

# On Bjorken sum rule: heavy quarks and analytic coupling

I.R. Gabdrakhmanov<sup>1</sup>, N.A. Gramotkov<sup>1,2</sup>, A.V. Kotikov<sup>1</sup>,

O.V. Teryaev<sup>1</sup>, D.A. Volkova<sup>1,3</sup> and I.A. Zemlyakov<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,*

*Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia;*

<sup>2</sup>*Moscow State University, 119991, Moscow, Russia*

<sup>3</sup>*Dubna State University, 141980 Dubna, Moscow Region, Russia;*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics, Universidad Tecnica Federico Santa Maria,*

*Avenida Espana 1680, Valparaiso, Chile*

## Abstract

We present the results of [1], where good agreement was obtained between calculations within the framework of analytic QCD and experimental data on polarized Bjorken sum rule. The heavy quark contributions are taken into account.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Experimental data for the polarized Bjorken sum rule (BSR)  $\Gamma_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  [2] were obtained in a wide range of squares of spacelike momenta  $Q^2$ :  $0.021 \text{ GeV}^2 \leq Q^2 < 5 \text{ GeV}^2$  (see [3, 4] and references therein), which opens up broad possibilities for studying QCD at low  $Q^2$  [5].

In theory, over the last thirty years, an extension of the QCD coupling constant (*couplant*) has been developed that does not have a Landau singularity for low  $Q^2$  and is called analytic perturbation theory (APT) [6, 7]. APT has already been used to compare theoretical expressions and experimental BSR data [4, 8–11].

In this paper we give a brief overview of the application [1] of heavy quark (HQ) contribution to the BSR calculated at the two-loop level in Ref. [12]. This study was carried out in the framework of APT, where the photoproduction limit was also investigated.

## II. BJORKEN SUM RULE

The polarized BSR is defined as the difference of the polarized structure functions of the proton and neutron, integrated over the entire interval  $x$

$$\Gamma_1^{p-n}(Q^2) = \int_0^1 dx [g_1^p(x, Q^2) - g_1^n(x, Q^2)] \quad (1)$$

and can be represented as:

$$\Gamma_1^{p-n}(Q^2) = \frac{g_A}{6} (1 - D_{BS}(Q^2)) + \frac{\hat{\mu}_4 M^2}{Q^2 + M^2}, \quad (2)$$

where  $g_A = 1.2762 \pm 0.0005$  [13] is the axial charge of the nucleon,  $(1 - D_{BS}(Q^2))$  is the contribution of the leading twist (twist-2), and  $(\hat{\mu}_4 M^2)/(Q^2 + M^2)$  is the so-called "massive" representation for twist-four (see [14]).

According to [15] (in  $k$ -order of perturbation theory (PT)) we introduce and use here derivatives

$$\tilde{a}_{n+1}^{(k)}(Q^2) = \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \frac{d^n a_s^{(k)}(Q^2)}{(dL)^n}, \quad a_s^{(k)}(Q^2) = \frac{\beta_0 \alpha_s^{(k)}(Q^2)}{4\pi} = \beta_0 \bar{a}_s^{(k)}(Q^2), \quad (3)$$

which play an important role when using analytic QCD. Here and below  $\beta_0$  is the first coefficient of the  $\beta$ -function of QCD  $\beta(\bar{a}_s^{(k)}) = -(\bar{a}_s^{(k)})^2 (\beta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^k \beta_i (\bar{a}_s^{(k)})^i)$ , where  $\beta_i$  are known up to  $k = 4$  [16].

The series of derivatives  $\tilde{a}_n(Q^2)$  can be used instead of the series of  $a_s$ -powers. Indeed, each derivative reduces the  $a_s$  power, but, on the other hand, it produces an additional  $\beta$ -function proportional to  $a_s^2$ . By definition (3), in the leading order (LO) the expressions for  $\tilde{a}_n(Q^2)$  and  $a_s^n$  exactly coincide. Beyond LO, a one-to-one correspondence between  $\tilde{a}_n(Q^2)$  and  $a_s^n$  was constructed [15, 18] and extended to the fractional case in [19].

The perturbative expansion up to the  $k$ th order has the following form

$$D_{\text{BS}}^{(1)}(Q^2) = \frac{4}{\beta_0} \tilde{a}_1^{(1)}, \quad D_{\text{BS}}^{(k \geq 2)}(Q^2) = \frac{4}{\beta_0} \left( \tilde{a}_1^{(k)} + \sum_{m=2}^k \tilde{d}_{m-1} \tilde{a}_m^{(k)} \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $\tilde{d}_1$ ,  $\tilde{d}_2$ , and  $\tilde{d}_3$  are known from direct calculations (see, e.g., [20]). The coefficient  $\tilde{d}_4$  is not known exactly, but its value has been estimated at [21].

From here on we will take  $f = 3$ . Thus, <sup>1</sup>

$$\tilde{d}_1 = 1.59, \quad \tilde{d}_2 = 2.73, \quad \tilde{d}_3 = 8.61, \quad \tilde{d}_4 = 21.52. \quad (5)$$

Switching from conventional PT to APT given by replacement  $D_{\text{BS}}^{(1)}(Q^2)$  with  $\tilde{a}_m^{(k)}$  by  $D_{\text{A,BS}}^{(1)}(Q^2)$  with analytic couplants  $\tilde{A}_m^{(k)}$  (the corresponding expressions for  $\tilde{A}_m^{(k)}$  can be found [24]). So, we have in APT

$$\Gamma_{\text{A},1}^{p-n}(Q^2) = \frac{g_A}{6} (1 - D_{\text{A,BS}}(Q^2)) + \frac{\hat{\mu}_{\text{A},4} M^2}{Q^2 + M^2}. \quad (6)$$

**3. HQ contribution** was calculated in [12] only at the next-to-leading (NLO) order, that leads to the following replacement for  $\tilde{d}_1$ :

$$\tilde{d}_1 \rightarrow \tilde{d}_1 - \sum_{i=c,b,t} C_1(\xi_i), \quad \xi_i = \frac{Q^2}{m_i^2} \quad (i = c, b, t) \quad (7)$$

and  $m_c = 1.27$  GeV,  $m_b = 4.18$  GeV and  $m_t = 172.76$  GeV (see [13]).

$C_1(\xi)$  has the following form

$$C_1(\xi) = \frac{8}{3\beta_0} \left\{ \frac{6\xi^2 + 2735\xi + 11724}{5040\xi} - \frac{3\xi^3 + 106\xi^2 + 1054\xi + 4812}{2520\xi} L(\xi) - \frac{5}{3\xi(\xi + 4)} L^2(\xi) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{3\xi^2 + 112\xi + 1260}{5040} \ln(\xi) \right\}, \quad L(\xi) = \frac{1}{2\delta} \ln \left( \frac{1 + \delta}{1 - \delta} \right), \quad \delta^2 = \frac{\xi}{4 + \xi}. \quad (8)$$

At large  $Q^2$  values,  $C_1(\xi) \sim 1/(3\beta_0)$  and at low  $Q^2$  values,  $C_1(\xi) \sim 2/(3\beta_0) \ln(\xi)$ , i.e. it rises as  $\ln Q^2$  at  $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$ .

<sup>1</sup> The coefficients  $\beta_i$  ( $i \geq 0$ ) of the QCD  $\beta$ -function and, as a consequence, the couplant  $\alpha_s(Q^2)$  depend on the number  $f$  of active flavors, and each new quark is switched on at the threshold level  $Q_f^2$  in accordance with [22]. The corresponding QCD parameters  $\Lambda^{(f)}$  in  $N^i$ LO PT are obtained in [23].

### III. RESULTS

	$M^2$ for (6) (for (9))	$\hat{\mu}_{\text{MA},4}$ for (6)	$\chi^2/(\text{d.o.f.})$ for (6) (for (9))
LO	$1.631 \pm 0.301$ ( $0.576 \pm 0.046$ )	$-0.166 \pm 0.001$	0.789 (0.575)
NLO	$1.740 \pm 0.389$ ( $0.411 \pm 0.035$ )	$-0.143 \pm 0.002$	0.742 (0.630)
N <sup>2</sup> LO	$1.574 \pm 0.319$ ( $0.400 \pm 0.034$ )	$-0.144 \pm 0.002$	0.714 (0.621)
N <sup>3</sup> LO	$1.587 \pm 0.327$ ( $0.411 \pm 0.035$ )	$-0.145 \pm 0.002$	0.733 (0.618)
N <sup>4</sup> LO	$1.630 \pm 0.344$ ( $0.412 \pm 0.035$ )	$-0.144 \pm 0.002$	0.739 (0.621)

TABLE I: Fitting parameters.

Since the usual PT is not applicable for BSR with small  $Q^2$  (see [4, 8–11]), we consider here only APT. Moreover, here we restrict ourselves to analyses for small  $Q^2$ . A more general case can be found in our paper [1]. The results of fitting experimental data obtained only with statistical uncertainties are presented in Table I and shown in Fig. 1.

Our results obtained for different APT orders are almost equivalent: the corresponding curves are indistinguishable when  $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$ , and differ slightly for other values of  $Q^2$ . As can be seen from Fig. 1, the quality of the fit is quite good, which is also demonstrated by the values of the corresponding  $\chi^2/(\text{d.o.f.})$  (see Table I).

As in the case without heavy quarks, considered earlier in [4, 11], the results are not entirely satisfactory (see Fig. 1). The curves obtained as a result of the fitting take negative values when we go to very low values of  $Q^2$ :  $Q^2 < 0.02 \text{ GeV}^2$ .

*Photoproduction.* To obtain the limit of  $\Gamma_{\text{A},1}^{p-n}(Q^2 \rightarrow 0) \rightarrow 0$  following from the finiteness of the photoproduction cross section, a new form for  $\Gamma_{\text{A},1}^{p-n}(Q^2)$  was proposed in [4]:

$$\Gamma_{\text{A},1}^{p-n}(Q^2) = \frac{g_A}{6} (1 - D_{\text{A,BS}}(Q^2)) \cdot \frac{Q^2}{Q^2 + M^2} + \frac{\hat{\mu}_{\text{A},4} M^2}{Q^2 + M^2} + \frac{\hat{\mu}_{\text{A},6} M^4}{(Q^2 + M^2)^2}, \quad (9)$$

where we added the “massive” twist-six term and introduced a factor  $Q^2/(Q^2 + M^2)$  to modify the twist-two contribution.

The finiteness of the cross section in the limit of a real photon now leads to (see [1])

$$\hat{\mu}_{\text{A},6} = -G M^2 + \frac{5g_A}{54}, \quad \hat{\mu}_{\text{A},4} = -\frac{g_A}{6} - \hat{\mu}_{\text{A},6} = G M^2 - \frac{7g_A}{27}, \quad (10)$$




FIG. 1: The results for  $\Gamma_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  (6) in the first five orders of APT from fits of experimental data with  $Q^2 < 0.6 \text{ GeV}^2$ .

where [25]  $G = 0.0631$  is small and, thus,  $\hat{\mu}_{A,4} < 0$  and  $\hat{\mu}_{A,6} > 0$ .

The results of fitting the theoretical predictions based on (9) with  $\hat{\mu}_{MA,4}$  and  $\hat{\mu}_{MA,6}$  from (10) are presented in Table I and Fig. 2. As can be seen from Table I, the results are very similar to those obtained earlier in [4, 11], since the increase in  $C_1(\xi)$  as  $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$  is compensated by the decrease in  $\tilde{A}_{\nu=2}^{(k)}(Q^2 \rightarrow 0)$ .

We also see the similarity between the results shown in Fig. 1 and 2. The difference appears only for small values of  $Q^2$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We gave a brief overview of the results [1], where we considered the Bjorken sum rule  $\Gamma_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  in the APT framework in the first five PT orders with the added contribution of heavy quarks and obtained results similar to those obtained in previous studies [8, 9, 11].

By investigating the low behavior of  $Q^2$ , we found, as in previous studies without heavy quarks, that there is a discrepancy between the results obtained in the fits and photoproduction. Indeed, the results of the fits extended to low  $Q^2$  lead to negative values for the




FIG. 2: As in Fig. 1 but for (9).

Bjorken sum rule:  $\Gamma_{A,1}^{p-n}(Q^2 \rightarrow 0) < 0$ , which contradicts the finiteness of the cross section in the real photon limit, which corresponds to  $\Gamma_{A,1}^{p-n}(Q^2 \rightarrow 0) = 0$ .

To solve the problem, we used a modification (9) of the OPE formula for  $\Gamma_{A,1}^{p-n}(Q^2)$  proposed in [4]. Using it, we found good agreement between the results obtained in the fits and photoproduction.

**Acknowledgments** Authors are grateful to Alexandre P. Deur for information about new experimental data in Ref. [3] and Johannes Blumlein for initiating the consideration of the contribution of heavy quarks. This work was supported in part by the Foundation for the Advancement of Theoretical Physics and Mathematics “BASIS”. One of us (I.A.Z.) is supported by the Directorate of Postgraduate Studies of the Technical University of Federico Santa Maria.

---

[1] I. R. Gabdrakhmanov *et al.*, arXiv:2408.16804 [hep-ph].

[2] J. D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. **148**, 1467-1478 (1966); Phys. Rev. D **1**, 1376-1379 (1970)

[3] A. Deur *et al.* Phys. Lett. B **825**, 136878 (2022)

[4] I. R. Gabdrakhmanov *et al.*, [arXiv:2404.01873 [hep-ph]].

- [5] A. Deur, S. J. Brodsky and G. F. De Téramond, [arXiv:1807.05250 [hep-ph]]
- [6] D. V. Shirkov and I. L. Solovtsov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997), 1209-1212
- [7] A. P. Bakulev, S. V. Mikhailov and N. G. Stefanis, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005), 074014
- [8] R. S. Pasechnik *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008), 071902; Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010), 016010
- [9] C. Ayala *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **33** (2018) no.18n19, 1850112;
- [10] C. Ayala *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, no.12, 1002 (2018);
- [11] I. R. Gabdrakhmanov *et al.*, JETP Lett. **118**, no. 7, 478-482 (2023)
- [12] J. Blümlein, G. Falcioni and A. De Freitas, Nucl. Phys. B **910**, 568-617 (2016)
- [13] Particle Data Group collaboration, P.A. Zyla *et al.*, PTEP **2020** (2020) 083C01.
- [14] O. Teryaev, Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl. **245** (2013), 195-198; V. L. Khandramai, O. V. Teryaev and I. R. Gabdrakhmanov, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **678** (2016) no.1, 012018
- [15] G. Cvetič and C. Valenzuela, J. Phys. G **32**, L27 (2006); Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006), 114030
- [16] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin and J. H. Kuhn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 012002 (2008)
- [17] A. V. Kotikov and I. A. Zemlyakov, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **115** (2022) no.10, 609
- [18] G. Cvetič, R. Kogerler and C. Valenzuela, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010), 114004
- [19] G. Cvetič and A. V. Kotikov, J. Phys. G **39** (2012), 065005
- [20] J. P. Chen, A. Deur and Z. E. Meziani, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **20** (2005), 2745-2766
- [21] C. Ayala and A. Pineda, Phys. Rev. D **106**, no.5, 056023 (2022)
- [22] K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kuhn and C. Sturm, Nucl. Phys. B **744** (2006), 121-135; Y. Schroder and M. Steinhauser, JHEP **01** (2006), 051; B. A. Kniehl *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** (2006), 042001
- [23] H. M. Chen *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. E **31**, no.02, 2250016 (2022)
- [24] A. V. Kotikov and I. A. Zemlyakov, J. Phys. G **50**, no.1, 015001 (2023)
- [25] J. Soffer and O. Teryaev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 3373-3375 (1993); Phys. Rev. D **70**, 116004 (2004)