LTH 417 UPRF - 98 - 10 ULG-PNT-98-CP-1

Search for 1=p² Corrections to the Running QCD Coupling

G.Burgio^a, F.DiRenzo^b, C.Parrinello^b, C.Pittori^c
^a Dipartimento di Fisica, Universita di Parma and INFN, Gruppo Collegato di Parma, Parma, Italy
^b Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of Liverpool Liverpool L69 3BX, UK. (UKQCD Collaboration)
^c Institut de Physique Nucleaire Theorique, Universite de Liege au Sart Tilmann B-4000 Liege, Belgique.

Abstract

We investigate the occurrence of power terms in the running QCD coupling $_{\rm s}$ (p) by analysing non-perturbative measurements at low momenta (p & 2GeV) obtained from the lattice three-gluon vertex. Our exploratory study provides some evidence for power contributions to $_{\rm s}$ (p) proportional to $1=p^2$. Possible in plications for physical observables are discussed.

1 Introduction

The standard procedure to parametrise non-perturbative QCD e ects in terms of power corrections to perturbative results is based on the Operator Product Expansion (OPE). In this framework, the powers involved in the expansion are expected to be uniquely xed by the symmetries and the dimension of the relevant operator product. It should be noted that, due to the asymptotic nature of QCD perturbative expansions, power corrections are reshu ed between operators and coe cient functions in the OPE [1].

The above picture has recently been challenged [2, 3, 4]. It was pointed out that power corrections which are not a priori expected from the OPE may in fact appear in the expansion of physical observables. Such terms may arise from (UV-subleading) power corrections to $_{\rm s}$ (p), corresponding to non-analytical contributions to the -function. To illustrate this point, consider for example a typical contribution to a condensate of dimension 2 :

$$\sum_{2}^{Q^{2}} \frac{dp^{2}}{p^{2}} \left(\frac{p^{2}}{Q^{2}} \right) = \left(\frac{p^{2}}{2} \right) : \qquad (1)$$

A power contribution to $s\left(\frac{p^2}{2}\right)$ of the form $\left(\frac{2}{p^2}\right)^z$ would generate (from the UV lim it of integration) a contribution to the condensate proportional to $\left(\frac{2}{Q^2}\right)^z$. The fact that the dimension of such a term would be independent of indicates that this contribution would be missed in a standard OPE analysis.

Note that in the above manipulations z could be in principle any (real) number. The value z = 1 may in fact play a special role (see the discussion in Section 2), as it would result in $\frac{2}{p^2}$ contributions to physical processes whose existence has been conjectured for a long time, mainly in the fram ework of the UV renorm alon [5].

C learly, the existence of -independent power corrections, if demonstrated, would have a major impact on our understanding of non-perturbative QCD elects and may a ect QCD predictions for several processes. For example, $\frac{2}{0.2}$ contributions may be relevant for the analysis of decays [6, 2].

A lthough the size of such corrections could in principle be estimated directly from experimental data, it would be highly desirable to develop a theoretical framework where the occurrence of these elects is demonstrated and estimates are obtained from inst principles QCD calculations. Some steps in this direction were performed in [7, 4], where some evidence for an unexpected $\frac{2}{Q^2}$ contribution to the gluon condensate was obtained through lattice calculations.

The aim of the present work is to test a method to detect the presence of power corrections in the running QCD coupling. Non-perturbative lattice estimates of the coupling at low momenta are compared with perturbative form ulae. A lthough at this stage our work is exploratory in nature and further simulations will be required to obtain a conclusive answer, our analysis provides some preliminary evidence for power corrections. The nalgoal is to investigate the possible link between OPE-independent power corrections to physical observables and power term s in the running coupling.

The paper is organised as follows: in Section 2 we brie y review some theoretical arguments in support of power corrections to $_{\rm s}$ (p), illustrating the special role that may be played by $\frac{2}{p^2}$ terms. In Section 3 we explain the meaning of the lattice data and our strategy for the analysis. Some preliminary evidence for power corrections is discussed. Finally, in Section 4 we draw our conclusions. The appendix contains some technical details.

2 Clues for
$$\frac{2}{p^2}$$
 Corrections to s (p)

Power corrections to $_{s}$ (p) can be shown to arise naturally in m any physical schem es [8, 9]. The occurrence of such corrections cannot be excluded a priori in any renorm alisation scheme. Clearly, given the non-analytic dependence of $(\frac{2}{p^{2}})^{z}$ terms on $_{s}$, power corrections cannot be generated or analysed in perturbation theory. In particular, the non-perturbative nature of such e ects m akes it very hard to assess their dependence on the renorm alisation scheme, which is only very weakly constrained by the general properties of the theory.

As discussed in the following, despite the arbitrariness a priori of the exponent z, several arguments have been put forward in the past to suggest that a likely candidate for a power correction to $_{s}(p)$ would be a term of order $^{2}=p^{2}$, i.e. z = 1.

2.1 Static Quark Potential and Con nem ent

Consider the interaction of two heavy quarks in the static lim it (for a more detailed discussion see [10]). In the one-gluon-exchange approximation, the

static potential V (r) can be written as

$$V(\mathbf{r}) / {}_{s} d^{3}k \frac{\exp^{i\tilde{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}}{\tilde{\chi}\hat{f}}$$
: (2)

C learly the above formula yields the Coulomb potential V (r) 1=r. U sing standard arguments of renormalon analysis, one may consider a generalisation of (2) obtained by replacing s with a running coupling:

$$\nabla (\mathbf{r}) / d^{3}k_{s} (\mathbf{\bar{k}}^{2}) \frac{\exp^{i\mathbf{\bar{k}} \mathbf{r}}}{\mathbf{\bar{k}}^{2}}$$
(3)

The presence of a power correction term of the form ${}_{\rm s}(k^2) / {}^2=k^2$ would generate a linear con ning potential V (r) K r. Note that a standard renorm alon analysis of (3) (see [10] for the details) reveals contributions to the potential containing various powers of r, but a linear contribution is missing. This is a typical result of renorm alon analysis: renorm alons can miss important pieces of non-perturbative inform ation.

2.2 An Estimate from the Lattice

The lattice community has been made aware for some time of the possibility of non-perturbative contributions to the running coupling; for a clear discussion see [11]. Consider the \force" de nition of the running coupling:

$$_{qq}(Q) = \frac{3}{4}r^2\frac{dV(r)}{dr} \qquad (Q = \frac{1}{r});$$
 (4)

where again V (r) represents the static interquark potential. By keeping into account the string tension contribution to V (r), which can be measured in lattice simulations, one obtains a $1=Q^2$ contribution, whose order of magnitude is given by the string tension itself. Ironically, this term has been mainly considered as a sort of ambiguity, resulting in an indeterm ination in the value of (Q) at a given scale. From a dimenst point of view, such a term could be interpreted as a clue for the existence of a $\frac{2}{p^2}$ contribution, and it also provides an estimate for the expected order of magnitude of it, at least in one (physically sound) scheme.

2.3 Landau pole and analyticity.

It is well known that perturbative QCD formulae for the running of $_{\rm s}$ inevitably contain singularities, which are often referred to as the Landau pole. The details of the analytical structure depend on the order at which the function is truncated and on the particular solution chosen. The existence of an interplay between the analytical structure of the perturbative solution and the structure of non-perturbative e ects has been advocated for a long time [12]. To illustrate this idea, consider the one-loop formula for the running coupling $_{\rm s}$ (p):

$$_{s}(p^{2}) = \frac{1}{b_{0} \log(\frac{p^{2}}{2})}$$
: (5)

Here the singularity is a simple pole, which can be removed if one rede nes $_{s}$ (p) according to the following prescription:

$$_{s}(p^{2}) = \frac{1}{b_{0} \log(\frac{p^{2}}{2})} + \frac{2}{b_{0}(2-p^{2})};$$
 (6)

where a power correction of the asymptotic form $\frac{2}{p^2}$ appears. However, the sign of such a correction is the opposite of what one would expect from the results of [4] and from the considerations in Section 2.1, so that in the end one could envisage a more general form ula for the regularised coupling:

$$_{s}(p^{2}) = \frac{1}{b_{0} \log(\frac{p^{2}}{2})} + \frac{2}{b_{0}(2-p^{2})} + c\frac{2}{p^{2}}$$
 (7)

The message from (7) is that the perturbative coupling is not dened at the $\frac{2}{p^2}$ level, so the coecient of the power correction is unconstrained, even after imposing the cancellation of the pole.

At higher perturbative orders one encounters multiple singularities, which include an unphysical cut. There are several ways to regularise them. In particular, the method discussed in [12] combines a spectral-representation approach with the Renorm alization G roup. The method was originally formulated for QED, but it has recently been extended to the QCD case [13].

O ther approaches can be conceived to achieve a system atic regularisation of the singularities arising from the Landau pole, order by order in perturbation theory. In this way one obtains form ulae for $_{\rm s}$ (p) that are well-de ned at all momentum scales.

Such form ulae would be quite useful in the fram ework of our study, since power corrections are expected to be sizeable at scales close to the location of the Landau pole. However, for the purpose of the prelim inary investigation discussed in the present paper, we shall lim it ourselves to a simpler approach, where one tries to t the data by simply adding power corrections to the perturbative expressions, without attempting a regularisation of the Landau pole.

3 Lattice D ata and P ow er C orrections

3.1 $_{\rm s}$ on the Lattice

Several m ethods for computing $_{s}$ (p) non-perturbatively on the lattice have been proposed in recent years [14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. In most cases, the goal of such studies is to obtain an accurate prediction for $_{s}$ (M $_{z}$), i.e. the running coupling at the Z peak, which is a fundam ental parameter in the standard model. For this reason, lattice parameters are usually tuned as to allow the computation of $_{s}$ (p) at momentum scales of at least a few G eV s, where the two-loop asymptotic behaviour is expected to dom inate and power contributions are suppressed. However, the same m ethods can in principle be applied to the study of $_{s}$ (p) at lowerm on entum scales, where power-like term sm ay be sizeable. For this purpose, the best m ethod is one where one can m easure $_{s}$ (p) in a wide range of m on enta from a single M onte C arlo data set.

O nem ethod which fulls the above criterion is the determination of the coupling from the renormalised lattice three-gluon vertex function [18, 19]. This is achieved by evaluating two-and three-point o -shellG reen's functions of the gluon eld in the Landau gauge, and in posing non-perturbative renormalisation conditions on them, for di erent values of the external momenta. By varying the renormalisation scale p, one can determine $_{\rm s}$ (p) for di erent momenta from a single simulation. Obviously the renormalisation scale must be chosen in a range of lattice momenta such that both nite volume e ects and discretisation errors are under control. Such a de nition of the coupling corresponds to a momentum -subtraction renormalisation scheme in continuum QCD [20]. It should be noted that in this scheme the coupling is a gauge-dependent quantity. O ne consequence of this fact is that $1=p^2$ cor-

rections should be expected, based on OPE considerations. We will return to this issue when drawing our conclusions.

The numerical results for $_{\rm s}$ (p) that we use for our investigation were obtained from 150 con gurations on a 16^4 lattice at = 6.0.

For full details of the method we refer the reader to Ref. [19], where such results were rst presented. In order to detect violations of rotational invariance, di erent combinations of lattice vectors have sometimes been used for a xed value of p^2 . This accounts for the graphical \splitting" of some data points.

3.2 M odels for Power Corrections

A sm entioned at the end of Section 2.3, in the present work we shall not address the general problem of de ning a regular coupling at all scales. For the purpose of our preliminary investigation, we shall compare the nonperturbative data for $_{\rm s}$ with simple models obtained by adding a power correction term to the perturbative formula at a given order. In order to identify momentum intervals where our ansatz to the data, one should keep in mind that the momentum range should start well above the location of the perturbative Landau pole, but it should nonetheless include low scales where power corrections may still be sizeable. The requirement of keeping the elects of the nite lattice spacing under control in the numerical data for $_{\rm s}$ induces a natural UV cuto on the momentum range. It is reassuring that intervals that full lithese requirements can be identified, as specified in the following.

One problem in this approach is the possible interplay between a description in terms of (non-perturbative) power corrections and our ignorance about higher orders of perturbation theory. In particular, for the scheme that we consider, the three-loop coe cient of the -function is not known. K now ledge of such a coe cient would allow to perform a more reliable comparison of our estimates for the parameter in our scheme with lattice determ inations of in a dierent scheme, for which the three-loop result is available [21]. In fact, although matching the parameter between dierent schemes only requires a one-loop computation (because of asymptotic freedom), the reliability of such a comparison rests on the assumption that the value of in each scheme is fairly stable with respect to the inclusion of higher orders, which in turn implies that a su cient number of perturbative orders has been considered in the de nition of . In practice, when working at two-or three-loop order, the value of is still quite sensitive to the order of the calculation. For this reason, in the form ulae for $_{\rm s}$ (p) we shall append a subscript to the parameter , to rem ind the reader that the value of such a parameter is expected to carry a sizeable dependence on the order of the perturbative calculation.

Even within such limitations, in the following we will argue that it is possible to estimate the impact of three-loop e ects in our model and that a description with power corrections seems to be stable with respect to the inclusion of such e ects.

3.3 Two-loop Analysis

At the two-bop level, we consider the following form ula:

$$s(p) = \frac{1}{b_0 \log (p^2 = \frac{2}{21})} \qquad \frac{b_1}{b_0} \frac{\log (\log (p^2 = \frac{2}{21}))}{(b_0 \log (p^2 = \frac{2}{21}))^2} + c_{21} \frac{\frac{2}{21}}{p^2}$$
(8)

By thing our data to (8) we obtain two sets of estimates for the parameters ($_{21}$, c_{21}), namely (0.84(1),0.31(3)) and (0.73(1),0.99(7)). The two results correspond to comparable values for $^2_{dof}$, and in both cases we obtain $^2_{dof}$ 1.8. In both cases, the momentum window extends up to p 3 GeV. We take the rst set of values as our best estimate of the parameters as the corresponding value of $_{21}$ is close to what is obtained from a \pure" two-loop t, i.e. $_{21}$ is stable with respect to the introduction of power corrections. Our choice for the value of $_{21}$ will be a posteriori supported also by independent considerations at the three-loop level. The momentum range that we are able to describe (1.8 3.0 GeV) is fully consistent with what one would expect from general considerations based on the value of the UV lattice cut-o and the value of $_{21}$. Notice that choosing between the two sets of values makes quite a di erence in the UV region, where power e ects are largely suppressed.

In sum m ary, a two-loop description with power corrections based on (8) ts well the data in a consistent m om entum range. Our best t of the data

to (8) is shown in Figure 1. We were also able to check that if one tries to determ ine the exponent z of the power correction $(\frac{2}{p^2})^z$ from the t, the best description of the data is obtained for z 1. We interpret this result as a con m ation of our theoretical prejudice z = 1. However, one should note that since that the quality of our data m akes a full three-parameter t very hard, the above check of the value of z and any other three-parameter t that we mention in the following sections were in fact obtained by performing a very large number of two-parameter ts, corresponding to dierent (xed) values of the third parameter.



Figure 1: The best t to (8). The crossed-circled points indicate the tting range.

3.4 Three-loop Analysis

As already mentioned, a major obstacle for a three-loop analysis is the fact that the rst non-universal coe cient b $_2$ of the perturbative -function is not known for our scheme.

In order to gain insight, we start by performing a two-parameter t to the standard three-loop expression for $_{\rm s}$ (p), where the tting parameters are $_{31}$ and the unknown coe cient b₂. We call b₂^{eff} the t estimate for b₂, to emphasize that we expect the electrice value b₂^{eff} to provide an order of magnitude estimate of the true (unknown) coe cient b₂. Our best estimate for $_{31}$ and b₂ is $_{31}$ = 0:72 (1), b₂^{eff} = 1:3 (1), with $_{\rm dof}^2$ 1:8 (see the dashed curve in Fig. 2). The error quoted for the t parameters should always be interpreted within the electrice description provided by the relevant form ula.

The momentum range where we obtain the best description of the data is $p = 2 = 3 \text{ GeV} \cdot 0$ ur result for $_{31}$ provides (via perturbative m atching) an estimate for $_{M-S}$, in very good agreement with the estimate in [21], which was obtained from the computation of the parameter in a completely dierent scheme. A like both estimates are a ected by our ignorance of higher loop e ects, and our estimate also depends on the extra parameter b_2^{eff} , the agreement between the two results appears remarkable. In order to investigate the reliability of b_2^{eff} as an estimate of b_2 , we discuss in the appendix an argument which appears to provide a lower bound for the value of b_2 in our scheme, namely $b_2 \& 0.3$. Our value for b_2^{eff} is therefore consistent with such a bound.

Having obtained comparable values for 2_{dof}^2 from the two-loop analysis with power corrections and from the \pure" three-loop analysis, one may be led to consider our results as evidence against the existence of power corrections, since so far they simply appear to provide an elective description of three-loop elects.

However, we will argue now that there is room for power corrections even at the three-bop level. To this aim, consider the following three-bop formula with a power correction:

$$_{s}$$
 (p) = $\frac{1}{b_{0} L}$ $\frac{b_{1}}{b_{0}} \frac{bg(L)}{(b_{0} L)^{2}}$

$$+ \frac{1}{(b_0 L)^3} \frac{b_2^{eff}}{b_0} + \frac{b_1^2}{b_0^2} (\log^2 (L) - \log (L) + 1) + c_{31} \frac{2}{p^2};$$
(9)

where $L = \log (p^2 = \frac{2}{31})$ and b_2^{eff} is again to be determined from a t. Fitting the data to (9), we obtain $_{31} = 0.72(1)$, $b_2^{eff} = 1.0(1)$ and $c_3 = 0.41(2)$, with $_{dof}^2$ 1.8, in a momentum range 1.8 3.0 GeV (see Fig. 2). The above result was in practice obtained by performing a large number of two-parameter ts for b_2^{eff} and c_3 , for xed values of $_{31}$. The range of trial values for $_{31}$ was suggested by the results of the \pure" three-loop t.

W e note the follow ing:

- 1. the value for the scale parameter ₃₁ is fully consistent with the previous determ ination from the \pure" three-loop description;
- 2. the value for b_2^{eff} is also reasonably stable with respect to the previous determ ination and it is also consistent with the approximate lower bound for b_2 discussed in the appendix;
- 3. by comparing results from ts to (8) and (9), it emerges that

$$c_2 {}^{2}_{21} = 0.22 (2) G eV^{2} c_3 {}^{2}_{31} = 0.21 (2) G eV^{2}$$
: (10)

This approximate equality gives us condence in the presence of power corrections, as it indicates that the power term sproviding the best to (8) and (9) are numerically equal. In other words, there appears to be no interplay between the indeterm ination connected to the perturbative term s and the power correction term, within the precision of our data, thus suggesting that a genuine $\frac{2}{r^2}$ correction is present in the data.

F inally, the coe cient of the power correction is of the order of m agnitude expected from the arguments in sections 2.1 and 2.2, that is, it is comparable to the standard estimate for the string tension squared.

O nem ay argue at this point that at the two-loop level we had to choose between two sets of values for $(_{21},c_{21})$, and that our choice is crucial for the

validity of (10). An a posteriori justi cation for our choice can be obtained from the following test: we plot a few values for $_{\rm s}$ (p) as generated by the \pure" three-loop formula for $_{31}$ = 0:72 and b_2 = 1:0. Then, by tting such points to the \pure" two-loop formula, one gets $_{21}$ 0:84, i.e. the value for which (10) holds.

4 Conclusions

We have discussed an exploratory investigation of power corrections in the nunning QCD coupling $_{\rm s}$ (p) by comparing non-perturbative lattice results with theoretical models. Some evidence was found for 1=p² corrections, whose size was consistent with what is suggested by simple arguments from the static potential.

At the technical level, our results need further con mation from the analysis of a larger data set and a study of the dependence of the t param – eters on the ultraviolet and infrared lattice cuto. Assuming our notings are con med at the technical level, one needs to address the issue of assessing the scheme dependence of our results. As already discussed, the non-perturbative nature of power corrections makes it very hard to form u-late any theoretical procedure to estimate the impact of scheme dependence. The best one can do at this stage is to consider di erent renormalisation schemes and de nitions of the coupling and gather numerical evidence and form alarguments supporting power corrections to $_{s}$ (p). In this way, schemeindependent features may eventually be identied. For example, on the basis of our results, we note the following:

Theoretical arguments suggest $1=\beta^2$ corrections both for the coupling as de ned from the static potential and for the one obtained from the three-gluon vertex. The arguments for the former case were outlined in Sections 2.1 and 2.2. As far as the coupling from the three-gluon vertex is concerned, $1=p^2$ corrections appear in an OPE analysis if one keeps into account the fact that such a coupling is a priori gauge dependent, so that a dimension 2 condensate appears in the relevant OPE.

In the static potential case, the theoretical argument also provides an estimate for the order of magnitude of the ∞e cient of the $1=p^2$ correc-

tion, while in the three-gluon vertex case the OPE argument provides no estimate for it, suggesting instead that it may depend on the gauge. However, our numerical result in the Landau gauge is in striking agreement with the estimate for the static potential case. A though such an agreement may of course be accidental, it calls for further investigation, which may be performed by attempting a similar calculation in a diement gauge.

The issue of scheme dependence will be the focus of our future work.

5 A cknow ledgem ents

W e thank B.Alles, H.Panagopoulos and D.G.R ichards for allowing us to use data les containing the results of Ref. [19].C.Parrinello acknow ledges the support of PPARC through an Advanced Fellow ship.C.Pittori thanks J.Cugnon and the \Institut de Physique de l'Universite de Liege au Sart T ilm an" and acknow ledges the partial support of HSN.W e thank C.M ichael for stim ulating discussions.

Appendix A

Consider the perturbative m atching between our scheme and the \overline{MS} scheme

$$M_{OM} = \frac{2}{MS} + C_1 \frac{2}{MS} + C_2 (b_2) \frac{3}{MS} + O (\frac{4}{S})$$

As it is well known, c_1 determ ines the ratio of the parameters in the di erent schemes, while c_2 depends on c_1 and the di erence between the value of b_2 in our scheme and b_2^{MS} . We assume that at very high momentum values (p > 150 GeV) the running coupling follows the three-loop asymptotic formula. Then if one takes the value for $_{MS}$ from [21] and the value for $_{MOM}$ in our scheme from the perturbative matching, the only unknown parameter in the above expression is the value of b_2 in our scheme. By demanding that at the two-loop level the expansion of one coupling in powers of the other is still convergent (i.e. the convergence is better at two loops than

at one loop as the series are not yet displaying their asymptotic nature) we obtain an approximate lower bound for the unknown coe cient as $b_2 \& 0.3$. We have checked that such a technique provides sensible results for every couple of couplings for which a two-loop matching is known.

References

[1] For reviews and classic references see:

V J. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B 385 (1992) 452;
A H. Mueller, in QCD 20 years later, vol. 1 (W orld Scientic, Singapore 1993). B. Lautnup, Phys. Lett. 69B (1977) 109; G. Parisi, Phys. Lett. 76B (1977) 65; Nucl. Phys. B150 (1979) 163; G. t'Hooff, in The W hys of Subnuclear Physics, Erice 1977, ed A. Zichichi, (P lenum, New York 1977); M. Beneke and V J. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. 312B (1993) 340; M. Beneke Nucl. Phys. B307 (1993) 154; A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B250 (1985) 327; Phys. Lett. 308B (1993) 355; G. Grunberg, Phys. Lett. 304B (1993) 183; Phys. Lett. 325B (1994) 441.

- [2] R.Akhoury and V.J.Zakharov, hep-ph/9705318.
- [3] G .G runberg, hep-ph/9705290; hep-ph/9705460.
- [4] G Burgio, F.DiRenzo, G.Marchesini and E.Onofri, Phys. Lett. 422B (1998) 219.
- [5] A.H.Mueller, in QCD 20 years later, vol. 1 and references therein.R. A khoury and V.J.Zakharov, hep-ph/9710257.
- [6] G.Altarelli, P.Nason, G.Ridol, Zeit. Phys. C 68 (1995) 257.
- [7] An early evidence of such a contribution was reported in G P. Lepage and P. Mackenzie, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 20 (1991) 173, although the perturbative series was not managed up to high orders.
- [8] Yu.L. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesini and B.R. Webber, Nucl. Phys. B469 (1996) 93
- [9] S.J. Brodsky, G.P. Lepage and P.B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D 28 (1983) 228.

- [10] R.Akhoury and V.I.Zakharov, hep-ph/9710487.
- [11] C.Michael, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 42 (1995) 147.
- [12] P. Redmond, Phys. Rev. D 112 (1958) 1404; N.N. Bogoliubov, A.A. Logunov and D.V. Shirkov, Sov. Phys. JETP 37 (1959) 805.
- [13] D.V. Shirkov and IL. Solovtsov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 1209
- [14] A X.El-Khadra et al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 69 (1992) 729.
- [15] M. Luscher et al, Nucl. Phys. B 413 (1994) 481.
- [16] G S.Baliand K.Schilling, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 661.
- [17] SP.Booth et al, Phys. Lett. B294 (1992) 385.
- [18] C. Parrinello, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 4247.
- [19] B.Alles, D.S.Henty, H.Panagopoulos, C.Parrinello, C.Pittori, D.G. Richards, Nucl. Phys. B 502 (1997) 325
- [20] R.Dashen and D.J.Gross, Phys. Rev. D 23 (1981) 2340
- [21] S. Capitani, M. Guagnelli, M. Luescher, S. Sint, R. Sommer, P. Weisz and H. Wittig, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 63 (1998) 153.



Figure 2: Fits to (9) (solid line) versus a pure three-loop t (dashed line). The crossed-circled points are consistent with both ansatze, while the starcircled one is best tted by (9).