

RESUMMATION IN HEAVY QUARK AND JET CROSS SECTIONS¹

Nikolaos Kidonakis and George Sterman

*Institute for Theoretical Physics
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, NY 11794-3840, USA*

Abstract

We discuss corrections from the elastic limit (partonic threshold) in hadronic hard-scattering cross sections. We show why these corrections can be large at all orders in perturbation theory, and describe their resummation to arbitrary logarithmic accuracy. In particular, we discuss the role of color exchange in the hard scattering. This enables us to generalize the resummation of the Drell-Yan cross section to QCD reactions. As an example, we give the explicit resummed hard-scattering cross section for heavy-quark production through light quark annihilation, which takes into account next-to-leading logarithms to all orders.

¹Presented at *Les Rencontres de Physique de la Vallée d'Aoste*, La Thuile, Aosta Valley, March 4-9, 1996.

1 Introduction: Perturbative QCD in Perspective

Among the motivations for studying perturbative QCD at high energy are: (i) to test QCD as a quantum field theory and as a component of the standard model; (ii) to infer the presence of phenomena beyond the standard model through deviations from its predictions and (iii) to understand backgrounds from QCD to signals of new particles or nonstandard interactions. All of these, but especially (ii) when the deviation from standard model predictions is modest, require us to use QCD as a precision tool. Hints of such deviations that are on everyone's mind right now are in the running of α_s , in R_b , and in very high- p_T jets. Whether they persist or not, these examples all suggest the need to further improve the theory. Such improvements will require control over a class of corrections associated with what is often called “partonic threshold”, or more accurately the elastic limit in partonic hard scattering. They appear first at next-to-leading order in hard-scattering cross sections, and recur in all orders. This talk will describe the nature of these corrections, and report on some progress [1] in their resummation to all orders in perturbation theory.

Before going further, we may distinguish two scenarios for the phenomenological application of resummed cross sections. Corrections due to resummation may turn out to be small, in which case our confidence in low-order perturbative cross sections should increase, and our ability to detect new physics through deviations from QCD predictions should improve. Or, they may turn out to be large, and may afford tests of QCD, and indeed of quantum field theory, in a new regime, where all orders of perturbation theory are relevant. It is possible that both scenarios apply in different cross sections. It's a “win-win” situation. We begin by reviewing a few facts about the calculation of hard-scattering cross sections in perturbative QCD.

2 The Elastic Limit in Hard Inclusive Scattering

2.1 Factorized Cross Sections

We will be interested in inclusive cross sections at large momentum transfer through strong interactions. In such cross sections we sum over all final states that include a particular heavy system F , which can only be produced by a short-distance process in partonic scattering. Outstanding examples of F are a top-antitop pair, or a pair of jets at very high transverse momentum.

We suppose for simplicity that the total mass Q of the system F is of order S , the total (hadronic) center of mass energy squared, and that the rapidity y of the produced system is not large. Any such cross section can be computed by combining parton distributions with perturbative calculations in the factorized expression [2]

$$\frac{d\sigma_{AB\rightarrow FX}}{dQ^2 dy} = \sum_{ab} \int_{Q^2/S}^1 dz \int \frac{dx_a}{x_a} \frac{dx_b}{x_b} \phi_{a/A}(x_a, Q^2) \phi_{b/B}(x_b, Q^2) \times \delta\left(z - \frac{Q^2}{x_a x_b S}\right) \hat{\sigma}_{ab\rightarrow FX}(z, y, x_a/x_b, \alpha_s(Q^2)), \quad (1)$$

which is illustrated in fig. 1. The ϕ 's are usual parton distributions (in some factorization scheme, like DIS or $\overline{\text{MS}}$), and $\hat{\sigma}$ is a partonic hard-scattering function, which at lowest order (parton model) is the Born cross section for $a + b \rightarrow F + X$,

$$\hat{\sigma} = \sigma_{\text{Born}} + \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \hat{\sigma}^{(1)} + \dots \quad (2)$$

$\hat{\sigma}^{(1)}$ is known for many processes, notably Drell-Yan [3], direct photon [4], heavy-quark [5], and jet production [6]. We will be interested in the elastic limit (see below), or partonic threshold of this function. Two- (and sometimes even three-) loop corrections of this sort are also known in deeply inelastic scattering (DIS) and Drell-Yan (DY) cross sections [7].

2.2 What Threshold?

The kinematics of the partonic process require that $x_a x_b S \geq Q^2$, so that $z \leq 1$ in eq. (1). At $z = 1$, the partons have just enough energy to produce the observed final state, with no extra hadronic radiation. This is what we shall refer to as the “elastic limit”, or “partonic threshold”. It is important to distinguish partonic threshold from the usual concept of a threshold. In particular, in heavy quark production, we shall assume that the heavy quarks of mass M are produced with nonzero velocity β , and hence with a total invariant mass $Q^2 > 4M^2$. Thus, only for $\beta = 0$ does partonic threshold coincide with true threshold. For the Drell-Yan production of highly relativistic lepton pairs with $Q^2 \gg 4m_\ell^2$, partonic threshold still refers to $z = 1$, and is the source of potentially large corrections.

2.3 Why Large?

Typical hard-scattering cross sections are distributions in the variable z rather than simply functions of z , because they include contributions from virtual as well as real gluons. We




Figure 1: Hard-scattering cross section in cut (unitarity) diagram notation.

are interested in a class of large, positive corrections due to such distributions that occur in all $\sigma^{(n)}$. Let us explain in what sense they are “large”, and why they are positive to all orders.

At order α_s^n , the leading logarithmic distributions in eq. (1) are of the form [3, 7, 8]

$$-\frac{\alpha_s^n}{n!} \left[\frac{\ln^{2n+1}((1-z)^{-1})}{1-z} \right]_+, \quad (3)$$

whose integral with a smooth function $\mathcal{F}(z)$ (such as the convolution of parton distributions in eq. (1)) is

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\alpha_s^n}{n!} \int_0^1 dz \frac{\mathcal{F}(z) - \mathcal{F}(1)}{1-z} \ln^{2n+1}((1-z)^{-1}) &= \frac{\alpha_s^n}{n!} \int_0^1 dz \mathcal{F}'(1) \ln^{2n+1}((1-z)^{-1}) + \dots \\ &\sim \frac{\alpha_s^n}{n!} (2n+1)! + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we have kept only the first term in the expansion of $\mathcal{F}(z)$ about $z = 1$. It is evident that such terms give, at least formally, contributions that grow even faster than $n!$ at n th order. If they had alternating signs, these contributions might add up to a finite number somehow, but they are all of the same sign.

2.4 Why Positive?

Why are these corrections positive, and hence potentially dangerous? Their sign comes directly from the manner in which hard-scattering cross sections are computed. The fully inclusive Drell-Yan cross section $d\sigma/dQ^2$ illustrates the situation. The computation of its hard-scattering function is easiest to understand in terms of moments, because eq. (1) factors into simple products of functions under moments with respect to $\tau = Q^2/S$,

$$\hat{\sigma}(N) \equiv \frac{1}{\left[\int_0^1 dx x^{N-1} \phi(x)\right]^2} \int_0^1 d\tau \tau^{N-1} \frac{d\sigma_{\text{DY}}(\tau)}{dQ^2}. \quad (5)$$

Neglecting parton labels, the moment $\hat{\sigma}(N)$ is the ratio of moments of the cross section to the product of moments of parton distributions. Because $\hat{\sigma}$ is, by construction, dependent only on short-distance behavior, this ratio may be computed in perturbation theory, as illustrated schematically in fig. 2 (for the DIS scheme). The numerator is a moment of the perturbative partonic Drell-Yan cross section, while the denominator is the product of moments of two perturbative parton distributions. For quark-antiquark processes, the parton distributions are the same, so the denominator is the square of squared partonic amplitudes, summed over final states.

$$\hat{\sigma}(N) = \frac{\left| \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} \right|^2}{\left| \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \text{---} \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \text{---} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \text{---} \end{array} \right|^4}$$

Figure 2: Schematic representation of moments of the Drell-Yan partonic hard-scattering function.

At each order both the numerator and denominator in fig. 2 have double-logarithmic terms like eq. (3). All logarithmically-divergent integrals over gluon transverse momenta cancel in the ratio by the standard factorization theorems. Before moments, the perturbative Drell-Yan cross sections include logarithmic distributions in $1 - z$, like eq. (3)

above, while in the deeply inelastic scattering cross section the same sort of distributions depend on Bjorken x through $1 - x$. After moments, both give double-logarithmic $\alpha_s^n \ln^{2n} N$ at n th order, with N the moment variable. These leading logarithms are the finite remainders of corrections from n pairs of real and virtual gluons that attach to the scattered quarks in DIS and the annihilating pair in DY. Now, in the denominator, each DIS parton distribution, which is itself of the form of a cross section, has both incoming *and* outgoing quarks, while in the numerator, DY involves incoming quarks only. Simply counting quarks, we discover that the coefficients of the double logs are 2^n times larger in the denominator than in the numerator at n th order. At the same time, both numerator and denominator have *alternating signs* for their leading logarithms. The reason for this may be seen by recalling the relations of z and x to the invariant mass W of hadrons in the final state for the two cases:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DY} & : W^2 \sim Q^2(1 - z)^2, \\ \text{DIS} & : W^2 \sim Q^2(1 - x). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The limits $z \rightarrow 1$ and $x \rightarrow 1$ thus both correspond to nearly elastic scattering: for Drell-Yan, the annihilation of a quark pair into an electroweak vector boson, for DIS, the scattering of a quark into a nearly massless jet of particles. In a gauge theory like QCD, the alternating-sign distributions in either cross section sum up to give Sudakov suppression in the elastic limit. The perturbative theory simply will not allow the annihilation or hard-scattering of isolated colored particles without copious radiation. It is not difficult to verify that in these limits, the partonic cross section is suppressed by a factor that decays faster than any fixed power of Q [8]. Indeed, in these limits, we expect the coherent scattering of hadronic bound states, whose contributions are normally suppressed by a power of Q compared to incoherent partonic scattering, to dominate.

As a result of the extra suppression in DIS, due to outgoing quarks, when the hard-scattering function $\hat{\sigma}$, fig. 2 is computed in perturbation theory, the DIS denominator is suppressed even more than the DY numerator. Then the ratio actually grows with moment N , from the elastic limit in z space. This is the source of the terms shown in eq. (3) in $\hat{\sigma}$, and is the reason why they all have the same sign.

2.5 Resolution?

For Drell-Yan and other hard-scattering cross sections the summation of leading singular distributions in $1 - z$ is most easily carried out in moment space, where we find [8],

$$\int_0^1 d\tau \tau^N \frac{d\sigma_{\text{DY}}(\tau)}{dQ^2} \sim \exp \left[+ \frac{\alpha_s(Q)}{\pi} C_F \ln^2 N \right]. \quad (7)$$

(An equivalent relation holds at fixed rapidity [9].) The moments, however, require integrals all the way to $\tau = 0$, which implies $S \rightarrow \infty$ at fixed Q^2 . In the cross section itself, which is an inverse moment, the fixed total energy keeps gluon emission kinematically linked, and we may expect the inverse transform to be rather better behaved when nonleading as well as leading contributions are taken into account. And indeed, recent estimates of the Drell-Yan cross section based on this approach to resummation give predictions which are just a few percent (at most) above the exact two-loop results for fixed target energies.

There has been considerable (but perhaps not yet enough) discussion in the literature on just what is the best way to define and invert a resummed cross section [10]-[15]. Most of these issues are well-illustrated by the Drell-Yan case.

2.6 Resummed Drell-Yan

The resummed Drell-Yan cross section is the benchmark example for the resummation of singular distributions. As above, singular distributions at $z = 1$ translate into logarithms of the moment variable N . Logarithms of N (to all logarithmic order, not just leading or next-to-leading logarithm) in the moments of the inclusive Drell-Yan cross section exponentiate [8],

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\text{DY}}(N) = \frac{d\sigma_{\text{Born}}}{dQ^2} e^{C(\alpha_s) + E(N, \alpha_s)}, \quad (8)$$

where α_s stands for $\alpha_s(Q^2)$. In the exponent, the function C is known to two loops, while the function E , which organizes all logs of N , has the following form in the DIS scheme,

$$E(N, \alpha_s) = - \int_0^1 dx \frac{x^{N-1} - 1}{1-x} \left[\int_0^x \frac{dy}{1-y} g_1 \left(\alpha_s \left[(1-x)(1-y)Q^2 \right] \right) + g_2 \left(\alpha_s \left[(1-x)Q^2 \right] \right) \right]. \quad (9)$$

The functions g_1 and g_2 are finite series in α_s [8],

$$g_1(\alpha_s) = 2C_F \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} + \frac{1}{2} K \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right)^2 \right) + \dots,$$

$$g_2(\alpha_s) = -\frac{3}{2}C_F\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} + \dots, \quad (10)$$

where

$$K = C_A \left(\frac{67}{18} - \frac{\pi^2}{6} \right) - \frac{5}{9}n_f. \quad (11)$$

Now eqs. (8) and (9) resum all logarithms of N in the sense of an order-by-order expansion, by reexpanding the running couplings in terms of α_s . The resummed integrals, however, are ill-defined for $x \rightarrow 1$, no matter how large Q^2 is, since the one-loop running coupling $\alpha_s(\mu) = 4\pi/b_1 \ln(\mu^2/\Lambda^2)$ diverges at $\mu^2 = (1-x)(1-y)Q^2 = \Lambda^2$. Such a divergence is called an “infrared renormalon”. The problem of infrared renormalons in resummed cross sections [16] takes its place alongside the divergence identified above due to Sudakov logarithms as an object of lively interest. This is not, however, the subject of this talk. (It is addressed in Paolo Nason’s contribution to this conference.) Rather, we will report below on how the resummation of Drell-Yan cross sections in eqs. (8) and (9) may be generalized to include all logarithmic order in cross sections like heavy quark or high- p_T jet production, which are initiated by QCD hard-scattering. This problem is distinguished from Drell-Yan by the complications of final-state radiation, and by color exchange in the hard-scattering, which is no longer based upon an electroweak interaction.

3 Threshold Resummations for Heavy Quarks and Jets

Over the past few years the one-loop-corrected jet cross section $d\sigma_{\text{jet}}^{(1)}(p_T)/dp_T$ has become an almost proverbial success for perturbative QCD, tracking the data to a few tens of percent (depending on the parton distributions) while it changes over many orders of magnitude. Nevertheless, recent experimental results have afforded a stimulus to study yet higher orders in QCD cross sections, particularly in terms of the elastic limit. Partly, this has come from the desire for resummations in heavy quark production [12-15], but even more strikingly, from the suggestion of an excess of events at the very highest jet p_T .

Thus far, resummations for top production have included leading logarithms in the singular distributions, through the function g_1 in eq. (9). It is not difficult to show that the leading logarithms are the same for Drell-Yan as for top, and even high- p_T jet, production. Resummations for gluons may be included by simply changing C_F to C_A . For instance, Ref. [13] on the one hand, and Ref. [12] on the other, start from the same resummation in moment space, but differ in their treatment of the $n \rightarrow 1 - z$ transform. Beyond leading

logarithms, however, there may be important differences between the electroweak-induced Drell Yan cross sections and the QCD-induced top or jet cross sections. These are due primarily to the presence of final-state radiation from scattered quarks in the latter case, which is absent in the former, and to the interplay of color exchange in the hard scattering with the soft radiation.

3.1 Resummation with Color Exchange

An exploration of the details of resummation in processes based on a QCD Born cross section, such as heavy quark and jet production, requires more time than we can devote here. As in the case of Drell-Yan (8), resummation is based first of all on the factorization properties of the cross section in the neighborhood of the elastic limit [8]. The situation is illustrated in fig. 3. Near the elastic limit, all gluons emitted into the final state have energies limited by $(1 - z)Q \ll Q$. Correspondingly, gluons with energies of order Q can appear only in virtual states. Standard factorization methods may then be used to separate the (relatively soft but still perturbative) soft gluons from the underlying hard scattering. We emphasize that this may be done order-by-order in perturbation theory, and that both the factorized hard and soft components of $\hat{\sigma}$ remain free of soft and collinear divergences. The process of factorization may be thought of as the construction of an “effective field theory” [17] for soft gluons in the presence of the hard scattering.

The hard-scattering function $\hat{\sigma}$ thus breaks up into a product of hard and soft functions. In the relevant effective field theory, the incoming partons that annihilate into the heavy quarks and the outgoing heavy quarks themselves are represented by ordered exponentials (Wilson lines) in the directions of the partons they represent. The Wilson lines are tied together in the amplitude and its complex conjugate at local vertices, T_I and T_J in fig. 3, which describe the flow of color between the initial and final state. Indices I and J label matrices in color space. The simplest examples are for the annihilation of light quarks (color indices a_1 and a_2) into heavy quarks (indices a_3 and a_4),

$$q_{a_1}(p_a) + \bar{q}_{a_2}(p_b) \rightarrow Q_{a_4}(p_1) + \bar{Q}_{a_3}(p_2), \quad (12)$$

with kinematic invariants,

$$t_1 = (p_a - p_2)^2 - m^2, \quad u_1 = (p_b - p_2)^2 - m^2, \quad s = (p_a + p_b)^2. \quad (13)$$

Here, for instance, we may choose a basis for the T 's that represents color singlet and octet exchange in the s -channel,

$$(T_1)_{\{a_i\}} = \delta_{a_1 a_2} \delta_{a_3 a_4},$$

$$(T_2)_{\{a_i\}} = \sum_c (T_c^{(F)})_{a_2 a_1} (T_c^{(F)})_{a_4 a_3} . \quad (14)$$

Other bases, particularly singlet exchange in the s - and u - channels, are also interesting. As in fig. 3, each choice of effective vertices leads to a separate soft function S_{IJ} , which depends on $(1-z)Q$ only, rather than Q itself.

Meanwhile, the two virtual hard-scattering functions, $h_I(Q)$ and $h_J^*(Q)$, which contain only virtual corrections and hence depend on Q only, are labelled by the same color exchange indices. As in most factorizations and constructions of effective field theories, the new vertices require renormalization. Thus we renormalize the soft functions [18],

$$S_{IJ}^{(\text{un})}((1-z)Q) = Z_{II'} Z_{JJ'}^* S_{I'J'}^{(\text{ren})}((1-z)Q) , \quad (15)$$

and the hard functions

$$h_I^{(\text{un})}(Q) = Z_{IJ}^{-1} h_J^{(\text{ren})}(Q) , \quad (16)$$

where the Z_{KL} are cutoff-dependent renormalization constants. The renormalization of such composite vertices linking Wilson lines has been discussed elsewhere, primarily in the context of nearly forward scattering for lightlike ordered exponentials [18-21]. In our case, to make a long story short, $1-z$ dependence beyond leading logarithm is determined by the anomalous dimension matrix corresponding to this renormalization [18, 20, 21, 22], in a manner analogous to the way in which the evolution of singlet parton distributions is controlled by the anomalous dimensions of light-cone operators in DIS.

In general, solutions to the renormalization group equation for S_{IJ} that follows from (15) are ordered exponentials [18, 22], as for singlet evolution in DIS. At leading logarithm in S_{IJ} , which is next-to-leading logarithm in the overall cross section, however, we can diagonalize the anomalous dimension, and separate the evolution of particular linear combinations of composite color vertices. This is a generalization of the exponentiation of logarithms (and infrared divergences) in the Sudakov form factor [23].

Passing from these general considerations to specific results, let us give the resummation of singular distributions at $z = 1$ for the partonic process in eq. (12) to next-to-leading logarithm in $1-z$ at all orders for light quark annihilation into heavy quarks. We consider the production of a pair of heavy quarks with total invariant mass $Q \geq 2M_Q$ at rapidity y . The cross section is, as usual, a convolution of hard-scattering functions $\hat{\sigma}_{ab}$ with parton distributions $\phi_{q/A}$ and $\phi_{\bar{q}/B}$, as in eq. (1), with $F = Q\bar{Q}$. Corresponding to the Drell-Yan result, (8), we now have, to next-to-leading logarithmic accuracy,

$$\hat{\sigma}_{q\bar{q} \rightarrow Q\bar{Q}}(N) = \sum_{IJ} S_{IJ}^{(0)} h_I(Q) h_J^*(Q) e^{C'(\alpha_s) + E_{IJ}(N, \alpha_s)} , \quad (17)$$




Figure 3: Representation of the factorization of the hard scattering function $\hat{\sigma}$ near the elastic limit. The second part shows the soft-gluon matrix S_{IJ} as a cut diagram for the scattering of incoming ordered exponentials (double lines - the incoming partons in the eikonal approximation) to give outgoing ordered exponentials (bold lines - the outgoing heavy quarks in the eikonal approximation). For simplicity, only a few of the possible gluon interactions with the ordered exponentials are shown.

where again α_s stands for $\alpha_s(Q^2)$. The function C' is known to one loop only at this time. To next-to-leading log, we need only the lowest-order soft functions, $S_{IJ}^{(0)} \sim \delta_{IJ}$. The function E_{IJ} , which contains the logs of the moment variable N has a form very similar to the Drell-Yan case, but now with a dependence on the effective color vertices, through a third function, g_3 ,

$$E_{IJ}^{(ab)}(N, \alpha_s) = - \int_0^1 dx \frac{x^{N-1} - 1}{1-x} \left[\int_0^x \frac{dy}{1-y} g_1(\alpha_s [(1-x)(1-y)Q^2]) \right. \\ \left. + g_2(\alpha_s [(1-x)Q^2]) \right]$$

$$+g_3^{(I)} \left(\alpha_s \left[(1-x)^2 Q^2 \right] \right) + g_3^{(J)*} \left(\alpha_s \left[(1-x)^2 Q^2 \right] \right) \Big]. \quad (18)$$

As before, the g_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$ are finite functions of their arguments. In the DIS scheme, g_1 and g_2 are given for incoming light quarks by (10) above. Dependence on color exchange in the hard scattering is contained entirely in the new functions $g_3^{(I)}$, which may (but need not) be defined to be zero in Drell-Yan, eq. (9) [24]. To determine $g_3^{(I)}$, we go to a color basis that diagonalizes the renormalization matrix Z_{IJ} in eqs. (16) and (15). In this basis,

$$g_3^{(I)}[\alpha_s] = -\lambda_I[\alpha_s], \quad (19)$$

where the eigenfunctions λ_I are complex in general, and may depend on the directions of the incoming and outgoing partons.

We are now ready to give the anomalous dimension matrix of the effective vertices T_I in fig. 3 for light to heavy quark annihilation in the singlet-octet basis of eq. (14) [1]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{11} &= -\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} C_F (L_\beta + 1 + \pi i), \\ \Gamma_{21} &= \frac{2\alpha_s}{\pi} \ln \left(\frac{u_1}{t_1} \right), \\ \Gamma_{12} &= \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \frac{C_F}{C_A} \ln \left(\frac{u_1}{t_1} \right), \\ \Gamma_{22} &= \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \left\{ C_F \left[4 \ln \left(\frac{u_1}{t_1} \right) - L_\beta - 1 - \pi i \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{C_A}{2} \left[-3 \ln \left(\frac{u_1}{t_1} \right) - \ln \left(\frac{m^2 s}{t_1 u_1} \right) + L_\beta + \pi i \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Here L_β is the vertex function in the eikonal approximation for the production of a pair of heavy quarks with center of mass velocity β ,

$$L_\beta = \frac{1 - 2m^2/s}{\beta} \left(\ln \frac{1 - \beta}{1 + \beta} + i\pi \right), \quad \beta = \sqrt{1 - 4m^2/s}. \quad (21)$$

Solving for the eigenvalues, substituting them in eq. (17), and expanding the result to first order in α_s , we can derive an explicit one-loop expression for the cross section for heavy quark production through light quark annihilation. We have checked that this result is consistent with the explicit one-loop formulas given in [25]. Here we content ourselves with pointing out that, unlike leading logarithms, next-to-leading logs depend on angles, through ratios of kinematic invariants, such as u_1/t_1 and s/t_1 . Interestingly, the singlet-octet anomalous dimension matrix is manifestly diagonal at ninety degrees.

Much the same considerations apply to jet production, whose resummation requires an additional factorization of the collinear singularities within the jets from the hard scattering *and* soft emission. In particular, the anomalous dimension matrix in this case is also dependent on the direction of the jets. The effect of resummation at next-to-leading logarithm will therefore in general change the angular dependence of the cross section, relative to next-to-leading order.

4 Conclusion

The general considerations and the explicit results quoted above are part of a renewed phenomenology of higher-order corrections in perturbative QCD. It remains to be seen if, and where, resummed next-to-leading logarithmic corrections like those quoted above are phenomenologically significant. As we have discussed above, however, the results will be of interest whether they are large or small.

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank Jack Smith and Eric Laenen for useful conversations. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant PHY9309888.

References

- [1] N. Kidonakis and G. Sterman, Stony Brook preprint ITP-SB-96-7, hep-ph/9604234, and in preparation; N. Kidonakis, Ph.D. thesis, Stony Brook, 1996.
- [2] J.C. Collins, D.E. Soper and G. Sterman, in *Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics*, ed. A.H. Mueller (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989), p. 1.
- [3] G. Altarelli, R.K. Ellis and G. Martinelli, Nucl. Phys. B157 (1979) 461; B. Humpert and W.L. van Neerven, Phys. Lett. 84B (1979) 327; J. Kubar-André and F.E. Paige, Phys. Rev. D19 (1979) 221; K. Harada, T. Kaneko and N. Sakai, Nucl. Phys. B155 (1979) 169; B165 (1980) 545 (E).
- [4] P. Aurenche, A. Douiri, R. Baier, M. Fontannaz and D. Schiff, Phys. Lett. 140B (1984) 87; H. Baer, J. Ohnemus and J.F. Owens, Phys. Rev. D42 (1990) 61; P.

- Aurenche, P. Chiappetta, M. Fontannaz, J.P. Guillet, E. Pilon, Nucl. Phys. B399 (1993) 34; L.E. Gordon and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. D48 (1993) 3136; D50 (1994) 1901; M. Glück, L.E. Gordon, E. Reya and W. Vogelsang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73 (1994) 388.
- [5] P. Nason, S. Dawson and R.K. Ellis, Nucl. Phys. B303 (1988) 607; W. Beenakker, H. Kuijf, W.L. van Neerven, and J. Smith Phys. Rev. D40 (1989) 54; W. Beenakker, W.L. van Neerven, R. Meng, G.A. Schuler, and J. Smith, Nucl. Phys. B351 (1991) 507.
- [6] F. Aversa, P. Chiappetta, M. Greco and J.-Ph. Guillet, Phys. Lett. B211 (1988) 465; Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 401; Z. Phys. C46 (1990) 253; F. Aversa, P. Chiappetta, L. Gonzales, M. Greco and J.-Ph. Guillet, Z. Phys. C49 (1991) 459; S.D. Ellis, Z. Kunszt and D.E. Soper, Phys. Rev. D40 (1989) 2188; Phys. Rev. Lett. 64 (1990) 2121; *ibid* 69 (1992) 1496; Z. Kunszt and D.E. Soper, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 192.
- [7] R. Hamberg and W.L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. B379 (1992) 143; E.B. Zijlstra and W.L. van Neerven, Phys. Lett. B273 (1991) 476; Nucl. Phys. B383 (1992) 525; B417 (1994) 61, (E) B426 (1994) 245; S.A. Larin, T. van Ritbergen and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Nucl. Phys. B427 (1994) 41; R. Mertig and W.L. van Neerven, Instituut-Lorentz preprint INLO-PUB-6/95, hep-ph/9506451; M. Buza, Y. Matiounine, J. Smith, R. Migneron and W.L. van Neerven, NIKHEF preprint NIKHEF/95-070, hep-ph/9601302.
- [8] G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B281 (1987) 310; S. Catani and L. Trentadue, Nucl. Phys. B327 (1989) 323.
- [9] E. Laenen and G. Sterman, in proceedings of *The Fermilab Meeting, DPF 92*, 7th meeting of the American Physical Society Division of Particles and Fields (Batavia, IL, 1992), ed. C.H. Albright *et al.* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993), p. 987.
- [10] H. Contopanagos and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B400 (1993) 211; B419 (1994) 77.
- [11] L. Alvero and H. Contopanagos, Nucl. Phys. B436 (1995) 184; Nucl. Phys. B456 (1995) 497.
- [12] E.L. Berger and H. Contopanagos, Phys. Lett. B361 (1995) 115; Argonne preprint ANL-HEP-95-82, hep-ph/9603326.

- [13] E. Laenen, J. Smith and W.L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. B369 (1992) 543; Phys. Lett. B321 (1994) 254.
- [14] N. Kidonakis and J. Smith, Phys. Rev. D51 (1995) 6092; Mod. Phys. Lett. A11 (1996) 587.
- [15] S. Catani, M.L. Mangano, P. Nason and L. Trentadue, CERN preprint CERN-TH/96-21, hep-ph/9602208; CERN-TH/96-86, hep-ph/9604351.
- [16] D. Appell, P. Mackenzie and G. Sterman in *Proceedings of the Storrs Meeting*, Fourth Meeting of the Division of Particles and Fields, Storrs, CT, August 15-18, 1988, p. 567; B.R. Webber, Phys. Lett. **B339**, 148 (1994); A.V. Manohar and M.B. Wise, Phys. Lett. **B344**, 407 (1995); G.P. Korchemsky and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. **B437**, 415 (1995); Yu.L. Dokshitzer and B.R. Webber, Phys. Lett. **B352**, 451 (1995); R. Akhoury and V.I. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. **B357**, 646 (1995); Nucl. Phys. B465 (1996) 295; P. Nason and M.H. Seymour, Nucl. Phys. **B454**, 291 (1995); M. Beneke and V.M. Braun, Nucl. Phys. **B454**, 253 (1995); Yu.L. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesini and B.R. Webber, CERN-TH/95-281, hep-ph/9512336.
- [17] K.G. Wilson and J. Kogut, Phys. Rep. 12 (1974) 75; J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. B231 (1984) 269; H. Georgi, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci., 43 (1993) 209.
- [18] J. Botts and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B325 (1989) 62.
- [19] M. Sotiropoulos and G. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B419 (1994) 59.
- [20] G.P. Korchemsky, Phys. Lett. B325 (1994) 459.
- [21] I.A. Korchemskaya and G.P. Korchemsky, Nucl. Phys. B437 (1995) 127.
- [22] H. Contopanagos, E. Laenen, and G. Sterman, CERN-TH-96-75, hep-ph/9604313.
- [23] J.G.M. Gatheral, Phys. Lett. 133B (1983) 90; J. Frenkel and J.C. Taylor, Nucl. Phys. B246 (1984) 231; G.P. Korchemsky and A.V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. B171 (1986) 459; J.C. Collins, in *Perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics*, ed. A.H. Mueller (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989), p. 573; L. Magnea and G. Sterman, Phys. Rev. D42 (1990) 4222.
- [24] S. Catani and L. Trentadue, Nucl. Phys. B353 (1991) 183.
- [25] R. Meng, G.A. Schuler, J. Smith and W.L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. B339 (1990) 325.