

# Numerical analysis of renormalization technique in quantum mechanics.

A. A. Penin<sup>1</sup> and A. A. Pivovarov<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Nuclear Research, Russian Academy of Sciences,  
Moscow 117312, Russia

<sup>2</sup>National Laboratory for High Energy Physics (KEK),  
Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan

## Abstract

We discuss the ways of extracting a low energy scale of an underlying theory using high energy scattering data. Within an exactly solvable model of quantum mechanics we analyze a technique based on introduction of nonperturbative power corrections accounting for asymptotically small terms and an alternative approach exploiting a modified running coupling constant of the model and nonperturbative continuation of evolution equations into an infrared region. Numerical estimates show that the latter is more efficient in approximating low-energy data of the model.

PACS number(s): 11.15.Bt, 12.38.Cy

# 1 Introduction.

Considerable and steady improvement of experimental data has recently caused a renewal of interest in resummation of perturbation theory (PT) series. In the growing number of cases finite order theoretical predictions within PT have uncertainties comparable with experimental errors that urgently requires more accurate theoretical estimates. Nonperturbative (power-like) corrections to different processes within Wilson's OPE are widely used to match with improving of experimental data. For cases that have no simple formulation in terms of OPE the attempts to go beyond PT are now mostly based on using renormalons (for a concise up-to-date review see [1]). Because the expansion parameter { a running coupling constant  $\alpha_s$  } is sufficiently large for moderate energies predictions differ strongly depending on a way one chooses to handle a strong coupling constant in the infrared region.

The technique we further refer to as a standard one presently consists in resumming bubble chains with principal value prescription for singularities in the Borel plane, e.g. [2]. Rich phenomenology can be developed on such a base [3] though the real sensitivity of the approach to the infrared physics is unclear as well as an unambiguous disentangle of perturbative and nonperturbative (condensate) contributions [4]. Some other approaches use mostly the modified running of the coupling constant [5, 6], specific recipes for scale setting [7, 8] and optimization of perturbation theory [9, 10], or some modification of function to produce a smooth evolution at small momenta [11]. Initially there is no preference between these techniques because no exact results on the behaviour of PT in large orders or in IR domain are known. Some general properties of the quantum field theory to be respected (like analyticity) give no much help to distinguish between possibilities. Yet in phenomenological applications, the existing methods give different numerical results lying on the edge of experimental errors. The selection of a working framework will eventually be based on how well the particular technique fits experimental data. Under these circumstances it seems to be instructive to study some simple models [4, 12] where different methods used in QCD could be quantitatively checked for their advantages at least for gaining some intuition useful (or misleading as well) in more complicated situations.

In the present paper we investigate two different approaches within a quantum mechanical model that mimics some general features of renormalons.

# 2 The model.

We consider the problem of potential scattering with

$$V(r) = V_0 - \frac{A}{r} \quad (1)$$

and limit ourselves to s-wave amplitudes. Such a potential can be considered as a kind of confining (not completely) one. We study a value of wave function at the origin (a free wave function is normalized to 1). The exact solution for scattering of the plane wave with momentum  $k$  reads

$$\psi(k; r=0) = 1 + \frac{V_0}{k} e^{ikr_0} \sin(kr_0) \quad (2)$$

where the mass of the particle in the hamiltonian is set to 1. To study scattering of wave packages with distributed momentum we consider an integral of the form

$$\psi(r) = \int_0^\infty dk W(k; r) \psi(k; r) \quad (3)$$

where  $W(k; r)$  is a normalized weight function of a package depending on a set of parameters  $\{r_0, V_0\}$ ,  $\int_0^\infty W(k; r) dk = 1$ . It is more convenient to deal with a function  $F(r)$

$$\psi(r) = 1 + F(r)$$

so that  $F$  vanishes if the scattering potential is switched off. Because of oscillating factors in eq. (2) integrals (3) are not well suitable for the PT analysis (they are "Minkowskian" quantities). For  $m = r_0^{-1} > |V_0|$  there are no bound states in the potential (1) and we can carry out the Wick rotation because  $\psi(k)$  is analytic in upper semi-plane ( $\text{Im } k > 0$ ) that corresponds to the physical sheet in energy  $E = k^2$ . In "Euclidean" region the exact expression for  $\psi(k)$  becomes

$$\psi(q) = 1 + \frac{V_0}{2q} (1 - e^{-2q r_0}) \quad (4)$$

where  $k = iq$ ,  $q > 0$ . The last formula can be obtained by PT from a Born series for the standard Lippmann-Schwinger equation of potential scattering since we deal with a finite range potential. The Born series is ordered in  $V_0$  with general form of a  $n$ th term  $V_0^n \psi_n(q; m)$ . Bearing in mind the high energy analysis one can classify the behavior of Born series according to the rate with which its terms vanish at large momenta. Then each term of the Born series for  $\psi(q) = \psi_n(q; m)$  contains contributions vanishing as a power and as an exponent that is similar to the situation in QCD where PT contains two kinds of terms different with respect to their high energy behavior { logarithmic and power like. This different behavior allows one to easily separate terms accordingly. Such a structure of PT series is in fact a justification for us of using this model as a toy analog of QCD and one must always remember a toy character of the model. The parameter  $V_0$  then determines the scale at which the series of power vanishing terms becomes poorly convergent while the exponential terms have already died out completely. The parameter  $m$  determines the scale of exponentially suppressed effects. In contrast to QCD where in the massless limit both

logarithmic and power suppressed terms are governed by a single dimensional parameter  $Q_{CD}$ , in our model one can change the relative weight of power and exponential terms varying parameters  $m$  and  $V_0$  independently or rather choosing the particular ratio  $V_0=m$ . Clearly at large values of this ratio exponentially small terms can hardly be detected at all and any modification of PT is going to be successful because corrections are really tiny. We however consider more interesting situation when this ratio is small enough and at some moderate energies both types of contributions are present with relatively essential weights. In such a situation one encounters a dilemma whether to keep them still separated therefore using the classification inspired by asymptotic considerations or to use more direct optimization technique though lifting the requirement of proper asymptotic behaviour but more efficient and precise at moderate energies. The numerical investigation of this problem is in fact the purpose of our paper.

Note that we do not fix the sign of the parameter  $V_0$  and will study both attractive and repulsive interaction.

At high energies ( $q \gg m$ ) the expansion parameter is a running coupling constant  $(q) = V_0/2q$  (trivial asymptotic freedom as in superrenormalizable theories)

$$(q) = \text{as}(q) + \text{np}(m; V_0; q)$$

where

$$\text{as}(q) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{V_0}{2q} \right)^n \quad (5)$$

and  $\text{np}(m; V_0; q)$  stands for exponentially suppressed "nonperturbative" terms

$$\text{np}(m; V_0; q) = \frac{V_0}{2q} e^{-2\frac{q}{m}} + \dots \quad (6)$$

Within the present model we classify terms with respect to their behavior at large  $q$ : power like vanishing { PT, faster than any power { non-PT. With the standard renormalization group (RG) terminology we have

$$(q) = q \frac{\partial}{\partial q} = : \quad (7)$$

Resummation in eq. (5) (in the spirit of RG) results in definition of a new (renormalization group improved) "running" coupling constant

$$\text{as}(q) = \frac{V_0}{2q + V_0} \quad (8)$$

with a function

$$\text{as}(\text{as}) = \text{as}(1 - \text{as}) : \quad (9)$$

This function has an infrared fixed point that makes the running coupling constant  $\alpha_s(q)$  finite at small  $q$  in accordance with the explicit expression (8). The use of this expansion parameter allows us to improve the perturbation theory and to sum up all "perturbative" power terms of the series (5)

$$\alpha_s(q) = 1 + \alpha_s(q) : \quad (10)$$

Now we turn to consideration of the wave package of a specific form given by the following weight function

$$W(q; Q) = Q \frac{e^{-\frac{Q}{q}}}{q^2} :$$

This weight function has a bump of the width  $\sim \frac{1}{Q}$  located at  $q = Q=2$  so the above wave package can be considered as a "probe" of the scattering potential at the scale  $2=Q$ .

### 3 Borel summation and renormalons.

It is easy to see that our observable (3) suffers from the renormalon. Substituting  $\alpha_s(q)$  in eq. (3) by its asymptotic expansion (10) we obtain

$$F^{as}(\lambda) = \int_0^{\lambda^{-1}} \alpha_s(q) W(q; Q) dq : \quad (11)$$

The quantity  $F^{as}(\lambda)$  has a typical structure of QCD observable containing renormalon, i.e. it is an integral of some weight function multiplied by a running coupling constant over the interval that includes strong coupling domain. Note that in our model the use of the running coupling constant (8) in the integrand accounts for all perturbative corrections. Situation in QCD is much more complicated and the representation of such a type is justified by the assumption of "naive nonabelianization" [13].

After integrating term by term in eq. (11) we get the series with factorially growing coefficients

$$F^{as}(\lambda) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n n!^{-n}; \quad \lambda = V_0 = 2Q : \quad (12)$$

Properties of the series (12) depend crucially on the sign of  $\lambda$  or  $V_0$ . Let us consider first repulsive potential  $V_0 > 0$ . Then the alternating series (12) is Borel summable (in QCD it might correspond to an ultraviolet renormalon). The Borel image

$$\tilde{F}^{as}(u) = \frac{u}{1+u} \quad (13)$$

has a pole at  $u = -1$  and is a regular function on the positive semiaxis. So the Borel summation leads to the result ( $\lambda = V_0 = 2Q$ )

$$F_B(\lambda) = \frac{e^{-1/\lambda}}{1 - 1/\lambda} \quad (14)$$

where  $E_1(x)$  is the integral exponent [14]

$$E_1(x) = \int_x^{\infty} \frac{e^{-t}}{t} dt$$

Clearly the Borel summation procedure in this case gives an unambiguous meaning to the series (12) and essentially improves on convergence of partial sums of the series (12). However numerical analysis shows that  $F_B(Q)$  does not approximate well the exact function  $F(Q)$  for intermediate  $Q$  (Fig. 1). Indeed,  $^{as}(q)$  is the best expansion parameter (exponentially accurate) at large momenta but  $^{as}(q)$  does not approximate well the function  $^{(1)}(q)$  at small  $q$  and eq. (14) tells us nothing about the parameter  $m$  that measures exponentially suppressed "nonperturbative" contributions. Is there more efficient way of extracting information on the parameter  $m$ ? An alternative approach is to compute the function  $F(Q)$  within the modified perturbation theory for  $^{as}(q)$  that can provide a sufficient accuracy even at very small  $q$ . For this purpose one has to choose a relevant expansion parameter. We write

$$^{as}(q) = ^{(1)}(q) \left( 1 - \frac{V_0}{V_0} ^{(1)}(q) \right)^{-1} = ^{(1)}(q) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{V_0^n}{V_0^n} ^{(1)}(q)^n;$$

$$^{(1)}(q) = \frac{V_0}{2q + \dots}$$

where  $\dots$  is a parameter that reflects some freedom in the choice of a scheme. Now we limit ourselves to only two terms of this expansion that is reasonable in PT region (though the precision may be improved on using more terms) and define new expansion parameter

$$^{(2)}(q) = ^{(1)}(q) \left( 1 + \frac{V_0}{V_0} ^{(1)}(q) \right) = \frac{V_0}{2q + \dots} \left( 1 + \frac{V_0}{2q + \dots} \right) \quad (15)$$

with a function

$$^{(2)}(\dots) = \dots + O(\dots^2)$$

that is a PT transformation. The perturbation theory series for  $^{(2)}(q)$  in  $^{(2)}$  reads

$$^{as}(q) = 1 + ^{(2)}(q) + O(\dots^2(q)): \quad (16)$$

Taking the first order term in eq. (16) and fixing the parameter  $m$  at an optimal value we find the function  $F(Q) = \int_0^{R_1} ^{(2)}(q) W(q; Q) dq$  to be very close to the exact function  $F(Q)$  up to very small  $Q$  (Fig. 1). Note that at very large  $Q$  the function  $F_B(Q)$  becomes closer to the exact result  $F(Q)$  than  $F^{(1)}(Q)$  because  $F_B(Q)$  and  $F(Q)$  have the same asymptotic expansion by construction. On the other hand lifting this too strong condition of the same asymptotic behavior at infinitely large  $q$  we find a function  $F(Q)$  that approximates the exact function  $F(Q)$  uniformly from moderate  $Q$ . Because at the optimal  $m$  the function  $^{(2)}(q)$  is close to  $^{(1)}(q)$  for finite  $q$  this approximation is universal in a sense that it works well for

various forms of scattering package. The optimal value  $\alpha^{opt}(m; V_0)$  can be extracted from experiment (in our model the exact solution plays the role of experimental data). It turns out to be very sensitive to the variation of  $m$  while the Borel resummed series is universal and gives the same prediction for theories with different  $m$ . So, in this case the modification of the running of the coupling constant is more efficient and flexible in determining the low energy structure of the model. Stress again that Borel resummed result in this case has no build-in mechanism to modify predictions in dependence on the parameter  $m$  while the value of optimal parameter directly and rather sensitively reflects the change of  $m$ .

The case of attractive potential  $V(r) = -V_0/r$ ,  $V_0 > 0$  at first sight seems to be completely different. The running coupling constant

$$\alpha_{as}(q) = \frac{V_0}{2q - V_0}$$

has a singularity at  $q = V_0/2 > 0$ . The series (12) now becomes

$$F^{as}(u) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{u^n}{n!} \alpha^n; \quad \alpha = V_0/2Q > 0 \quad (17)$$

and it is not Borel summable. This situation resembles the case of the infrared renormalon. The Borel image of the series (17) has a pole on the positive  $u$  axis and the Borel procedure leads to an ill-defined representation in case of attractive potential. Though this could be considered as a signal of the presence of nonperturbative contributions one should stress that the exact function (4) undergoes no qualitative change in the low energy domain (see also [15]). Following the line of QCD renormalon technique we define the result of Borel summation by deforming the integration contour in the complex  $u$  plane. The result obtained in this way depends on the specific form of an integration contour while an appropriate nonperturbative part must cancel this dependence. In our model we use the principal value (PV) prescription to define the sum of the series (17)

$$F_B(u) = PV \int_0^{\infty} e^{-u} \frac{u}{1-u} du = \frac{e^{-1}}{1} Ei\left(\frac{1}{1-u}\right) \quad (18)$$

where  $Ei(x)$  is the integral exponent [14]

$$Ei(x) = PV \int_1^{\infty} \frac{e^{-t}}{t} dt$$

$\alpha = V_0/2Q > 0$ . Within the renormalon technique one should search for the exact function  $F(Q)$  in the form

$$F(Q) = F_B(u) + C e^{-1/(1-u)} + \dots \quad (19)$$

Here the first term has the same perturbative asymptotic expansion as the exact function  $F(Q)$ , a constant  $C$  gives the leading exponentially suppressed correction and ellipsis stands

for "higher twist" contributions. The power of the exponent in (19) is determined by the position of the pole of the Borel image. To find the value of  $C$  one has to use purely nonperturbative method or extract it from experiment. The form of first term, the value of the constant  $C$ , and high order corrections do depend on summation prescription while the whole sum should not by construction. So, in contrast to the previous case where the PT sum was uniquely determined by Borel prescription, in this case there is a parameter that can be adjusted to fit experimental data and therefore to measure the value of  $m$ . It happens that the parameter  $C(m; V_0)$  is quite sensitive to the variation of  $m$  so it can be considered as a "probe" of nonperturbative effects.

The result of approximation for the exact function  $F(Q)$  with eq. (19) is given in Fig. 2.

The approximation diverges strongly at small  $Q$ . The reason is the same as in the previous case of the Borel summable series. Namely,  $\alpha_s(q)$  is a poor expansion parameter at small momenta. Still at sufficiently large  $Q$  the accuracy is reasonable and adding of an adjusting term (constant  $C$ ) improves on a precision of the resummed series at moderate energies. This is rather natural because an introduction of an additional free parameter ( $C$  in this case) always allows one to get better results.

Though the running coupling  $\alpha_s(q)$  becomes singular at some point and can hardly be used for approximation of regular function  $\beta(q)$  the introduction of a new term for Borel nonsummable series (extra degree of freedom) helps to detect the dependence of the constant  $C$  on  $m$  through experimental data. Note that this method gives no hint on how to construct "higher twist" contributions in this case because there is a single singularity of the Borel image on the positive semiaxes allowing only one additional degree of freedom.

Stress once again however that even the singular function  $\text{as}(q)$  still accumulates all PT terms exactly as in the previous case. Though making results numerically better, in our model the assumption that a singularity of the Borel image determines the index of vanishing of the leading nonperturbative term is incorrect. Indeed eq. (19) fails to detect the leading non-PT asymptotics of the exact function  $F(Q)$  which reads

$$\frac{s}{m} \frac{V_0}{\exp} \quad \frac{s}{2} \frac{V_0}{m} !$$

while the Borel-based guess is  $\exp(-1) = 0.3679$ ,  $\beta = V_0/2Q = 0.25$ . In addition, the parameterization (19) is not universal i.e. one gets essentially different values of  $C$  for different scattering packages and it is not clear how this variety of parameters should be used to estimate the infrared parameter  $m_\pi$  of the model.

Turning to an alternative approach and introducing a running coupling constant of the form (15) with an appropriate  $\beta$  we obtain a uniform approximation of the function  $F(Q)$  practically for all  $Q$  (Fig. 2). Because in our toy model experimental data (exact solution) is available for all  $Q$  with arbitrary accuracy we do not limit the applicability of the



methods in question to the asymptotic regime only but try them at all possible  $Q$ . Thus, the approach based on introduction of a single parameter as in the previous case produces more efficient fitting for experimental data in broader range of energies. The accuracy of the approximation and the actual value of the parameter (and  $C$  as well) depend on the range where data have to be fitted. The renormalon approach cannot be used for small  $Q$  by construction of approximants while the modified running technique is applicable till rather small energies. The optimal value of the parameter depends on the scattering packages rather weakly because this technique essentially approximates the exact function (4) point-wise. This dependence is also expected because it reflects the different choice of optimal scheme for different observables.

In QCD this prescription would correspond to the use of (probably mass dependent) RG equation for strong coupling constant with infrared regular solution [5, 11, 16]. We should note however that in this way we determine only the scale of nonperturbative effects while the exact form of  $F(Q)$  can be found only via real nonperturbative calculations.

## 4 Conclusion.

The analysis of two possible ways of extracting information on low energy domain of a quantum mechanical model shows that approach based on optimization of the PT through introduction of a flexible expansion parameter using the freedom of choice of the scheme is more efficient for moderate energies than direct Borel resummation technique. In our model also the singularity of Borel image for attractive potential does not correspond to leading non-PT asymptotics of exact function that is one of main reasons for using the renormalon technique in phenomenological applications of QCD. Though obtained in a toy model, these observations may serve as a ground for using a modified running of the coupling constant of QCD in the infrared domain for phenomenological applications instead (or in addition to) the standard renormalon technique.

## Acknowledgments

A. A. Pivovarov thanks Prof. Y. Okada for his interest in the work, comments, and discussion. A. A. Pivovarov is grateful to Prof. Y. Okada and to colleagues from Theory Group for the kind hospitality extended to him during the stay at KEK where the final version of the paper was written. The work of A. A. Pivovarov is supported in part by Russian Fund for Basic Research No. 96-01-01860. The work of A. A. Penin is supported in part by INTAS grant N 93-1630-ext and N 93-2492-ext (research program of International Fund for Fundamental Physics in Moscow).

## R e f e r e n c e s

- [1] R Akhoury and V I Zakharov, hep-ph/9610492.
- [2] P Ball, M Beneke and V M Braun, NuclPhys. B 452 (1995)563.
- [3] B R Webber, PhysLett. B 339 (1994)148;  
 Yu L Dokshitzer and B R Webber, PhysLett. B 352 (1995)451;  
 A V Manohar and M B Wise, PhysLett. B 344 (1995)407;  
 I I Bigi, M A Shifman, N G Uraltsev, A I Vainshtein, PhysRev. D 50 (1994)2234;  
 M Beneke and V M Braun NuclPhys. B 454 (1995)253;  
 R Akhoury and V I Zakharov, NuclPhys. B 465 (1996)295.
- [4] G Martinelli and C T Sachrajda, NuclPhys. B 478 (1996)660.
- [5] G G runberg, PhysLett. B 372 (1996)121.
- [6] D V Shirkov, I L Solovtsov, hep-ph/9604363.
- [7] S J Brodsky, P G Lepage and P B Mackenzie, PhysRev. D 28 (1983)228;  
 S J Brodsky, H J Lu, PhysRev. D 51 (1995)3652.
- [8] M Neubert, PhysRev. D 51 (1995)5924.
- [9] G G runberg, PhysLett. B 95 (1980)70.
- [10] P M Stevenson, PhysRev. D 23 (1981)2916.
- [11] N V Krasnikov and A A Pivovarov, INR-903, hep-ph/9510207,  
 INR-903a, hep-ph/9512213, Mod PhysLett. A 11 (1996)835.
- [12] A A Penin and A A Pivovarov, PhysLett. B 357 (1995)427,  
 PhysLett. B 367 (1996)342.
- [13] D J Broadhurst, Z Phys. C 58 (1993)339;  
 D J Broadhurst and A G Grozin, PhysRev. D 52 (1995)4082;  
 M Beneke, V Braun, PhysLett. B 348 (1995)513;  
 C N Lovett-Turner, C J Maxwell, NuclPhys. B 452 (1995)188.
- [14] Handbook of mathematical functions, ed. by M Abramowitz and I A Stegun, National Bureau of standards (1964).
- [15] S Peris, E. de Rafael, PhysLett. B 387 (1996)603.
- [16] Yu L Dokshitzer, V A Khoze and S I Troyan, PhysRev. D 53 (1996)89.

## Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Numerical results for repulsive potential  $V_0 = 1, m = 3$ .

Function  $F(Q) = F(Q)$ , the optimal value  $= 5$  (line a).

Function  $F_B(Q) = F(Q)$  (line b).

Function  $F^{(3)}(Q) = F(Q)$  where  $F^{(3)}(Q)$  is the sum of the first three terms of the asymptotic expansion (12) (line c).

Fig. 2. Numerical results for attractive potential  $V_0 = 1, m = 3$ .

Function  $F(Q) = F(Q)$  for the optimal value  $= 2.7$  (line a).

Function  $(F_B(Q) + C e^{-1}) = F(Q)$  for an optimal value  $C = 0.06$  (line b).

Function  $F_B(Q) = F(Q)$  (line c).




Fig. 1




Fig. 2