

hep-ph/9608399  
Edinburgh 96/23  
DFTT 37/96

**POLARIZED PARTONS  
AT NEXT-TO-LEADING ORDER**

Stefano Forte

*INFN, Sezione di Torino  
via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

Richard D. Ball\*

*Department of Physics and Astronomy  
University of Edinburgh, EH9 3JZ, Scotland*

Giovanni Ridolfi

*INFN, Sezione di Genova  
via Dodecaneso 33, I-16146 Genova, Italy*

**Abstract**

We discuss the determination of polarized parton distributions from a NLO analysis of recent experimental data. We extract the first moment of the polarized quark and gluon distribution and assess the corresponding uncertainties, with special regard to those related to scheme dependence.

Talk given at *DIS96*, Rome, April 1996

*to be published in the proceedings*

August 1996

---

\* Royal Society University Research Fellow

# POLARIZED PARTONS AT NEXT-TO-LEADING ORDER

STEFANO FORTE

*INFN, Sezione di Torino  
via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

RICHARD D. BALL

*Department of Physics and Astronomy,  
University of Edinburgh, EH9 3JZ, Scotland*

GIOVANNI RIDOLFI

*INFN, Sezione di Genova  
via Dodecaneso 33, I-16146 Genova, Italy*

We discuss the determination of polarized parton distributions from a NLO analysis of recent experimental data. We extract the first moment of the polarized quark and gluon distribution and assess the corresponding uncertainties, with special regard to those related to scheme dependence.

The theoretical and experimental information on inclusive polarized deep-inelastic scattering has considerably improved recently. On the one hand, the polarized structure function  $g_1$  has now been measured over a reasonably wide range in  $x$  at several scales, both for proton and deuterium targets.<sup>1–3</sup> On the other hand, a complete determination of the two-loop polarized anomalous dimensions is now available.<sup>4,5</sup> This makes a fully-fledged NLO analysis of polarized parton distributions both feasible and justified. Such an analysis is necessary in order to extract the physically relevant matrix elements of quark and gluon operators from the measured  $g_1(x, Q^2)$ .

The simplest leading-twist polarized observables are the nucleon matrix elements of the quark axial currents  $j_{5,i}^\mu = \bar{\psi}_i \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi_i$ : for a target of mass  $M$  and spin  $s^\mu$  the matrix elements  $\langle s | j_{5,i}^\mu | s \rangle = M a_i(Q^2) s^\mu$  are related to the first moment of  $\Gamma_1(Q^2) \equiv \int_0^1 dx g_1(x, Q^2)$  by

$$\Gamma_1(Q^2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} e_i^2 C_i a_i = \frac{1}{2} [\langle e^2 \rangle C_S(Q^2) a_0(Q^2) + C_{NS}(Q^2) a_{NS}(Q^2)], \quad (1)$$

where the average quark electric charge is  $\langle e^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{n_f} \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} e_i^2$ , the singlet and nonsinglet axial charges are respectively  $a_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} a_i$  and  $a^{NS} = \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} (e_i^2 - \langle e^2 \rangle) a_i$ , and  $C(Q^2)$  are perturbatively computable coefficient functions, which at NLO are given by  $C_S(Q^2) = C_{NS}(Q^2) = 1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} + O(\alpha_s^2)$ .<sup>6</sup> While the nonsinglet axial charge  $a_{NS}(Q^2)$  only depends on scale due to heavy quark

thresholds and is otherwise determined by SU(3) symmetry in terms of hyperon  $\beta$  decay constants, the singlet charge measures a nontrivial combination of the first moments of the polarized quark and gluon distributions:

$$C_S(Q^2)a_0(Q^2) = C_q(1, Q^2)\Delta\Sigma(1, Q^2) + C_g(1, Q^2)\Delta g(1, Q^2) \quad (2)$$

where  $\Delta\Sigma(N, Q^2) = \sum_{i=1}^{n_f} \int_0^1 dx x^{N-1} [\Delta q_i + \Delta \bar{q}_i](x, Q^2)$  is the moment-space polarized singlet quark distribution, other Mellin moments are defined similarly,  $C_q(1, Q^2) = 1 + O(\alpha_s(Q^2))$  and  $C_g(1, Q^2) = O(\alpha_s(Q^2))$ .

A direct determination of  $a_0(Q^2)$  would be possible only if  $g_1$  were known for all  $x$  at one scale; since this is not the case we can only determine it indirectly through eq. (2) from quark and gluon distributions, the primary quantities which enter the QCD evolution equations. All the available experimental information on  $g_1(x, Q^2)$  is then summarized by constructing a set of polarized parton distributions (gluon and quark singlet and nonsinglet) at a reference scale  $Q_0$ , from which  $g_1$  can be obtained for all  $x$  and  $Q^2$  by solving the evolution equations. We parametrize these distributions as  $\Delta f(x, Q_0) = N_f \eta_f x^{\alpha_f} (1-x)^{\beta_f} (1+a_f x)$  (with  $N_f$  chosen in such a way that the first moment of  $\Delta f$  equals  $\eta_f$ ). We evolve these distributions to all the points in the  $(x, Q^2)$  plane where  $g_1(x, Q^2)$  has been measured, and thereby determine the best fit values of the parameters (further details of the fitting procedure are given in refs. 7, 8). We use the NLO form of anomalous dimensions and coefficient functions, determined in the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  renormalization scheme.

The choice of factorization scheme is particularly subtle in the polarized case because of the extra ambiguity related to the prescription used to define the  $\gamma_5$  matrix in dimensional regularization; without such a prescription the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme is not fully defined. We will use the so-called Adler-Bardeen scheme,<sup>8</sup> which is defined in terms of a specific factorization scheme change on the singlet anomalous dimensions and coefficient functions of refs. 4,5 (which are in turn obtained from  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  factorization and the 't Hooft-Veltman prescription for  $\gamma_5$  by a scheme change which enforces the conservation of the nonsinglet axial current). The AB scheme is constructed by imposing conditions on first moments of singlet anomalous dimensions and coefficient functions, whose factorization scheme dependence is especially delicate.

To understand this, recall that  $a_0$  depends on  $Q^2$  because the singlet axial current, unlike its nonsinglet counterpart, is not conserved in the chiral limit in the quantized theory due to the axial anomaly:  $\partial_\mu j_5^\mu = n_f \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \text{tr} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma}$ . As a consequence, the current is multiplicatively renormalized:  $\frac{d}{dt} j_5^\mu = \gamma^{(5)}(\alpha_s) j_5^\mu$ , with an anomalous dimension  $\gamma^{(5)} = \gamma_{(2)}^{(5)} \alpha_s^2 + O(\alpha_s^3)$  that starts at two loops. The anomaly equation then implies that the (gluonic) anomaly operator mixes with the axial current according to  $\frac{d}{dt} n_f \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \text{tr} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\rho\sigma} = \gamma^{(5)}(\alpha_s) \partial_\mu j_5^\mu$ . At the level of operator matrix elements, the current is

parametrized by  $a_0(Q^2)$ , and the partonic quantity which mixes with it can be identified with the first moment of the polarized gluon distribution:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left[ -n_f \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \Delta g(1, Q^2) \right] = \gamma^{(5)}(\alpha_s) a_0(Q^2). \quad (3)$$

This is possible because at LO  $\alpha_s \Delta g(1, Q^2)$  is scale independent.

Eq. (3) implies that the scale dependence of  $\Delta g(1, Q^2)$  causes a strong scheme dependence of  $\Delta \Sigma(1, Q^2)$ : upon a general scheme change  $\left( \frac{\Delta \Sigma'}{\Delta g'} \right) = \left[ \mathbb{1} + \alpha_s \begin{pmatrix} z_{qq} & z_{qg} \\ z_{gq} & z_{gg} \end{pmatrix} + O(\alpha_s^2) \right] \left( \frac{\Delta \Sigma}{\Delta g} \right)$ , and since  $\alpha_s \Delta g(1, Q^2)$  is scale independent at LO it follows that  $\Delta \Sigma' - \Delta \Sigma$  does not vanish asymptotically if  $z_{qg} \neq 0$ . Because at LO  $\Delta \Sigma$  is scale-independent this implies that even asymptotically the ambiguity on  $\Delta \Sigma(1, Q^2)$  is of the same order as its size, i.e. the definition of  $\Delta \Sigma(1, Q^2)$  is entirely ambiguous. This is not the case for the gluon: even if we redefine it by setting  $z_{gg} \neq 0$  then  $\Delta g'(1, Q^2) - \Delta g(1, Q^2)$  is asymptotically constant, but since in the same limit  $\Delta g(1, Q^2)$  diverges (as  $\alpha_s^{-1}$ ) the relative scheme ambiguity in  $\Delta g(1, Q^2)$  vanishes asymptotically.

The definition of  $\Delta \Sigma(1, Q^2)$  is thus intrinsically arbitrary and can only be fixed on the basis of physical requirements. A simple choice is based on the observation that since the quantities on either side of eq. (3) evolve in the same way, their difference is scale independent: we can then identify this scale-independent combination with the singlet quark first moment

$$\Delta \Sigma(1) = a_0(Q^2) + n_f \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \Delta g(1, Q^2) \quad (4)$$

to all orders. This choice has several advantages: a) only when  $\Delta \Sigma(1)$  is scale independent does the Ellis-Jaffe ansatz, which would equate it to the scale-independent octet axial charge  $a_8$ , acquire an unambiguous meaning beyond LO;<sup>9</sup> b) the polarized quark distribution can then be defined directly in terms of a hard observable (such as a jet cross section), by properly factorizing all soft contributions to the cross section into the parton distributions;<sup>10</sup> c)  $\Delta \Sigma(1)$  eq. (4) coincides with the matrix element of the canonically defined quark helicity operator.<sup>11</sup>

The AB scheme choice exploits the fact that eq. (3) is automatically satisfied with the factorization choice of refs. 4,5, and enforces the definition eq. (4) of the polarized quark distribution. This still leaves the freedom to further redefine the normalization of  $\Delta g(1, Q^2)$  (i.e. to vary  $z_{gg}$  in the scheme change), which can be fixed entirely at NLO by requiring that eq. (3) be also true at NNLO: in fact, the Adler-Bardeen theorem<sup>12</sup> implies that there exists a scheme where eq. (3) is valid to all orders. Knowledge<sup>13</sup> of the  $O(\alpha_s^3)$  contribution to  $\gamma^{(5)}$  then fixes entirely the scheme choice for the first moments of parton distributions. As a consequence, in the AB scheme the evolution of  $a_0$ , as given by eq. (3), is automatically correct through NNLO when the parton distributions

are evolved at NLO. The factorization scheme for all other moments is finally fixed by insisting that the full scheme change from the scheme of refs. 4,5 to the AB scheme is independent of  $x$ .

The growth of the first moment of the polarized gluon distribution with scale implies sizable scaling violations for moments close to the first, which evolve at LO by mixing with the gluon distribution. Measuring these scaling violations then determines the polarized gluon distribution. This determination is only asymptotically scheme independent, while at finite  $Q^2$  it is subject to a factorization scheme ambiguity.\* On the other hand, large scaling violations driven by a large gluon distribution also imply large scheme ambiguities, in particular in the determination of  $a_0$ . For instance, it is clear from eq. (2) that at NLO  $a_0(Q^2)$  will be affected by a scheme ambiguity of order  $\alpha_s^2 \Delta g$ , which only decreases with scale as  $\alpha_s$ .

Fitting to the data of refs.1,2 we find<sup>8</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} a_0(10 \text{ GeV}^2) &= 0.14 \pm 0.10 \text{ (exp.) }^{+0.12}_{-0.05} \text{ (th.)} \\ \Delta\Sigma(1) &= 0.5 \pm 0.1, \quad \Delta g(1, 10 \text{ GeV}^2) = 3.0 \pm 1.6. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The largest source of experimental error comes from the uncertainty in the behaviour of the partons in the unmeasured small  $x$  region,<sup>7,8,14</sup> which could of course in principle lead to an infinite (either positive or negative) contribution to first moments. In ref.8 it is constrained by our specific choice of functional form for the initial parton distributions: assuming that the small  $x$  exponent  $\alpha_f$  can be fitted from the data amounts to assuming that the asymptotic small  $x$  behaviour has already started setting in in the measured region ( $x \geq 0.003$ ). The data turn out to determine reasonably well the small  $x$  behaviour of the nonsinglet ( $\alpha_{\text{NS}} = -0.68 \pm 0.15$ ), but only very poorly that of the singlet quark ( $\alpha_{\text{S}} = 0.41 \pm 0.38$ ) and gluon ( $\alpha_{\text{g}} = -0.47 \pm 0.30$ ); this is then reflected in a sizable statistical uncertainty in the first moments. The bulk of the theoretical error is due to lack of knowledge of higher order corrections, as manifested by scheme dependence, which we estimate by varying the renormalization and factorization scales by a factor of two around  $Q^2$ . Further sources of error,

---

\* Note that the Altarelli-Parisi equations allow a determination of all moments of  $\Delta g$  from scaling violations, including the first, provided only that the input distributions are sufficiently smooth. This is despite the fact that the singlet first moment evolves multiplicatively, and thus measurements at different scales determine only one linear combination of  $\Delta\Sigma(1)$  and  $\Delta g(1)$ . However, two functions of  $x$  whose moments are all identical, but whose first moments are different, can only differ by a term proportional to  $\delta(x)$ . Such terms are not experimentally measurable, even in principle, and are thus by construction not included in the definition of parton distributions. The first moment  $\Delta g(1)$  is thus uniquely determined by analytic continuation from  $\Delta g(N)$ ,  $N \neq 1$ . In practice this analytic continuation is performed implicitly through the choice of the form of the parametrization of the initial parton distributions.

which include the variation of the position of heavy quark thresholds, the value of  $\alpha_s$  and SU(2) and SU(3) breaking (as reflected in the values of the nonsinglet axial charges) are negligible in comparison.

Since the error on the determination of the polarized gluon distribution is dominated by the statistics, it can be improved when more precise or abundant data in the presently measured region become available: for instance, including the data of ref. 3 in the analysis leads to  $\Delta g(1, 10 \text{ GeV}^2) = 2.6 \pm 1.3$ , even though the statistical weight of these data is relatively modest. The determination of the axial charge  $a_0$ , on the other hand, is dominated by the systematics related to higher order corrections, and the uncertainty in the small  $x$  extrapolation. The former could be improved by higher statistics data which provide a more complete coverage of the  $x - Q^2$  plane (allowing evaluations of the first moment at essentially a single value of  $Q^2$ ). However, to obtain a significant improvement in the latter, data in the unexplored small  $x$  region will be required. A substantial improvement in the determination of the singlet axial charge will thus only be accomplished by the next generation of experiments, such as would be possible at HERA with a polarized proton beam.<sup>15</sup>

**Acknowledgments:** We thank A. Deshpande and J. Lichtenstadt for interesting conversations on their data, and G. Altarelli for discussions.

## References

1. SMC Collaboration, D. Adams et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B329**, 399 (1994); *Phys. Lett.* **B357**, 248 (1995).
2. E143 Collaboration, K. Abe et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 346 (1995); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 25 (1995).
3. E143 Collaboration, K. Abe et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B364**, 61 (1995).
4. R. Mertig and W.L. van Neerven, *Zeit. Phys.* **C70**, 637 (1996).
5. W. Vogelsang, *Phys. Rev.* **D54**, 2023 (1996).
6. J. Kodaira et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D20**, 627 (1979).
7. R.D. Ball, S. Forte and G. Ridolfi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B444**, 287 (1995).
8. R.D. Ball, S. Forte and G. Ridolfi, *Phys. Lett.* **B378**, 255 (1996).
9. G. Altarelli and G.G. Ross, *Phys. Lett.* **B212**, 391 (1988).
10. R.D. Carlitz, J.C. Collins and A.H. Mueller, *Phys. Lett.* **B214**, 229 (1988) and in Proc. of 24th Rencontre de Moriond, T. T. Vanh, ed, (Frontières, Paris, 1989); G. Altarelli and B. Lampe, *Zeit. Phys.* **C47**, 315 (1990); W. Vogelsang, *Zeit. Phys.* **C50**, 275 (1991).
11. S. Forte, *Nucl. Phys.* **B331**, 1 (1990).
12. S. Adler and W. Bardeen, *Phys. Rev.* **182**, 1517 (1969); M. Bos, *Nucl. Phys.* **B404**, 215 (1993).
13. S. A. Larin, *Phys. Lett.* **B334** (1994) 192.
14. R.D. Ball, **hep-ph/9511330**, in the proceedings of the “International School on Nucleon Spin Structure”, Erice 1995.
15. J. Lichtenstadt, these proceedings; R. D. Ball et al., in the proceedings of the workshop on “Future physics at HERA”.