

Three{loop QED Vacuum Polarization and the Four{loop Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment^y

P. A. BAIKOV^z

Institute of Nuclear Physics, Moscow State University
119 899, Moscow, Russia

and

D. J. BROADHURST^x

Physics Department, Open University
Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK

Three{loop contributions to massive QED vacuum polarization are evaluated by a combination of analytical and numerical techniques. The first three Taylor coefficients, at small q^2 , are obtained analytically, using dimensional recurrence relations. Combining these with analytical input at threshold, and at large q^2 , an accurate Padé approximation is obtained, for all q^2 . Inserting this in the one{loop diagram for the muon anomalous magnetic moment, we find reasonable agreement with four{loop, single{electron{loop, muon{anomaly contributions, recently re{evaluated by Kinoshita, using 8{dimensional MonteCarlo integration. We believe that our new method is at least two orders of magnitude more accurate than the MonteCarlo approach, whose uncertainties appear to have been underestimated, by a factor of 6.

1. Introduction

We describe a method, previously tested¹ in two{loop QCD, to approximate, to high accuracy, three{loop contributions to QED vacuum polarization, using new analytical results for the small momentum {transfer limit, combined with asymptotic^{2;3;4} and threshold⁵ results. Related contributions to the four{loop muon anomalous magnetic moment are computed, to test an evaluation⁶ that was undertaken in response to a previous discrepancy between numerical⁷ and analytical⁸ work.

In the on{shell (OS) renormalization scheme of conventional QED, the renormalized photon propagator has a denominator $(1 + \Pi(z))$, where $z = q^2/4m^2$, with an electron mass m , and the vacuum polarization function, $\Pi(z)$, vanishes at $z = 0$. Non{relativistic consideration of the electron{positron system yields information about the threshold⁵ behaviour, as $z \rightarrow 1$. Moreover, the \overline{MS} asymptotic behaviour^{3;4}, as $z \rightarrow \infty$, combined with relations^{8;9} between the \overline{MS} and OS

^y Presented by P. A. Baikov, at the AI{HENP 95 workshop, Pisa, April 1995

^z INP{OU collaboration, supported in part by INTAS project 93{1180 (contract 1010{CT 93{0024)

^x Supported in part by the Russian Basic Research Foundation (grant N 93{02{14428);

Em ail: baikov@theory.npi.msu.su

^x Em ail: D.Broadhurst@open.ac.uk

schemes, yields two terms of the asymptotic expansion in powers of $1=z$.

The crucial new ingredient is our use of recurrence relations⁹, to obtain the first three terms of the expansion as $z \rightarrow 0$. Combining 6 analytical data with Pade^{1;10} (or hypergeometric^{1;11}) approximations, we shall produce reliable fits, for all z , and hence check four{loop momentum contributions⁶.

2. Small{momentum behaviour

We evaluated, to 3 loops, the first 3 moments in the $z \rightarrow 0$ expansion

$$\chi(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C_n z^n + O(z^4);$$

by intensive application of d{dimensional recurrence relations to three{loop massive vacuum diagram⁹, with propagators raised to powers up to 11, since up to 8 differentiations w.r.t. the external momentum q are required before setting it to zero. This put great demands on the REDUCE package RECURSOR⁹, which used 80 MB of memory, for 2 days, on a Dec Alpha machine, after hand{tuning the procedures, to minimize recomputation of integrals, and to allow safe truncation in $d = (4 - \epsilon) = 2$. The gauge invariance of C_1 and C_2 was verified for all d . After OS mass^{12;13} and charge⁹ renormalization, we obtained the finite $z \rightarrow 0$ limits

$$C_1 = \sum_n N^2 \left[\frac{8}{15} z^2 + \frac{203}{864} z^3 + \frac{11407}{11664} z^4 + N \left(\frac{1}{5} \ln 2 \right) z^2 + \frac{22781}{6912} z^3 + \frac{8687}{3456} z^4 + \frac{O(z^3)}{3} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{82}{81} N \frac{z^2}{2} + \frac{4}{15} N z \right]; \quad (1)$$

$$C_2 = \sum_n N^2 \left[\frac{16}{35} z^2 + \frac{14203}{73728} z^3 + \frac{1520789}{1658880} z^4 + N \left(\frac{6}{7} \right) z \left(\frac{8}{5} \ln 2 \right) z^2 + \frac{4857587}{184320} z^3 + \frac{223404289}{7464960} z^4 + \frac{O(z^3)}{3} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{449}{675} N \frac{z^2}{2} + \frac{4}{35} N z \right]; \quad (2)$$

$$C_3 = \sum_n N^2 \left(\frac{128}{315} z^2 + \frac{12355}{55296} z^3 + \frac{83936527}{93312000} z^4 \right) \\ + N \left(\frac{16}{21} \right) z \left(\frac{8}{5} \ln 2 \right) z^2 + \frac{33067024499}{206438400} z^3 + \frac{885937890461}{4644864000} z^4 + \frac{O(z^3)}{3} \\ + \frac{249916}{496125} N \frac{z^2}{2} + \frac{64}{945} N z; \quad (3)$$

where we follow common practice⁸, by allowing for N degenerate leptons. In pure QED, $N = 1$; formally, the powers of N serve to count the number of electron loops. Our principal interest, for consideration of four{loop momentum contributions⁶, is $\chi_3^{[1]}(z) = z^3$, the three{loop contributions to χ_3 that involve a single electron loop. The moments of $\chi_3^{[1]}(z)$ are given by the coefficients of $N^3 = z^3$. (We shall not need the $N^2 = z^3$ terms in Section 6, since the momentum contributions of the diagrams with two electron loops are better understood^{8;14}.)

3. Large{momentum behaviour

The situation regarding the $z \rightarrow 1$ behaviour of $\Gamma_3(z)$ was unclear, until recently, because three{loop $\overline{\text{MS}}$ QCD results² had been altered, while obtaining QED results³, in the belief (now known⁴ to be mistaken) that the former contained errors. Further calculation¹⁵ confirmed the QCD results² and hence invalidated the O(1=z) QED results³. Accordingly, we thought it prudent to derive the OS asymptotic behaviour ourselves, from first principles, using the REDUCE package SLICER, which had been written specially to check⁸ the leading, massless, $\overline{\text{MS}}$ behaviour, obtained³ with the SCHOONSCHIP package MINCER¹⁶.

In our *ab initio* derivation of the asymptotic OS result for $\Gamma_3^{[1]}$, we used neither the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, nor MINCER. Instead, the asymptotic expansion of the bare diagrams was obtained, in dimensions, using SLICER, and the bare charge and mass were transformed directly to the physical charge and mass, using multiplicative OS renormalizations^{9;13}, obtained by RECURSOR. Setting $\epsilon = 0$, we obtained a finite OS result of the form

$$\Gamma_3^{[1]}(z) = A(z) + B(z)z + O(L^3=z^2);$$

where $L = \ln(4z) = \ln(q^2=m^2)$ and

$$A(z) = \frac{121}{192} + \frac{5}{2} \zeta_5 - \frac{99}{64} \zeta_3 + 2 \ln 2 - \frac{5}{8} \zeta_2 + \frac{1}{32} L; \quad (4)$$

$$B(z) = \frac{139}{48} - \frac{35}{24} \zeta_5 - \frac{41}{48} \zeta_3 + 3 \ln 2 - \frac{5}{8} \zeta_2 - \frac{3}{32} L - 6L^2; \quad (5)$$

Using finite transformations^{9;12} from physical to $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalized quantities, one obtains, from our OS result, an $\overline{\text{MS}}$ asymptotic behaviour identical to that which would¹⁷ have been obtained from the QCD analysis², had it not been miscorrected in the course of deriving QED results³. As a result of our, and other¹⁵, work, a (second) erratum⁴ to the QED work³ was issued.

In conclusion, we are confident of our OS QED result, since it is quite independent of previous works^{2;3;15} and, eventually^{4;17}, in agreement with them.

4. Threshold behaviour

The leading threshold behaviour, at 3 loops, is determined by non-relativistic quantum mechanics: $\Gamma_3^{[1]}(z) = \frac{1}{24} \zeta_5 (1-z)^{1=2} + O(\ln(1-z))$, as $z \rightarrow 1$. Moreover, it appears^{5;18} that a stronger statement can be made, namely that the first relativistic correction to the spectral density, $\text{Im}(\Gamma(t+i0))$, at any given order in ϵ , is cancelled in the combination $(1+4\epsilon) \text{Im}(\Gamma(t+i0))$. At the two{loop level, the exact relativistic results confirm that $\zeta_2(t) + 4 \zeta_1(t) = \zeta_2 + O(v^2)$ is free of a term of first order in v ($1=1=t$)¹⁼². The corresponding cancellation at 3 loops is expected¹⁸ to occur in $v(\Gamma_3^{[1]} + 4 \zeta_2) = \frac{1}{24} \zeta_4 + O(v^2)$, implying that

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 1} \Gamma_3^{[1]}(z) + 4 \zeta_2(z) = \frac{\zeta_5}{24(1-z)^{1=2}} = \text{constant}; \quad (6)$$

with an unknown value for the constant, but no logarithmic singularity.

5. Approximation method

We express the analytical results (16) as properties of the combination

$$\sim_3^{[1]}(z) = \sim_3^{[1]}(z) + 4 \sim_2(z) + (1-z)G(z) - \frac{9}{4}G(z) + \frac{31}{16} + \frac{229}{32z} - \frac{229}{32z} - \frac{173}{96}; \quad (7)$$

where $G(z) = {}_2F_1(1; 1; \frac{3}{2}; z)$ is given by $(z^2 - z)^{-1/2} \operatorname{arcsinh}(-z)^{1/2}$, on the negative real axis, and the two-loop term, $\sim_2(z)$, is quadratic in $G(z)$ and involves a trilogarithm⁸ and its derivative.

The data are conveniently encoded by the moments

$$M(n) = \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{t^{n+1}} \sim_3^{[1]}(t)$$

of the spectral density of $\sim_3^{[1]}$. At small z , we have $\sim_3^{[1]}(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} M(n) z^n$ and hence obtain $M(1), M(2), M(3)$ from the coefficients of $N^{-3} = z^3$ in the results of Eqs (1,2,3) for the moments of $\sim_3(z)$, after taking account of the known moments of the additional terms in Eq (7). At large z , the logarithmic singularities of these additional terms cancel, by deliberate construction, those of Eqs (4,5), whose constant terms therefore determine $M(0)$ and $M(-1)$, respectively. Finally, the threshold Coulomb singularity of Eq (6) gives the large- n behaviour of the ratio

$$R(n) = \frac{M(n)}{C(n)} = \frac{4}{24} + O(1/n); \quad C(n) = \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{t^{n+1}} \sim_3^{[c]}(t) = \frac{(1)_{n+1}}{2^{n+2}};$$

where $C(n)$ is the moment of a spectral density $\sim_3^{[c]}(t) = t^{-3/2}(t-1)^{-1/2}$, with a Coulombic $1=\sqrt{}$ threshold singularity and the same convergence properties, at large t , as $\sim_3^{[1]}(t)$. Note that a further datum, namely the absence of a logarithmic singularity in Eq (6), corresponds to the absence of an $O(1/n^{1/2})$ term in $R(n)$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, partly accounting for the remarkable uniformity of our analytical database:

$$\begin{aligned} R(-1) &= \frac{3}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{5}{8} + \frac{41}{96} + \frac{35}{48} + \frac{911}{384} = 3.473721028889 \\ R(0) &= \frac{3}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{5}{8} + \frac{1065}{256} + \frac{15}{8} + \frac{307}{256} = 4.087577319347 \\ R(1) &= \frac{3}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{5}{8} + \frac{113905}{36864} + \frac{35551}{55296} = 4.188975919282 \\ R(2) &= \frac{3}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{5}{8} + \frac{34003109}{1179648} + \frac{7229411363}{238878720} = 4.216954083059 \\ R(3) &= \frac{3}{2} \ln 2 - \frac{5}{8} + \frac{33067024499}{167772160} + \frac{6144308789323}{26424115200} = 4.224481581719 \\ R(4) &= \frac{15}{4} = 4.058712126417 \end{aligned}$$

which has been obtained from 3 quite disparate regimes.


Now we map¹ the cut z -plane onto the unit disk, and define a mapped function

$$P(j) = \frac{1}{(1+j)^2} \sim_3^{[1]}(z) = \sim_3^{[1]}(1-j); \quad z = \frac{4}{(1+j)^2}; \quad (8)$$

which is analytic for $|j| < 1$, with the cut mapped to the unit circle. The 6 data then determine $P(-1); P(0); P'(0); P''(0); P'''(0); P(1)$, allowing us to construct $[2/3]$ and $[3/2]$ Padé approximants¹, with benign poles outside the unit disk, and imaginary parts on the unit circle that accurately approximate the spectral density. The differences between these two approximations are very small, for all $|j| \leq 1$.

6. Four{loop contribution to the Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment

Our simple rational approximations to $P(!)$ reproduce, exactly, all known data on $A_3^{[1]}$, as well as its analyticity structure. We now use them to calculate the four{loop contribution⁶, $a = A_4^{[1]} = 4$, to the muon anomaly, $(g=2-1)$, due to insertion of three{loop, single{electron{loop vacuum polarization diagrams into the one{loop anomaly diagram. A typical diagram is




The resulting coefficient of $4 = 4$ in the muon anomaly is given by¹⁴

$$A_4^{[1]} = \int_0^1 dy (1-y) A_3^{[1]}(z); \quad z = \frac{m^2}{4m^2-1} \frac{y^2}{y}; \quad (9)$$

We calculate the integral using $[3/2]$, $[2/3]$, and $[2/2]$ Padé approximants to $P(!)$. In the $[2/2]$ approximants we omit a piece of data from each regime, obtaining

Input	all	all	omit Eq (3)	omit Eq (5)	omit Eq (6)
Padé	$[3=2]$	$[2=3]$	$[2;2]$	$[2=2]$	$[2=2]$
$A_4^{[1]}$	0.23036220	0.23036218	0.23036042	0.23036694	0.23036149

with a muon mass $m = 206.768262m$. The stability is remarkable: changing the Padé method from $[3/2]$ to $[2/3]$ changes the output by 1 part in 10^7 ; removing a piece of data, from any of the 3 regimes, changes it by no more than 2 parts in 10^5 . The improvement from using 6 inputs, as opposed to 5, is greatest in the case of including the asymptotic result of Eq (5). In contrast, the Coulomb datum, $R(1) = \frac{1}{24} 4$, improves the result by only 3 parts in 10^6 , since the muon{anomaly integral (9) involves only spacelike momenta. The smallness of our spread of results demonstrates a high degree of consistency in the input, making the possibility of analytical error very remote. Being conservative, we take the range of $[2/2]$ results as a measure of our uncertainty, and arrive at $A_4^{[1]} = 0.230362(5)$, to be compared with a recent⁶ Monte Carlo result, $A_4^{[1]} = 0.2415(19)$, obtained using VEGAS, in preference to RIWIAD (which gave⁷ a grossly discrepant value, amended⁶ in the light of a renormalization{group analysis⁸). In visual terms, the comparison is



To verify that this discrepancy is not an artifact of the Padé method, we also tried a hypergeometric¹¹ method, i.e. a polynomial $t \rightarrow {}_3^{[1]}(t) = {}_3^{[c]}(t) \frac{1}{24} = \sum_{k \geq 1} c_k v^k$, with 5 coefficients, fixed by $R(n) \frac{1}{24} = \sum_k c_k \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{n+2} = \frac{k+1}{2} \frac{1}{n+2}$. As might be expected, the resultant fit to the spectral density ${}_3^{[1]}(t)$ was less smooth than in our Padé methods. Nevertheless, the shift in the value for $A_4^{[1]}$ was two orders of magnitude less than the disagreement with the Monte Carlo result.

In conclusion, we stress that the analytical data of Eqs (16) exhibit a high degree of internal consistency, making it most unlikely that any of them is in error. Padé approximants for the mapping (8) of the well-behaved function (7) enable us to evaluate the muon anomaly contribution (9) with an uncertainty of 2 parts in 10^5 . Our result is in reasonable agreement with a recent, lower-precision, Monte Carlo re-evaluation⁶, whose uncertainties appear to have been underestimated by a factor of 6, which is a great improvement on the situation revealed by a previous discrepancy between analytical⁸ and numerical⁷ work.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to K.G.Chetyrkin, A.L.Kataev and V.A.Smirnov, for discussions of asymptotic behaviour, to M.B.Voloshin, for discussion of threshold behaviour, to T.Kinoshita, for correspondence on the muon anomaly, and to A.C.Heam, for adapting REDUCE¹⁹ to suit the needs of RECURSOR. (The file to update REDUCE 3.5 is obtained by asking `reduce-netlib@rand.org` to 'send patches.red'.)

References

1. D.J.Broadhurst, P.A.Baikov, V.A.Ilyin, J.Fleischer, O.V.Tarasov, V.A.Smirnov, Phys.Lett. B 329 (1994) 103.
2. S.G.Gorishny, A.L.Kataev, S.A.Larin, Nuovo Cim ento 92A (1986) 119.
3. S.G.Gorishny, A.L.Kataev, S.A.Larin, Phys.Lett. B 273 (1991) 141; S.G.Gorishny, A.L.Kataev, S.A.Larin, Phys.Lett. B 275 (1992) 512 (Erratum # 1).
4. S.G.Gorishny, A.L.Kataev, S.A.Larin, Phys.Lett. B 341 (1995) 448 (Erratum # 2).
5. B.H.Smith, M.B.Voloshin, Phys.Lett. B 324 (1994) 117; B 333 (1994) 564 (Erratum).
6. T.Kinoshita, Phys.Rev. D 47 (1993) 5013.
7. T.Kinoshita, B.Nizic, Y.Okamoto, Phys.Rev. D 41 (1990) 593.
8. D.J.Broadhurst, A.L.Kataev, O.V.Tarasov, Phys.Lett. B 298 (1993) 445.
9. D.J.Broadhurst, Z.Phys. C 54 (1992) 559.
10. D.J.Broadhurst, J.Fleischer, O.V.Tarasov, Z.Phys. C 60 (1993) 287.
11. P.A.Baikov, V.A.Ilyin, V.A.Smirnov, Phys.At.Nucl. B 56(11) (1993) 1527.
12. N.Gray, D.J.Broadhurst, W.Grafe, K.Schilcher, Z.Phys. C 48 (1990) 673.
13. D.J.Broadhurst, N.Gray, K.Schilcher, Z.Phys. C 52 (1991) 111.
14. D.J.Broadhurst, Z.Phys. C 58 (1993) 339.
15. K.G.Chetyrkin, A.Kwiatkowski, Z.Phys. C 59 (1993) 525.
16. S.G.Gorishny, S.A.Larin, F.V.Tkachov, INR P {0330 (1984); S.G.Gorishny, S.A.Larin, L.R.Surguladze, F.V.Tkachov, Comput.Phys.Comm un. 55 (1989) 381.
17. A.L.Kataev, private communication.
18. M.B.Voloshin, private communication.
19. A.C.Heam, REDUCE User's Manual, Version 3.5, Rand publication CP 78 (1993).