

NORDITA-96/65 P  
 hep-ph/9610212

**THEORETICAL UNCERTAINTIES IN THE DETERMINATION  
 OF  $\alpha_s$  FROM HADRONIC EVENT OBSERVABLES: THE  
 IMPACT OF NONPERTURBATIVE EFFECTS**

V.M. BRAUN

*NORDITA, Blegdamsvej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark*

*talk presented at Annual Meeting of Division of Particles and Fields of the APS  
 (DPF'96), Minneapolis, MN, August 10–15, 1996*

I review the theoretical status of hadronization corrections to hadronic event observables and discuss their impact on the determination of  $\alpha_s$ .

Precise determination of the strong coupling has become one of the most important tasks of the QCD theory and phenomenology<sup>1</sup>. From the theoretical point of view the cleanest measurement comes from the total  $e^+e^-$  annihilation cross section at high energies. The accuracy is dominated in this case by statistical errors; high statistics is needed because the effect proportional to  $\alpha_s$  is a few percent fraction only of the total cross section. Thus, going over to various event shape observables which are proportional to  $\alpha_s$  at the leading order presents a clear experimental advantage. The price to pay is that the QCD description becomes more complicated and making a defensible estimate of the theoretical accuracy presents a nontrivial task.

The uncertainty due to nonperturbative effects is a particularly delicate issue. From the experimentalist's point of view this is the uncertainty of 'hadronization corrections' which are applied to uncover the structure of the event at the *parton level* from the observed structure at the *hadron level*. The hadronization process is modelled in a certain way, and differences between models (say, Lund string fragmentation or parton showers) are taken to estimate the error. In statistically important regions the hadronization corrections are of order 10% (at the Z peak) while the claimed error is of order 2–3%. This is less than the uncertainties of existing perturbative calculations (estimated by the scale dependence) so that for an experimentalist the hadronization could be considered under control.

This procedure is very successful phenomenologically, but it is unsatisfactory from the theoretical point of view. In particular — I will return to this point later — the separation of perturbative versus nonperturbative alias

parton level versus hadronization effects is theoretically ill-defined, and the commonly accepted procedures might be suspected to be plagued by double counting of infrared effects. The theoretical understanding is guided by the Wilson operator product expansion (OPE) which is applicable, most notably, to the deep inelastic scattering (DIS). As a representative example, consider the Gross–Llewellyn Smith sum rule (GLS):

$$\int_0^1 dx F_3^{\nu p + \bar{\nu} p}(x, Q^2) = 3 \left[ 1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}(Q^2) + \dots - \frac{8}{27} \frac{\langle\langle O \rangle\rangle}{Q^2} \right] + O(1/Q^4) \quad (1)$$

Here  $\langle\langle O \rangle\rangle$  is the reduced matrix element of a certain quark-antiquark-gluon operator which quantifies the correlations between partons in the nucleon.

From the OPE one learns: (i) *Power counting* of nonperturbative effects; in this case that perturbation theory is valid to  $O(1/Q^2)$  accuracy and that the description to order  $O(1/Q^2)$  requires one dimensionful nonperturbative parameter; (ii) *‘Universality’* of nonperturbative effects in the sense that the same quark-antiquark-gluon operator appears in different physical processes; the coefficient is calculable in perturbation theory, hence one can sacrifice one measurement to get the prediction for other ones.

Theoretical approaches to the nonperturbative corrections in hadron production would aim to get the similar structure. For a generic observable dominated by short distances one expects an expansion of the type

$$R = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_n \alpha_s^n + \left( \frac{\Lambda_R}{Q} \right)^p (\ln Q/\Lambda)^\gamma \quad (2)$$

The goal is to understand the power counting, that is which powers  $p$  are present, calculate ‘anomalous dimensions’  $\gamma$  and relate the nonperturbative parameters  $\Lambda_R$  in different processes (universality). Note that the question of actual magnitude of the nonperturbative parameters remains open.

For the precision  $\alpha_s$  measurements the power counting is of primary importance. Indeed, assuming a  $1/Q^2$  correction, for the effective hard scale  $Q_{\text{eff}} \geq 10$  GeV and the intrinsic size of ‘matrix elements’ 1 GeV, one obtains a ball-park estimate for the nonperturbative effects  $\sim 1\%$  which can be neglected. On the other hand, if the nonperturbative effects are  $O(1/Q)$ , they can be of order 10% and one has to estimate them quantitatively.

The structure of nonperturbative power-suppressed corrections to physical observables appears to be intimately connected with the same-sign factorial divergence  $r_n \sim n!$  of the QCD perturbation theory in high orders. Divergence of perturbation theory implies that the sum of the series is only defined to power

accuracy  $\exp[-\text{const}/\alpha_s(Q)] \sim 1/Q^p$  and the ambiguity has to be remedied by adding nonperturbative corrections. In particular, the large- $n$  behavior of the perturbative coefficients

$$r_n \sim \text{const} \cdot n^{\tilde{\gamma}} \cdot s^{-n} \cdot n!, \quad (3)$$

necessarily requires a nonperturbative correction in (2) with the powers  $p$  and  $\gamma$  related in a simple way to the coefficients  $s$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}$ , respectively.

This has two consequences. First, one can investigate the structure of nonperturbative corrections to a large class of observables by studying the structure of higher orders in the perturbative expansions, which attracted a lot of recent activity (see <sup>2</sup> for a recent review). Here is a short summary of results, related to  $\alpha_s$  determinations:

- Most of the existing hadronic event observables are predicted to have nonperturbative corrections of order  $1/Q^{3,4,5}$ .
- The thrust and heavy jet mass distributions have  $1/Q$  corrections for the average values. However, outside the two-jet region nonperturbative effects have an extra suppression factor  $\sim \alpha_s(Q)^6$ .
- The one-particle inclusive cross section in the  $e^+e^-$  annihilation (fragmentation function) has only  $1/Q^2$  corrections for fixed energy fraction; however, the integrated longitudinal (and transverse) cross sections have  $1/Q$  corrections <sup>7,8</sup>.
- Power counting of the nonperturbative effects in jet fractions depends on the jet finding algorithm;  $1/Q$  corrections are intrinsic for JADE and are most likely absent for the Durham  $k_{\perp}$ -clustering method <sup>9</sup>.
- There are no  $1/Q$  corrections to the Drell-Yan (heavy quark production) cross section to leading order <sup>10</sup>; their existence to the  $O(\alpha_s(Q)/Q)$  accuracy is still disputed <sup>11</sup>.

The power counting of nonperturbative effects can be tested experimentally by the energy dependence of hadron event observables, subtracting the parton level prediction. This was done recently by DELPHI <sup>12</sup>.

Perturbative calculations in certain regions of phase space may require resummations of large logarithms (threshold corrections). An important question is whether the power counting of nonperturbative effects is disturbed by the resummations. It was studied for the Drell-Yan production <sup>13,14,10,15</sup>. Different resummation procedures which are equivalent in perturbation theory, can introduce different power-like corrections, and it was suggested that a criterium

for a ‘good’ resummation technique is that it does not bring in nonperturbative effects which are absent in finite orders; this study emphasizes importance of large-angle soft gluon emission<sup>10,15</sup>. It turns out that quality of resummations in moment and momentum spaces is not related in any obvious way and their truncation may introduce spurious  $1/Q^p$  effects with a small power  $p \sim \alpha_s$ <sup>16</sup>.

The second consequence is that the separation of ‘perturbative’ and ‘non-perturbative’ effects is conceptually ambiguous. To make it meaningful one has to introduce an *IR matching scale*  $\mu_{\text{IR}}$ <sup>17</sup>, define ‘nonperturbative’ contributions as absorbing all effects from scales below  $\mu_{\text{IR}}$  and subtract the small momentum contributions from perturbative series to avoid a double counting. Continuing the example with the GLS sum rule one obtains, schematically

$$\int_0^1 dx F_3^{\nu p + \bar{\nu} p}(x, Q^2) = 3 \left[ 1 - \left( 1 - \frac{\mu_{\text{IR}}^2}{Q^2} \right) \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}(Q^2) + \dots - \frac{8}{27} \frac{\langle\langle O(\mu_{\text{IR}}) \rangle\rangle}{Q^2} \right] + O(1/Q^4) \quad (4)$$

The premium for this refinement is that perturbation theory restricted to the contributions of scales above  $\mu_{\text{IR}}$  is (almost) free from factorial divergences in high orders; the price to pay is that subtraction of small momenta is very awkward in practice and introduces an additional scale (and scheme) dependence.

The same applies to the ‘hadronization corrections’. The lessons to be learnt from OPE are: (i) separation of the parton cascade and hadronization is ambiguous; (ii) high orders of the perturbative series can imitate a power correction; (iii) if extracted from comparison with the data, the power correction is expected to depend on the order of perturbation theory, factorization scheme and scale; (iv) numerical estimates suggest that ‘true nonperturbative’ contributions at small scales are of the same order as perturbative.

To see how it works, consider energy dependence of the mean value of thrust  $\langle 1 - T \rangle$  in the  $e^+e^-$  annihilation. The experimental data are well described by the formula

$$\langle 1 - T \rangle(Q) = 0.335 \alpha_s(Q) + 1.02 \alpha_s^2(Q) + \frac{1 \text{ GeV}}{Q} \quad (5)$$

Here  $Q$  is the c.m. energy, the two first terms on the r.h.s. correspond to the perturbation theory and the last term is the nonperturbative correction. The common procedure is to fix the  $1 \text{ GeV}/Q$  correction (assume it comes from a certain model) and fit  $\alpha_s(Q)$  to the data; this gives  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.120$ . Then, *keeping the hadronization correction fixed*, one varies the scale  $\alpha_s(Q) \rightarrow \alpha_s(\mu)$  to estimate the perturbative uncertainty coming from unknown higher orders.

The caveat is that if nonperturbative and higher-order perturbative effects are inseparable, the hadronization correction can be scale-dependent itself, an

aspect which usually remains fogged. It should be fitted anew for each scale. Let us try  $\mu = 0.13 Q$  which is of order of the gluon transverse momentum  $k_{\perp}^2 \sim (1 - T)Q^2/4$ . Keeping  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.120$  fixed, one obtains an equally good fit to the data by changing the  $1/Q$  correction

$$\langle 1 - T \rangle(Q) = 0.335 \alpha_s(0.13Q) + 0.19 \alpha_s^2(0.13Q) + \frac{0.4\text{GeV}}{Q} \quad (6)$$

This illustrates that the reshuffling of higher-order perturbative corrections by changing the factorization scale can be compensated by the change of the hadronization correction. The only known way to separate the nonperturbative effects from the factorization scale dependence is to introduce an IR matching scale in the spirit of the OPE treatment as discussed above. This is attempted in the Dokshitzer-Webber model<sup>4</sup>, where contributions of small scales are subtracted from perturbation theory. First applications of this model to the extraction of  $\alpha_s$  are encouraging<sup>12</sup>: The scale dependence is reduced by factor two compared to the traditional treatment, the IR matching scale dependence is small, and the value of the extracted nonperturbative parameter is stable.

The question of possible ‘universality’ of hadronization corrections is complicated and needs further study. Real solution requires development of the OPE-like techniques. The present approaches to this problem rely on two assumptions: that nonperturbative effects are proportional to perturbative ambiguities and that present ‘naive’ estimates of these ambiguities are representative. This may well be not true, or only partially true, and these assumptions should be tested on simpler examples. Of particular interest are predictions for the  $x$ -dependence of the  $1/Q^2$  effects in DIS<sup>9,18,19</sup> and for the fragmentation functions<sup>7,8</sup>. The Dokshitzer-Webber model has a built-in universality also for the event shapes.

In general, one should expect that the expansion is organized in powers of some physical scale (say the BLM scale) rather than the ‘naive’ c.m. energy, and differences in the effective scales for various processes (together with the power counting) can give a rough idea of the difference in nonperturbative corrections. For example, the twist-4 effects in DIS at  $x \rightarrow 1$  are proportional to  $\Lambda^2/[(1-x)Q^2]$  while they are of order  $\Lambda^2/[(1-x)^2Q^2]$  for the Drell-Yan cross section. The difference reflects different hard scales for the gluon emission.

Viewed this way, the problem of power corrections is inseparable from the familiar problem of the scale dependence and scale fixing. The specifics of hadron event observables is that the physical scale (estimated e.g. by any of existing scale fixing prescriptions) appears to be very low – of order 1/10 of the c.m. energy. It was argued<sup>20</sup> that the data do not show any preference for a low scale since the spread of the results for  $\alpha_s$  between different observables is

not reduced. From my point of view this conclusion is not warranted and the observed spread may indicate an intrinsic accuracy of the present treatment, with the separation of perturbative and hadronization effects as independent entities.<sup>a</sup>

In any case, some standardization is needed for the choice of scale in the data analysis. At present, each experimental collaboration uses different criteria to fix the scale range, which makes the comparison difficult.

To summarize, what is done and what is necessary to do to improve the theoretical accuracy of the determinations of  $\alpha_s$  from hadronic event shapes?

- Certain theoretical tools are developed to determine the power counting of nonperturbative effects in hadronic event observables. Some of the existing event shapes are predicted to have smaller corrections than the others, and it is advisable to concentrate on them rather than make ‘global fits’.
- With this new knowledge, one should try to design new event shapes. An ‘event shape of the year’ should be measurable, calculable to  $O(\alpha_s^3)$  accuracy and have small nonperturbative effects. Some work in this direction is reported in<sup>8</sup>.
- In addition to the traditional procedures, one has to apply alternative methods for the data analysis with the hadronization corrections fitted to the data rather than taken from models. One should always bear in mind that hadronization corrections do not have objective meaning unless a clear scale separation is made.
- The existing procedures should be checked for double counting of perturbative contributions at low scales. The complete next-to-leading order parton shower models would help a lot.
- A convention for the scheme and scale setting is badly needed.

My personal feeling is that present theoretical accuracy of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  from hadronic event shapes is of order 7% and it can be improved up to factor two if the above questions are clarified.

---

<sup>a</sup> Using low scales is more consistent with hadronization corrections taken from parton shower models which imply  $\alpha_s(k_\perp)$  for each gluon emission. Note, however, that these corrections by construction parametrize contributions of small gluon virtualities, which is in spirit of the OPE. Combining them with the fixed-order perturbative calculations one has to subtract contributions of the low scales from the latter to avoid the double counting, at least in principle. In practice this is difficult to do because the parton showers do not include NLO radiative corrections consistently.

## Acknowledgments

I am grateful to M. Beneke, K. Hamacher and L. Lönnblad for the discussions. Special thanks are due to M. Shifman for the invitation to this conference.

## References

1. S. Bethke, presented at ‘QCD-96’, Montpellier, July 1996 (hep-ex/9609014); M. Schmelling, presented at ICHEP’96, Warsaw, July 1996.
2. M. Beneke, presented at ICHEP’96, Warsaw, July 1996 (hep-ph/9609215).
3. B. Webber, *Phys. Lett. B* **339**, 148 (1994).
4. Yu. Dokshitzer and B. Webber, *Phys. Lett. B* **352**, 451 (1995).
5. R. Akhoury and V.I. Zakharov, *Phys. Lett. B* **357**, 646 (1995). *Nucl. Phys. B* **465**, 295 (1996).
6. P. Nason and M.H. Seymour, *Nucl. Phys. B* **454**, 291 (1995).
7. M. Dasgupta and B. Webber, CAVENDISH-HEP-96-2 (hep-ph/9608394).
8. M. Beneke, V.M. Braun and L. Magnea, NORDITA-96/52 P (hep-ph/9609266).
9. Yu. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesini and B. Webber, CERN-TH-95-281 (hep-ph/9512336).
10. M. Beneke and V.M. Braun, *Nucl. Phys. B* **454**, 253 (1995).
11. G. Korchemsky, presented at NORDITA workshop on renormalons and power corrections in QCD, Copenhagen, August 1996; R. Akhoury, *ibid.*
12. DELPHI collab., DELPHI 96-107 CONF 34, paper pa02003 submitted to ICHEP’96, Warsaw.
13. H. Contopanagos and G. Sterman, *Nucl. Phys. B* **419**, 77 (1994).
14. G.P. Korchemsky and G. Sterman, *Nucl. Phys. B* **437**, 415 (1995).
15. M. Beneke and V.M. Braun, presented at ‘Continuos Advances in QCD’ Minneapolis, March 1996 (hep-ph/9605375).
16. S. Catani et al., CERN-TH-96-86 (hep-ph/9604351).
17. V. Novikov et al, *Nucl. Phys. B* **249**, 445 (1985).
18. E. Stein et al, *Phys. Lett. B* **376**, 177 (1996); M. Meyer-Hermann et al, UFTP-414-1996 [hep-ph/9605229].
19. M. Dasgupta and B. Webber, CAVENDISH-HEP-96-1 (hep-ph/9604388).
20. P.N. Burrows et al, *Phys. Lett. B* **382**, 157 (1996).