller for raising the question.

work<sup>5</sup> here. This is another point of discrepancy with the standard SV Z procedure, on top of the assumption that the perturbative part of the condensate dom inates.

# 5. D iscussion and conclusions

The essential assumption in the present approach is that the perturbative beta function has an IR xed point at least down to N<sub>f</sub> = 3. This is partly implemented by constructing beta functions with negative three-loop coecients: at NNLO the method of section 3 yields  $_2 = _{2i0} + _{2i1} _{0}$  where both  $_{2i0}$  and  $_{2i1}$  turn out negative (see footnote 4) for the considered couplings. A ctually, essentially the same results can be obtained (at least for the brem sstrahlung coupling) in a simpler way, which makes it transparent the reason for the existence of the IR xed point. Indeed, consider the 4-loop beta function eq.(3.1), and observe that in the IR region the usual power counting should be modi ed: namely, given that a is 0 ( $_{0}$ ) there, to 0 ( $_{0}^{6}$ ) accuracy one should drop the 0 ( $_{0}^{2}$ ) term in  $_{2}$ , and keep only the leading 0 (( $_{0}$ )<sup>0</sup>) term in  $_{3}$ , i.e. use the elective 4-loop beta function (in accordance with the remark in footnote 1)

$$_{eff}$$
 (a; ) =  $_{0} a^{2} _{1} a^{3} (_{2;0} + _{2;1} _{0})a^{4} _{3;0} a^{5} + O (a^{6})$  (5.1)

(in the ultraviolet region, this beta function has of course only the O (a<sup>4</sup>) accuracy of the 2-loop beta function). In the case of the brem sstrahlung coupling, the results obtained using the 4-loop  $_{\rm eff}$  turn out to be very close to those of section 4 in the NNLO approximation. For instance  $_{\rm eff}$  has an IR xed point at a = 0.294 if N<sub>f</sub> = 3 (I used  $_{3;0} = 37.76$  from eq.(3.6)), and one gets:  $a_0 = 0.201$ ,  $a_1 = 0.177$  and  $a_3 = 0.156$  if  $\frac{M}{s}$  (M<sub>Z</sub>) = 0.117, and  $a_0 = 0.210$ ,  $a_1 = 0.189$  and  $a_3 = 0.168$  if  $\frac{M}{s}$  (M<sub>Z</sub>) = 0.120. Similarly in NLO one should use a 3-loop  $_{\rm eff}(a; ) = 0$  a<sup>2</sup>  $_{1;0} a^3 + 0$  (a<sup>4</sup>). The presence of an IR xed point in  $_{\rm eff}$  down to low values of N<sub>f</sub> seems to be a general phenom enon, at least up to NLO. This is obvious in LO, since  $_{1;0}$  is scheme e independent, but less so in NLO where  $_{2;0}$  is scheme e dependent. Nevertheless it turns out that  $_{2;0}$  is negative for all known physical elective charges [18], as well as for the three couplings quoted above. Consequently, there may be a positive zero in the 3-loop  $_{\rm eff}$  correctly signalling an IR xed point, even if the standard 3-loop beta function has no positive zero with all its coe cients of the same e sign.

AtNNLO, the presence of an IR xed point in the 4-bop  $_{eff}$  m ay be jeopardized by large positive values of  $_{2;1}$  and (or)  $_{3;0}$ . Actually,  $_{2;1}$  turns out to be negative for all known<sup>6</sup> e ective charges (except the one (\av ") de ned by the static QCD

 $<sup>{}^{5}</sup>S$  in ilar results are obtained if one uses [8] the BLM scale [18] in a.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>For the pinch coupling and the brem sstrahlung coupling,  $_{2;1}$  has been \predicted" from the assumption that  $_2$  ' 0, which yields (eq.(3.3))  $_{2;1}$  = 23:6 for the pinch coupling and  $_{2;1}$  =

potential, where it is positive [18] but small enough not to destabilize the xed point). The real problem comes from the 4-bop coe cient  $_{3;0}$ , which is positive for all known elective charges (except again  $a_V$ , where it is negative and tiny). In the case of the pinch coupling, it turns out in fact too large (one gets  $_{3;0} = 164:7$  from eq.(3.6)) for the 4-bop  $_{eff}$  to have an IR xed point if N  $_f < 13$ . Sim ilarly, in the case of the A dler D-function elective charge where  $_{3;0} = 127$ , the 4-bop  $_{eff}$  does not have an IR xed point if N  $_f < 11$ . For all other elective charges however the 4-bop  $_{eff}$  does exhibit an IR xed point down to N  $_f = 0!$  How ever, in those cases of large positive  $_{3;0}$  (which is a consequence of a small  $_{2;0}$ , see eq.(3.6)), the method of section 3 provides an elective resummation of the relevant higher order terms, obtained under the assumption the Banks-Zaks expansions of the IR xed point and of the critical exponent do converge: all known to N  $_f = 0$  (although the convergence of the xed point Banks-Zaks expansion becomes problem atic already at N  $_f = 3$  for some of them, such as the pinch coupling).

The suggestion of perturbative freezing of the coupling at low  $N_f$  was rst made in [13]. There is however an essential di erence with the present proposal: it is not suggested here that the perturbative IR xed point has anything to do with the low energy behavior of the full QCD amplitudes below the conform alwindow, which is entirely non-perturbative. For instance, as observed in [25] spontaneous chiral sym metry breaking considerations at large N<sub>c</sub> in ply the Adler D -function must vanish at zero m om entum, which is inconsistent with the positive value expected from perturbative freezing. W hat is suggested instead is that the perturbative freezing at low N<sub>f</sub> is relevant to determ ine the norm alization of renorm alon-related condensates and power corrections which appear in the short distance expansion of am plitudes. This am ounts to the recognition that objects like the \gluon condensate", at the difference of the quark condensate, are of a basically \perturbative" nature, and thus unrelated to \genuine" non-perturbative properties of the vacuum such as chiral sym metry breaking or con nement. The notion of a \conform alwindow " is an essential part of the present proposal: only those power corrections which are already present within the conform alwindow are amenable to a perturbative treatment, and below the conform alw indow there are other really \non-perturbative" contributions which

<sup>7:43</sup> for the brem sstrahlung coupling. This assumption turns out to yield rather good results in the case of the elective charges associated to the Adler D-function and the polarized  $(g_1)$  and non-polarized  $(F_1)$  B prken sum rules, for which the \predicted" values are respectively  $_{2;1}$  =

<sup>16:17; 9:98; 6:97</sup> com pared to the exact values (corrected for som e num erical inaccuracies in [18])  $_{2;1} = 15:94$ ; 11:19; 6:81. The partial reason for this success are the large cancellations between  $g_2$  (the \scheme independent" contribution to  $_2$  in eq.(3.3)) and the \scheme dependent" contribution which involves  $_1$  and  $_{2;1}$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> This is even true for the e ective charge associated [24] to H iggs decay. In this case how ever one gets a large xed point value a = 0 (1), and convergence of the Banks-Zaks expansion is doubtful for N<sub>f</sub> < 4.

are crucial to determ ine the true low energy properties of QCD. Moreover, it was shown in [6] that the assumption that the perturbative IR xed point persists below the bottom N<sub>f</sub> of the conform alw indow leads to the condition () = 1 to determ ine N<sub>f</sub>. It is interesting that this condition gives N<sub>f</sub> ' 4, rather close to the \real life" QCD value N<sub>f</sub> = 3, which m ight give an alternative justication to the suggested calculation procedure based on the \anti-SVZ" hypothesis that the \perturbative" piece of the condensates actually dom inates over the \non-perturbative" uctuations. Note that the opposite SVZ assumption of dom inance of the non-perturbative piece has been questioned previously in the literature (see e.g. [2]). Furtherm ore, even if the present assumption turns out to be invalid, the results of this paper are still useful to extract from experiment the \truly non-perturbative" part C<sub>NP</sub>, which is given a completely unambiguous de nition through eq.(2.9).

The typical example of a \perturbative" conform alw indow am plitude is the \single dressed gluon" integral of eq. (2.4), where the running coupling inside the integral is IR nite, and calculable from perturbative input through an (eventually resum m ed) Banks-Zaks expansion. It is in plicitly assumed that this particular coupling is free of IR renorm alons and can be unambiguously determ ined from its perturbative series (say, by Borel sum mation). The corresponding Banks-Zaks series should then be also Borel sum m able. Note also that the integral eq.(2.4) is free of any renorm alon am biguity, although renorm alons are present in the corresponding perturbative series, but is still expected to be a ected below the conform alwindow by unphysical Landau singularities in the complex  $Q^2$  plane. Such an amplitude [22, 23] represents a natural form of a generalized perturbation theory, which gives the background on top of which genuine non-perturbative contributions may take place below N<sub>f</sub>. The calculation of the \perturbative condensate", although using only perturbative inform ation, goes beyond a mere renorm alon estimate, since there is usually a part [26, 6] of the low momentum contribution of the perturbative coupling which is not determ ined only [26, 27] by renorm alons. The assumption that renorm alon-related power corrections are \perturbative" in the above sense also gives a straightforward justi cation to the IR nite coupling approach to power corrections, and leaves no arbitrary free parameter (except of course the overall QCD scale) to be xed from experiment. The main conceptual problem in this framework remains to nd the identity of the (hopefully unique) perturbative IR nite QCD coupling which determ ines the power corrections, and derive the system atic form to all orders of the (yet to be constructed) generalized perturbation theory, perhaps [18] along the lines of a QCD \skeleton expansion": this is however a problem of a basically perturbative nature.

## A cknow ledgm ents

I thank Yu.L.D okshitzer and A.H.M ueller for stimulating discussions. I also wish

to thank the referee for constructive criticism .

#### References

- [1] M A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 147 (1979) 385.
- [2] See e.g.M. Beneke, Phys. Rept. B 317 (1999) 1 [hep-ph/9807443].
- [3] Yu L. Dokshitzer and B R. Webber, Phys. Lett. B 352 (1995) 451 [hep-ph/9504219].
- [4] Yu L. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesiniand B.R. Webber, Nucl. Phys. B 469 (1996) 93 [hepph/9512336].
- [5] For a review and further references, see Yu.L.Dokshitzer, in International Conference \Frontiers of M atter", B bis, France, June 1999 [hep-ph/9911299].
- [6] G.Grunberg, Conform alwindow and Landau singularities, hep-ph/0104098.
- [7] G.Grunberg, JHEP 11 (1998) 006 [hep-ph/9807494].
- [8] E.Gardiand G.Grunberg, JHEP 11 (1999) 016 [hep-ph/9908458].
- [9] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D 51 (1995) 5924 [hep-ph/9412265].
- [10] T.Banks and A.Zaks, Nucl. Phys. B 196 (1982) 189.
- [11] A R. W hite, Phys. Rev. D 29 (1984) 1435; Int. J. M cd. Phys. A 8 (1993) 4755
   [hep-th/9303053].
- [12] G.Grunberg, Phys. Rev. D 46 (1992) 2228.
- [13] P.M. Stevenson, Phys. Lett. B 331 (1994) 187 [hep-ph/9402276]; S.A. Caveny and P.M. Stevenson, hep-ph/9705319.
- [14] E.Gardiand M.Karliner, Nucl. Phys. B 529 (1998) 383 [hep-ph/9802218].
- [15] E.Gardiand G.Grunberg, JHEP 03 (1999) 024 [hep-th/9810192].
- [16] G.Grunberg, Fixing the conform alwindow in QCD, hep-ph/0009272.
- [17] G.Grunberg, Phys. Lett. B 135 (1984) 455.
- [18] S.J.Brodsky, E.G ardi, G.G runberg and J.R athsm an, Phys. Rev. D 63 (2001) 094017 [hep-ph/0002065].
- [19] N.J.Watson, Nucl. Phys. B 494 (1997) 388 [hep-ph/9606381]; Nucl. Phys. B 552 (1999) 461 [hep-ph/9812202]; hep-ph/9912303.
- [20] J.Papavassiliou, Phys. Rev. D 62 (2000) 045006 [hep-ph/9912338]; Phys. Rev. Lett.
   84 (2000) 2782 [hep-ph/9912336].
- [21] S.Catani, G.Marchesiniand B.R.Webber, Nucl. Phys. B 349 (1991) 635.

- [22] G. Grunberg, Phys. Lett. B 372 (1996) 121 [hep-ph/9512203]; in DIS96 [hep-ph/9608375].
- [23] Yu L. Dokshitzer and N G. Uraltsev, Phys. Lett. B 380 (1996) 141 [hep-ph/9512407].
- [24] J.A.M. Verm aseren, S.A. Larin and T. van Ritbergen Phys. Lett. B 405 (1997) 327 [hep-ph/9703284].
- [25] S.Peris and E.de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B 500 (1997) 325 [hep-ph/9701418].
- [26] G.Grunberg, Phys. Lett. B 325 (1994) 441.
- [27] G.Grunberg, Phys. Lett. B 349 (1995) 469.

	brem sstrahlung	universal	pinch
a <sub>0</sub>	0207 (0222)	0.225 (0.246)	0,330 (0,366)
a <sub>1</sub>	0.176 (0.198)	0.187 (0.212)	0.256 (0.300)
a <sub>3</sub>	0.155 (0.173)	0163 (0183)	0.210 (0.243)
	Table 1:Mome	nts for $\frac{MS}{S}$ (Mz)	) = 0:117.

	brem sstrahlung	universal	pinch		
$a_0$	0.217 (0.232)	0237 (0259)	0,353 (0,390)		
a <sub>1</sub>	0.188 (0.213)	0202 (0230)	0.281 (0.332)		
a <sub>3</sub>	0.167 (0.189)	0.176 (0.201)	0233 (0273)		
Table 2: M om ents for $\frac{M}{s}$ (M z) = 0:120.					