Constraints on "Second Order Fixed Point" QCD from the CCFR Data on Deep Inelastic Neutrino-Nucleon Scattering

A leksander V . Sidorov Bogoliubov Theoretical Laboratory Joint Institute for Nuclear Research 141980 Dubna, Russia E-mail: sidorov@thsun1.jjnr.dubna.su

D im iter B. Stam enov Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy Bulgarian Academ y of Sciences Boul. T sarigradsko chausse 72, So a 1784, Bulgaria E-m ailistam enov@bgeam.acad.bg

Abstract

The results of LO Fixed point QCD (FP-QCD) analysis of the CCFR data for the nucleon structure function $xF_3(x;Q^2)$ are presented. The predictions of FP-QCD, in which the Callan-Symanzik function admits a second order ultraviolet zero at $= _0$ are in good agreement with the data. Constraints for the possible values of the function parameter b regulating how fast $_s(Q^2)$ tends to its asymptotic value $_0 \notin 0$ are found from the data. The corresponding values of $_0$ are also determined. Having in mind our recent "First order xed point" QCD t to the same data we conclude that in spite of the high precision and the large $(x;Q^2)$ kinematic range of the CCFR data they cannot discrim inate between QCD and FP-QCD predictions for $xF_3(x;Q^2)$.

1. Introduction.

The success of perturbative Q uantum C hrom odynamics (QCD) in the description of the high energy physics of strong interactions is considerable. The QCD predictions are in good quantitative agreement with a great number of data on lepton-hadron and hadron-hadron processes in a large kinematic region (e.g. see reviews [1] and the references therein). Despite of this success of QCD, we consider that it is useful and reasonable to put the question: D o the present data fully exclude the so-called xed point (FP) theory models [2] ?

We rem ind that these models are not asymptotically free. The elective coupling constant ${}_{s}(Q^{2})$ approaches a constant value ${}_{0} \notin 0$ as Q^{2} ! 1 (the so-called xed point at which the Callan-Symanzik -function $({}_{0}) = 0$). Using the assumption that ${}_{0}$ is smallone can make predictions for the physical quantities in the high energy region, as like in QCD, and confront them to the experimental data. Such a test of FP theory models has been made [3, 4] by using the data of deep inelastic lepton-nucleon experiments started by the SLAC-M IT group [5] at the end of the sixties and perform ed in the seventies [6]. It was shown that

i) the predictions of the FP theory models with scalar and non-colored (Abelian) vector gluons do not agree with the data

ii) the data cannot distinguish between di erent form s of scaling violation predicted by QCD and the so-called Fixed point QCD (FP-QCD), a theory with colored vector gluons, in which the elective coupling constant $_{s}(Q^{2})$ does not vanish when Q^{2} tends to in nity.

We think there are two reasons to discuss again the predictions of FP-QCD. First of all, there is evidence from the non-perturbative lattice calculations [7] that the – function in QCD vanishes at a nonzero coupling $_0$ that is small. (N ote that the structure of the –function can be studied only by non-perturbative methods.) Secondly, in the last years the accuracy and the kinematic region of deep inelastic scattering data became large enough, which makes us hope that discrimination between QCD and FP-QCD could be performed.

Recently we have analyzed the CCFR deep inelastic neutrino-nucleon scattering data [8] in the fram ework of the Fixed point QCD. It was demonstrated [9] that the data for the nucleon structure function $xF_3(x;Q^2)$ are in good agreement with the LO predictions of this theory model using the assumption that the function has a rst

2

order ultraviolet zero (xed point) at $= _0$ that is small.

Having in m ind that up to now the structure of the xed point theory is not well known, it seems to us to be useful to m ake predictions for the physical quantities studying the dierent hypotheses about the function behaviour near it xed point $_0$ and confront them to the data.

In this letter we present a leading order F ixed point QCD analysis of the CCFR data [8], in which an expression for $xF_3(x;Q^2)$ based on the assumption that the Callan-Sym anzik function has a second order ultraviolet zero at $=_0$ is used. We remind that the structure function xF_3 is a pure non-singlet and the results of the analysis are independent of the assumption on the shape of gluons. As in a previous analysis the m ethod [10] of reconstruction of the struct functions from their M ellin m om ents is used. This m ethod is based on the Jacobi polynom ial expansion [11] of the structure functions. In [12] this m ethod has been already applied to the QCD analysis of the CCFR data.

2. M ethod and Results of A nalysis.

Let us start with the basic form ulas needed for our analysis. The M ellin m oments of the structure function $xF_3(x;Q^2)$ are de ned as:

$$M_{n}^{NS}(Q^{2}) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx x^{n^{2}} x F_{3}(x;Q^{2}); \qquad (1)$$

where n = 1;2;3;4; ...:

In the case of FP-QCD the elective coupling constant ${}_{\rm s}$ (Q 2) at large Q 2 takes the form :

$$_{s}(Q^{2}) = _{0} + f(Q^{2});$$
 (2)

where $f(Q^2)! 0$ when $Q^2! 1$:

Let us assume that $_0$ is a second order ultraviolet xed point for the -function, i.e.

$$() = b(_{0})^{2}; b > 0:$$
 (3)

Then

$${}_{s}(Q^{2}) = {}_{0} + \frac{{}_{s}(Q^{2}_{0}) {}_{0}}{1 + b [{}_{s}(Q^{2}_{0}) {}_{0}] \ln (Q^{2} = Q^{2}_{0})}$$
(4)

and we obtain for the m om ents of xF_3 the following leading order expression:

$$M_{n}^{NS} (Q^{2}) = M_{n}^{NS} (Q_{0}^{2})^{"} \frac{Q_{0}^{2}}{Q^{2}}^{\# \frac{1}{2} d_{n}^{NS}} F_{n} (Q^{2});$$
(5)

where

$$F_{n}(Q^{2}) = \frac{1}{1 + b \left[s(Q_{0}^{2}) - 0 \right] \ln (Q^{2} = Q_{0}^{2})}$$
(6)

In (5) and (6)

$$d_{n}^{NS} = \frac{0}{4} \frac{0}{n}$$
(7)

and

$${}_{n}^{(0)NS} = \frac{8}{3} \left[1 - \frac{2}{n(n+1)} + 4 \right]_{j=2}^{X^{n}} \frac{1}{j} \left[1 - \frac{2}{n(n+1)} + 4 \right]_{j=2}^{X^{n}} \frac{1}{j} \left[1 - \frac{2}{n(n+1)} \right]_{j=2}^{X^{n}} \frac{1}{j} \left[1 - \frac{2}{n(n+1)} + 4 \right]_{j=2}^{X^{n}} \frac{1}{j} \left[1 - \frac{2}{n($$

The n dependence of $n^{(0)NS}$ is exactly the same as in QCD, if we assume that the Perturbative QCD expansion for the anom abus dimensions $n^{NS}(s)$ is valid in the range of sm all s including the xed point 0 too. However, the Q² behaviour of the moments is dimensioned of the dimension Q^2 behaviour of the moments is dimensioned of the dimension of the B jorken scaling for the moments of the structure functions is broken by powers in Q² in addition to the usual ln Q² term s. In (6) and (7) 0 and b are parameters, to be determined from the data.

Having in hand the moments (5) and following the method [10, 11], we can write the structure function xF_3 in the form:

$$xF_{3}^{N_{max}}(x;Q^{2}) = x (1 x) \sum_{n=0}^{N_{X_{1}ax}} (x) C_{j}^{(n)}(x) M_{j+2}^{NS} Q^{2}; \qquad (9)$$

where $_{n}$ (x) is a set of Jacobi polynom ials and c_{j}^{n} (;) are coe cients of the series of $_{n}$ ' (x) in powers in x:

$$a_{n}^{\prime}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=0}^{X^{n}} c_{j}^{(n)}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{x}^{j}$$
 (10)

 N_{max} ; and have to be chosen so as to achieve the fastest convergence of the series in the R.H.S. of Eq. (9) and to reconstruct xF_3 with the accuracy required. Following the results of [10] we use = 0:12; = 2:0 and N_{max} = 12. These numbers guarantee accuracy better than 10³. Finally we have to parametrize the structure function xF_3 at some xed value of $Q^2 = Q_0^2$. We choose $xF_3(x;Q^2)$ in the form :

$$xF_{3}(x;Q_{0}^{2}) = Ax^{B}(1 x)^{C}$$
: (11)

The parameters A, B and C in Eq. (11) and the FP-QCD parameters $_0$ and b are free parameters which are determined by the t to the data.

In our analysis the target m ass corrections [13] are taken into account. To avoid the in uence of higher{twist e ects we have used only the experimental points in the plane $(x;Q^2)$ with $10 < Q^2$ 501 (GeV=c)². This cut corresponds to the following x range: 0:015 x 0:65.

The results of the tare presented in Table 1. In all ts only statistical errors are taken into account.

b	2 d:f:	0		s(M ² _z) _{FP QCD}	
0.9	83.5/61	0.029	0.014	0.123	0.022
1.0	83.3/61	0.040	0.014	0.126	0.021
1.1	83.1/61	0.048	0.014	0.128	0.021
1.3	82.9/61	0.063	0.013	0.133	0.019
1.5	82.6/61	0.074	0.013	0.136	0.019

Table 1. The results of the LO FP-QCD to the CCFR xF_3 data. $^2_{d:f:}$ is the ²-parameter normalized to the degree of freedom d:f:.

Summarizing the results in the Table one can conclude:

1. The values of $^2_{d:f:}$ are practically the same as in the case of a rst order ultraviolet xed point for the function [9]. They are slightly smaller than those obtained in the LO QCD analysis [12] of the CCFR data by the same method and indicate a good description of the data.

2. It is seen from the Table that $_0$ increases with increasing b. The values of b, for which the asymptotic coupling $_0$ is acceptable, are found to range in the following interval:

$$0 < b \quad 1.5:$$
 (12)

For the values of b > 1:5 the corresponding theoretical values for (M_z^2) obtained by the Eq.(4) are bigger than $_{s}(M_z^2)$ determined from the LEP experiments [14]:

$$_{\rm s}$$
 (M $_{\rm z}^2$) = 0:125 0:005 : (13)

For the values of b sm aller than 0.9_{0} can not be determined from CCFR data. The errors in $_{0}$ exceed the mean values of this parameter.

3. The accuracy of determ ination of $_0$ is not good enough. The accuracy increases with increasing b.

4. The values of $_0 = 0.029$; 0.040; 0.048 corresponding to b = 0.9; 1.0; 1.1 are preferred to the other values of $_0$ determined from the data.

5. The values of ${}_{s}(M_{z}^{2})$ corresponding to the values of b from the range (12) are in agreement within one standard deviation with ${}_{s}(M_{z}^{2})$ determined from the LEP experiments.

6. The values of the parameters A, B and C are in agreement with the results of [9] and [12]. For illustration we present here the values of these parameters at $Q_0^2 = 3 (\text{GeV}=c)^2$ for b = 1.0 :

A = 7.07 0.20; B = 0.865 0.013; C = 3.43 0.004:

They are found to be independent of b and $_0$. We have found also that multiplying the R H S. of (11) by term (1 + x) one can not in prove the t.

Sum m ary.

The CCFR deep inelastic neutrino-nucleon scattering data have been analyzed in the fram ework of the Fixed point QCD. It has been demonstrated that the data for the nucleon structure function $xF_3(x;Q^2)$ are in good agreement with the LO predictions of this quantum eld theory model using the assumption that $_0$ is a second order ultraviolet xed point of the function and $_0$ is small. Some constraints on the behaviour of the function near $_0$ have been found from the data. The values for

0:029 0:048;

corresponding to the function parameter b in the range

are preferred to the other ones determ ined from the data.

In conclusion, taking into account also our previous results [9] in the case of function with a rst order xed point, we nd that the CCFR data, the most precise data on deep inelastic scattering at present, do not elim inate the FP-QCD and therefore other tests have to be made in order to distinguish between QCD and FP-QCD.

6

A first completion of this work we learned about the paper [15] where the measured inclusive cross section in pp collisions at p = 1.3 TeV has been presented. It has been shown that the cross section for jets with $E_t > 200$ GeV is significantly higher than predictions based on perturbative QCD.

Having in m ind that at such large energies $_{s}(Q^{2})$ in FP-QCD runs slower than its perturbatively predicted rate we hope this fact could help to explain the deviation from the perturbative QCD predictions mentioned above.

A cknow ledgm ents

W e are grateful to A L.K ataev and C.V.M ihaylov for useful discussions and remarks. One of us (D.S) would like to thank also I.T.Todorov for calling his attention to the papers of A.Patrascioiu and E.Seiler, in which the problem on vanishing of the function in QCD at nonzero coupling is discussed.

This research was partly supported by the Russian Fond for Fundam ental Research G rant N 96-02-17435-a and by the Bulgarian Science Foundation under Contract Ph 510.

References

- G.A Itarelli, in Proc. of the \QCD -20 Years Later" Conf. 9-13 June 1992, Aachen;
 W orld Scienti c 1993, v. 1., p. 172; Ed. by P.M. Zerwas and H.A.Kastrup.
 S.Bethke.Proc.QCD -94 Conference, Montpelier, France, July 1994.
- [2] A.M. Polyakov, ZHETF 59 (1970) 542.G.Mack, Nucl. Phys. B 35 (1971) 592;
 A.V.Efrem ov and IF.G inzburg, Phys. Lett. B 36 (1972) 371; D.Bailin and A.
 Love, Nucl. Phys. B 75 (1974) 159.
- [3] M.Gluck and E.Reya, Phys. Rev. D. 16 (1977) 3242; Nucl. Phys. B 156 (1979) 456.
- [4] S.I.Bilenkaya and D.B.Stam enov, Sov.J. of Nucl. Phys. 31 (1980) 122.
- [5] D.H.Coward et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 20 (1968) 292; E.D.B.bom et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23 (1969) 930; H.Breidenbach et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 23 (1969) 935.
- [6] R.G. Roberts and M.R. W halley, J. Phys. G.; Nucl. Part. Phys. 17 (1991) D1-D151.

- [7] A. Patrascioiu and E. Seiler, Expected Deviations from Perturbative QCD at 1 TeV or Less, preprint M PI-Ph/92-18; Scaling, A symptotic Scaling and Improved Perturbation Theory, preprint M PI-Ph/93-34; J. Finberg, U. Heller and F. Karsh, Nucl. Phys. B 392 (1993) 493, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74 (1995) 1924.
- [8] CCFR Collab., S.R.M ishra et al., Nevis Preprint N 1459 (1992); CCFR Collab.,
 W .C.Leung et al., Phys. Lett. B 317 (1993) 655; CCFR Collab., P.Z.Quintas et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 71 (1993) 1307.
- [9] A.V. Sidorov and D.B. Stam enov, Phys. Lett. B 357 (1995) 423.
- [10] V.G.Krivokhizhin et al., Z.Phys.C36 (1987) 51;
 V.G.Krivokhizhin et al., Z.Phys.C48 (1990) 347.
- [11] G.Parisi and N. Sourlas, Nucl. Phys. B 151 (1979) 421;
 I.S.Barker, C.B.Langensiepen and G.Shaw, Nucl. Phys. B 186 (1981) 61.
- [12] A.L.Kataev and A.V.Sidorov, Phys. Lett. B 331 (1994) 179.
- [13] O.Nachtmann, Nucl. Phys. B 63 (1973) 237;S.W andzura, Nucl. Phys. B 122 (1977) 412.
- [14] G.A Larelli, Talk at the Four Seas Conference, Trieste, Italy, June, 1955.
- [15] F.Abe et al., Inclusive Jet Cross Section in pp collisions at p = 1.8 TeV, Ferm ilab preprint PUB-96/020-E, 1996.