

A Precision Calculation of the Next-to-Leading Order Energy-Energy Correlation Function

Keith A. Clay and Stephen D. Ellis
Department of Physics, University of Washington

January 30, 1995

Abstract

The $O(\alpha_s^2)$ contribution to the Energy-Energy Correlation function (EEC) [1, 2, 3, 4] of $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons is calculated to high precision and the results are shown to be larger than previously reported [9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. The consistency with the leading logarithm approximation and the accurate cancellation of infrared singularities exhibited by the new calculation suggest that it is reliable. We offer evidence that the source of the disagreement with previous results lies in the regulation of double singularities.

The energy-energy correlation function (EEC) [1, 2, 3, 4] for e^+e^- annihilation into hadrons is widely used as a measure of the strong coupling constant α_s [5, 6, 7] and is potentially one of the most precise and detailed experimental tests of QCD available [7, 8]. However, that potential has not been realized due to disagreement over the predicted value of the next-to-leading order correction in the strong coupling constant [9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. We report on a new calculation of the $O(\alpha_s^2)$ term using subtraction for control of infrared singularities. Accuracy was checked at every stage by symbolic computation, high precision arithmetic, and human calculation. The detailed cancellation of singularities in the complicated four-parton states was carefully tested. A more complete description will be presented elsewhere [14].

The EEC was invented to take advantage of the asymptotic freedom of QCD by viewing the products of e^+e^- annihilation with a weighting that favored the most energetic hadrons [1, 3, 4]. Conservation of energy requires all energy carried by quarks and gluons to be transferred to detectable hadrons, hence the EEC is experimentally and theoretically defined as

$$\frac{d}{d\cos(\theta)} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\text{events}} \sum_{\text{hadrons } a, b} \frac{E_a E_b}{E_{\text{total}}^2} \cos(\theta_{ab}) \quad (1)$$

$$= \sum_{\text{partons } i, j} \int d^3p_i d^3p_j \frac{d}{d^3p_i d^3p_j} \frac{E_i E_j}{E_{\text{total}}^2} (\hat{p}_i \cdot \hat{p}_j \cos(\theta))$$

where σ is the total cross section for $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons, E_n and p_n are the energy and momentum of particle n , and E_{total} is the center of mass energy of the system. The EEC is free of collinear singularities since all parallel momenta are linearly summed [15].




Figure 1: The $O(s^2)$ contribution to the Energy-Energy Correlation function. For comparison we display our results (solid circles), the results of Kunszt and Nason [12] (open squares), and the results of Richards, Stirling, and Ellis [10] (open triangles). B values shown are for five active quark flavors or $T_R = \frac{5}{2}$ (see equation 5).

After factoring out the trivial dependence on the total cross section and $\sin^2 \chi$ [12], the EEC has the following perturbative expansion in the region $0 < \chi < \pi$,

$$\frac{d}{d\cos(\chi)} = \frac{\sigma_0}{\sin^2 \chi} \left[\frac{n}{2} A(\chi) + 1 + \frac{s}{2} \sigma_0 \log \frac{s}{E_{\text{total}}} + \frac{s}{2} B(\chi) + O(s^3) \right] \quad (2)$$

Here σ_0 is the leading order total cross section, s is the renormalization scale, and σ_0 is the leading coefficient of the function: $\sigma_0 = \frac{11}{3}C_A - \frac{4}{3}T_R$. For QCD in this notation, $C_F = \frac{4}{3}$, $C_A = 3$, and $T_R = \frac{1}{2}N_F$, where N_F is the number of active quark flavors at energy E_{total} . A analytic calculation of A yields [1]

$$A(\chi) = C_F (1 + \frac{1}{2}!) (1 + 3!) (2 - 6!)^2 \log(1 + \frac{1}{2}!) + 6! - 3 \quad (3)$$

where $! = \cot^2(\chi/2)$. No such analytic expression is possible for $B(\chi)$. At $O(s^2)$, the EEC receives contributions from four-parton final states at tree level and from three-parton final states with a virtual parton forming one internal loop. The three-parton final states pose little challenge, but the integrals corresponding to four-parton states with an external angle fixed at dem and numerical as well as analytic calculation.

To calculate contributions near soft or collinear poles, the four-parton expressions were simplified to allow analytic integration in the presence of an infrared regulator (dimension $D = 4 - 2\epsilon$). Using the subtraction method of infrared regulation, the simplified expressions were subtracted from exact expressions and the finite difference was numerically integrated without infrared regulation ($\epsilon = 0$).

Coefficient	Exact Value	Clay and Ellis	Richards, Stirling and Ellis
B_3^+	$2 C_F$	$(2.017 \ 0.049) C_F$	$(2.46 \ 0.29) C_F$
B_2^+	$9 C_F + 3.67 C_A + 1.333 T_R$	$(9.84 \ 0.90) C_F + (3.63 \ 0.12) C_A + (1.333 \ 0.001) T_R$	$(21.0 \ 9.0) C_F + (2.86 \ 7.24) C_A + (1.35 \ 0.05) T_R$
B_1^+	$23.6 C_F + 1.34 C_A + 0.222 T_R$	$(20.6 \ 4.79) C_F + (1.53 \ 2.11) C_A + (0.220 \ 0.03) T_R$	$(140 \ 111) C_F + (14.0 \ 71.7) C_A + (0.066 \ 0.480) T_R$
B_0^+	$26.2 C_F + 16.6 C_A + 3.58 T_R$	$(23.1 \ 5.89) C_F + (13.43 \ 9.00) C_A + (3.58 \ 0.17) T_R$	$(370 \ 196) C_F + (56.8 \ 228) C_A + (4.16 \ 1.64) T_R$
B_1	$3.125 C_F + 3.567 C_A + 0.8833 T_R$	$(3.15 \ 0.04) C_F + (3.57 \ 0.01) C_A + (0.8832 \ 0.0005) T_R$	$(6.51 \ 0.35)$ (exact = 6.533) + $(0.88 \ 0.02) T_R$
B_0	?	$(8.69 \ 0.40) C_F + (15.7 \ 0.2) C_A + (5.46 \ 0.005) T_R$	$29.9 \ 2.9$ $(N_F \ 4)$

Table 1: The coefficients of the leading log expansion of the EEC at large (B_j^+) and small (B_j) angles. The expansion is as shown in equation 4. Listed are the exact leading log coefficients and the coefficients producing the best fit to Clay and Ellis as well as Richards, Stirling, and Ellis [17].

Analytic integrals of the three-parton and simplified four-parton expressions (at finite ϵ) were then added and the sum was shown to remain finite in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. As in all previous calculations of B , we used the expressions derived by Ellis, Ross, and Terrano (ERT) [16] for the exact three-parton and four-parton final states, but we did not use the ERT simplifications or analytic integrals for reasons of maximizing numerical convergence.

Our results (Clay and Ellis or CE) are plotted in Figure 1 along with the results previously reported by Richards, Stirling, and Ellis (RSE) [10] and Kunzst and Nason (KN) [12]. The mean relative numerical uncertainty in our calculation is 0.3%, while for KN it is roughly 4%, both arising from the precision of numerical integrations. This uncertainty is insufficient to explain the roughly 15% overall difference between KN and CE. While it is possible for systematic differences such as these to arise from purely numerical errors, we believe there is an analytic error at the heart of the disagreement.

The only known test of the analytic behavior of B is a comparison with the predictions of the leading logarithm approximation for large and small angles [2]. To determine asymptotic behavior, $B(\epsilon)$ was calculated over the range $\cos(\theta) \in (1 - 10^{-6})$, and the results were compared to an expansion of the form

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} B(\epsilon) = C_F \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} B_j \ln^j(1-\epsilon) \quad (4)$$

where $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos(\theta))$. The coefficients B_j that best fit our calculation were found using an unconstrained least squares fit and are displayed in Table 1 (we find that $B_3 = B_2 = 0$, as expected). For comparison, we also show the coefficients derived by RSE [17] who reported some inconsistency with the leading logarithm approximation. No inconsistency is evident in our data. The previously unpublished exact values for B_0^+ are based on our conjecture that the form factor for the EEC is the same as that for the second energy moment of the Drell-Yan cross section [18, 19]. The form factor is convoluted with a known parton evolution function [20] to produce B_0^+ .

The discrepancy over the value of B_0 is significant. With $N_F = 4$, RSE extracted a value of B_0

equal to 29:9 ± 2:9, while our calculation predicts a value of 47:8 ± 0:8 (see Table 1). Based on our preliminary analysis of data from KN as well as Glover and Sutton (GS) [13], we conclude that neither is consistent with the values of B_0 from either CE or RSE. It is unfortunate that the coefficient that best discriminates between the various calculations is unknown. An independent calculation of B_0 would be very useful for resolving the disagreement.

To explore the source of the disagreement, we parameterize B as a sum of three functions

$$B(\theta) = C_F (C_F B_{C_F}(\theta) + C_A B_{C_A}(\theta) + T_R B_{T_R}(\theta)) \quad (5)$$

and compare our results for each function with those of GS as well as RSE. While CE and GS [21] differ significantly over B_A and even more so over B_{C_F} , they agree with each other and with RSE [10] on the value of B_{T_R} . It was also only for B_{C_A} and B_{C_F} that RSE reported difficulty in the fit to leading logarithms [17]. This strongly suggests that the source of the disagreement lies outside of the calculation of B_{T_R} and is most severely manifest in that of B_{C_F} .

We believe that the source of disagreement is the regulation of double (i.e., soft and collinear) infrared singularities. Calculation of B_{T_R} involves no such regulation since the four-fermion states have no soft singularities, while unique to B_{C_F} are "ladder diagram" contributions that produce the double singularities least controlled by energy weighting.

To deal with infrared singularities, the exact perturbative integrands are simplified in such a way as to be analytically integrable in the presence of an infrared regulator (e.g., 4 - 2 dimensions) while producing integrated expressions that display the same singular dependence on the regulator (e.g., poles in ϵ) as do integrals of the exact integrands. The simplified integrands are also used in numerical integrations where the regulator is necessarily removed ($\epsilon \rightarrow 0$) before integration. Any such algorithm guarantees that the singular parts of the dependence on the regulator will be correctly calculated.

We have found that simplifications of integrands involving double poles can produce non-singular ($O(\epsilon^0)$) errors from inexact treatment of $O(1=\epsilon)$ shoulders of the $O(1=\epsilon^2)$ double poles multiplying terms of $O(\epsilon)$. Since energy weighting can reposition these shoulders in a complicated way, simplified EEC integrands may be especially prone to such errors. These errors cannot be corrected in any numerical integrals where $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ prior to integration. The subtraction method prescribes addition and subtraction of the same quantity but the added quantities are integrated analytically while subtracted quantities must be integrated numerically to cancel poles in the exact four-parton integrands. Thus the added and subtracted quantities may differ due to necessarily different regulation methods for the numerical and analytic integrals. In such cases, integration of the difference between simplified and exact integrands is not uniformly convergent near double poles and the integrals are finite only in the sense of a numerically computed average. This average will generally not be the correct result obtained by analytically setting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ after completing integration rather than before.

As a test for these errors in our calculation, the cancellation of double singularities was examined. Since analytic work is difficult for the four-parton states, we have focused on tests of numerical convergence. The scale of the independent variable controlling the singularities was magnified by a factor of 10^4 in a search for instabilities and neighborhoods of double poles were divided into separately integrated patches to isolate divergences. While further study is required, neither test produced signs of non-uniform convergence or error.

Ultimately theory must be compared with experiment, and tests of our calculation to data from SLD [7] have been performed [22]. Using the procedure adopted in [7], values for $\sigma_s(M_Z)$ were derived using the EEC as well as the asymmetry of the EEC or AEEC:

$$AEEC(\theta) = EEC(\theta) - EEC(\theta):$$

Renormalization scales used were in the range

$$\begin{aligned} 0.0035 (EEC) & \quad \frac{\mu^2}{E_{total}^2} & 4; \\ 0.09 (AEEC) & \end{aligned}$$

and while tests using KN and CE were found to have similar dependence, EEC tests using the larger CE values for B yield $\sigma_s(M_Z)$ values smaller by about 0.005 [22, 23]. Although all B calculations

yield larger $s(M_Z)$ values from EEC ts than from AEEC ts [7], it is interesting to note that the two differ by 0.012 for KN, as opposed to only 0.006 for CE [7, 22, 23]:

$$\begin{aligned} s_{(CE)}^{(EEC)}(M_Z) &= 0.118 \pm 0.013 (\text{scale}) \pm 0.002 (\text{hadronization}) \pm 0.003 (\text{experiment}); \\ s_{(CE)}^{(AEEC)}(M_Z) &= 0.112 \pm 0.003 (\text{scale}) \pm 0.002 (\text{hadronization}) \pm 0.003 (\text{experiment}): \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

While the improved agreement does not constitute evidence that our calculation is correct, it is an attractive and suggestive feature of the results.

We conclude that the disagreement over the next-to-leading order contribution to the EEC has not been resolved. Comparison of our calculation with all that is known about the EEC shows it to be reasonable and numerically reliable despite disagreement with previous calculations. A more intensive investigation of the cancellation of double singularities combined with a possible extension of our knowledge of the leading logarithm expansion is needed to resolve the differences.

Acknowledgments:

The authors gratefully acknowledge many helpful discussions with P. Burrows and H. Masuda concerning experimental results from SLD, and many useful communications with E. W. N. Glover concerning his results. This research was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, grant number DE-FG 06-91ER 40614.

R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] C . L . B a s h a m , L . S . B r o w n , S . D . E l l i s , a n d S . T . L o v e , P h y s . R e v . D 17 (1978) 2298; *ibid.* D 19 (1979) 2018; *ibid.* D 24 (1981) 2382; P h y s . R e v . L e t t . 41 (1978) 1585.
- [2] C . L . B a s h a m , L . S . B r o w n , S . D . E l l i s , a n d S . T . L o v e , P h y s . L e t t . 85B (1979) 297.
- [3] L . S . B r o w n a n d S . D . E l l i s , P h y s . R e v . D 24 (1981) 2383.
- [4] L . S . B r o w n , i n H i g h E n e r g y P h y s i c s i n t h e E i n s t e i n C e n t e n n i a l Y e a r , e d . B . K u r s u n o g l u , P l e n u m P u b l i s h i n g , (1979) p . 373
- [5] D E L P H I C c o l l a b o r a t i o n , P . A b r e u e t a l , P h y s . L e t t . 252B (1990) 149.
- [6] O P A L C c o l l a b o r a t i o n , M . A k r a w y e t a l , P h y s . L e t t . 252B (1990) 159; *ibid.* 296B (1992) 547.
- [7] S L D C o l l a b o r a t i o n , K . A b e e t a l , S L A C - P U B - 6641 (1994) t o a p p e a r i n P h y s . R e v . D 51 (1995); P h y s . R e v . D 50 (1994) 5580.
- [8] S . B e t h k e , i n t h e P r o c e e d i n g s o f t h e X X V I I n t e r n a t i o n a l C o n f e r e n c e o n H i g h E n e r g y P h y s i c s , e d . J . S a n f o r d , (1992) p . 81
- [9] A . A l i a n d F . B a r r e i r o , P h y s . L e t t . 118B (1982) 155; N u c l . P h y s . B 236 (1984) 269.
- [10] D . G . R i c h a r d s , W . J . S t i r l i n g , a n d S . D . E l l i s , P h y s . L e t t . 119B (1982) 193; N u c l . P h y s . B 229 (1983) 317.
- [11] N . K . F a l c k a n d G . K r a m e r , Z . P h y s , C 42 (1989) 459.
- [12] Z . K u n s z t a n d P . N a s o n , Z p h y s i c s a t L E P 1 , C E R N 89-08, v o l 1 , (1989) p . 373
- [13] E . W . N . G l o v e r a n d M . R . S u t t o n , U n i v e r s i t y o f D u r h a m p r e p r i n t D T P / 94/80, (1994).
- [14] K . A . C l a y a n d S . D . E l l i s , i n p r e p a r a t i o n .
- [15] G . S t e r m a n a n d S . W e i n b e r g , P h y s . R e v . L e t t . 39 (1977) 1436.
- [16] R . K . E l l i s , D . A . R o s s , a n d A . E . T e r r a n o , N u c l . P h y s . B 178 (1981) 421.
- [17] D . G . R i c h a r d s , W . J . S t i r l i n g , a n d S . D . E l l i s , P h y s . L e t t . 136B (1984) 99.
- [18] C . T . H . D a v i e s a n d W . J . S t i r l i n g , N u c l . P h y s . B 244 (1984) 337.
- [19] C . T . H . D a v i e s , B . R . W e b b e r , a n d W . J . S t i r l i n g , N u c l . P h y s . B 256 (1985) 413.
- [20] J . C . C o l l i n s , D . E . S o p e r , N u c l . P h y s . B 193 (1981) 381; *ibid.* B 197 (1982) 446; *ibid.* B 284 (1987) 253.
- [21] E . W . N . G l o v e r a n d M . R . S u t t o n , p e r s o n a l c o m m u n i c a t i o n .
- [22] P . B u r r o w s a n d H . M a s u d a , p e r s o n a l c o m m u n i c a t i o n .
- [23] S L D C o l l a b o r a t i o n , K . A b e e t a l , S L A C - P U B - 95-6739 (1995), s u b m i t t e d t o P h y s . R e v . D . (r a p i d c o m m u n i c a t i o n s) .

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9502223v4>