

Constraints on "Second Order Fixed Point" QCD from the CCFR Data on Deep Inelastic Neutrino-Nucleon Scattering

Aleksander V. Sidorov

Bogoliubov Theoretical Laboratory

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research

141980 Dubna, Russia

E-mail: sidorov@thsun1.jinr.dubna.su

Dimiter B. Stamenov

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Boul. Tsarigradsko chaussee 72, Sofia 1784, Bulgaria

E-mail: stamenov@bgearn.acad.bg

Abstract

The results of LO *Fixed point* QCD (FP-QCD) analysis of the CCFR data for the nucleon structure function $xF_3(x, Q^2)$ are presented. The predictions of FP-QCD, in which the Callan-Symanzik β function admits a *second order* ultraviolet zero at $\alpha = \alpha_0$ are in good agreement with the data. Constraints for the possible values of the β function parameter b regulating how fast $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ tends to its asymptotic value $\alpha_0 \neq 0$ are found from the data. The corresponding values of α_0 are also determined. Having in mind our recent "First order fixed point" QCD fit to the same data we conclude that in spite of the high precision and the large (x, Q^2) kinematic range of the CCFR data they cannot discriminate between QCD and FP-QCD predictions for $xF_3(x, Q^2)$.

1. Introduction.

The success of perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) in the description of the high energy physics of strong interactions is considerable. The QCD predictions are in good quantitative agreement with a great number of data on lepton-hadron and hadron-hadron processes in a large kinematic region (e.g. see reviews [1] and the references therein). Despite of this success of QCD, we consider that it is useful and reasonable to put the question: Do the present data fully exclude the so-called *fixed point* (FP) theory models [2] ?

We remind that these models are not asymptotically free. The effective coupling constant $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ approaches a constant value $\alpha_0 \neq 0$ as $Q^2 \rightarrow \infty$ (the so-called fixed point at which the Callan- Symanzik β -function $\beta(\alpha_0) = 0$). Using the assumption that α_0 is *small* one can make predictions for the physical quantities in the high energy region, as like in QCD, and confront them to the experimental data. Such a test of FP theory models has been made [3, 4] by using the data of deep inelastic lepton-nucleon experiments started by the SLAC-MIT group [5] at the end of the sixties and performed in the seventies [6]. It was shown that

i) the predictions of the FP theory models with *scalar* and *non- colored (Abelian) vector* gluons *do not agree* with the data

ii) the data *cannot distinguish* between different forms of scaling violation predicted by QCD and the so-called *Fixed point* QCD (FP-QCD), a theory with *colored vector* gluons, in which the effective coupling constant $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ does not vanish when Q^2 tends to infinity.

We think there are two reasons to discuss again the predictions of FP-QCD. First of all, there is evidence from the non-perturbative lattice calculations [7] that the β -function in QCD vanishes at a nonzero coupling α_0 that is small. (Note that the structure of the β -function can be studied only by non-perturbative methods.) Secondly, in the last years the accuracy and the kinematic region of deep inelastic scattering data became large enough, which makes us hope that discrimination between QCD and FP-QCD could be performed.

Recently we have analyzed the CCFR deep inelastic neutrino-nucleon scattering data [8] in the framework of the *Fixed point* QCD. It was demonstrated [9] that the data for the nucleon structure function $xF_3(x, Q^2)$ are in good agreement with the LO predictions of this theory model using the assumption that the β function has a *first*

order ultraviolet zero (fixed point) at $\alpha = \alpha_0$ that is small.

Having in mind that up to now the structure of the fixed point theory is not well known, it seems to us to be useful to make predictions for the physical quantities studying the different hypotheses about the β function behaviour near its fixed point α_0 and confront them to the data.

In this letter we present a leading order *Fixed point* QCD analysis of the CCFR data [8], in which an expression for $x F_3(x, Q^2)$ based on the assumption that the Callan-Symanzik β function has a *second order* ultraviolet zero at $\alpha = \alpha_0$ is used. We remind that the structure function $x F_3$ is a pure non-singlet and the results of the analysis are independent of the assumption on the shape of gluons. As in a previous analysis the method [10] of reconstruction of the structure functions from their Mellin moments is used. This method is based on the Jacobi polynomial expansion [11] of the structure functions. In [12] this method has been already applied to the QCD analysis of the CCFR data.

2. Method and Results of Analysis.

Let us start with the basic formulas needed for our analysis.

The Mellin moments of the structure function $x F_3(x, Q^2)$ are defined as:

$$M_n^{NS}(Q^2) = \int_0^1 dx x^{n-2} x F_3(x, Q^2) , \quad (1)$$

where $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$.

In the case of FP-QCD the effective coupling constant $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ at large Q^2 takes the form:

$$\alpha_s(Q^2) = \alpha_0 + f(Q^2) , \quad (2)$$

where $f(Q^2) \rightarrow 0$ when $Q^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

Let us assume that α_0 is a *second order* ultraviolet fixed point for the β -function, i.e.

$$\beta(\alpha) = -b(\alpha - \alpha_0)^2 , \quad b > 0 . \quad (3)$$

Then

$$\alpha_s(Q^2) = \alpha_0 + \frac{\alpha_s(Q_0^2) - \alpha_0}{1 + b [\alpha_s(Q_0^2) - \alpha_0] \ln(Q^2/Q_0^2)} \quad (4)$$

and we obtain for the moments of $x F_3$ the following leading order expression:

$$M_n^{NS}(Q^2) = M_n^{NS}(Q_0^2) \left[\frac{Q_0^2}{Q^2} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}d_n^{NS}} \mathcal{F}_n(Q^2), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_n(Q^2) = \left[\frac{1}{1 + b [\alpha_s(Q_0^2) - \alpha_0] \ln(Q^2/Q_0^2)} \right]^{d_n^{NS}/2b\alpha_0}. \quad (6)$$

In (5) and (6)

$$d_n^{NS} = \frac{\alpha_0}{4\pi} \gamma_n^{(0)NS} \quad (7)$$

and

$$\gamma_n^{(0)NS} = \frac{8}{3} \left[1 - \frac{2}{n(n+1)} + 4 \sum_{j=2}^n \frac{1}{j} \right]. \quad (8)$$

The n dependence of $\gamma_n^{(0)NS}$ is exactly the same as in QCD, if we assume that the Perturbative QCD expansion for the anomalous dimensions $\gamma_n^{NS}(\alpha_s)$ is valid in the range of small α_s including the fixed point α_0 too. However, the Q^2 behaviour of the moments is different because of the different Q^2 behaviour of the effective coupling constant $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ in FP-QCD. In contrast to QCD, the Bjorken scaling for the moments of the structure functions is broken by powers in Q^2 in addition to the usual $\ln Q^2$ terms. In (6) and (7) α_0 and b are parameters, to be determined from the data.

Having in hand the moments (5) and following the method [10, 11], we can write the structure function $x F_3$ in the form:

$$x F_3^{N_{max}}(x, Q^2) = x^\alpha (1-x)^\beta \sum_{n=0}^{N_{max}} \Theta_n^{\alpha,\beta}(x) \sum_{j=0}^n c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta) M_{j+2}^{NS}(Q^2), \quad (9)$$

where $\Theta_n^{\alpha,\beta}(x)$ is a set of Jacobi polynomials and $c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta)$ are coefficients of the series of $\Theta_n^{\alpha,\beta}(x)$ in powers in x :

$$\Theta_n^{\alpha,\beta}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^n c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta) x^j. \quad (10)$$

N_{max} , α and β have to be chosen so as to achieve the fastest convergence of the series in the R.H.S. of Eq. (9) and to reconstruct $x F_3$ with the accuracy required. Following the results of [10] we use $\alpha = 0.12$, $\beta = 2.0$ and $N_{max} = 12$. These numbers guarantee accuracy better than 10^{-3} .

Finally we have to parametrize the structure function $x F_3$ at some fixed value of $Q^2 = Q_0^2$. We choose $x F_3(x, Q^2)$ in the form:

$$x F_3(x, Q_0^2) = A x^B (1 - x)^C . \quad (11)$$

The parameters A, B and C in Eq. (11) and the FP-QCD parameters α_0 and b are free parameters which are determined by the fit to the data.

In our analysis the target mass corrections [13] are taken into account. To avoid the influence of higher-twist effects we have used only the experimental points in the plane (x, Q^2) with $10 < Q^2 \leq 501 (GeV/c)^2$. This cut corresponds to the following x range: $0.015 \leq x \leq 0.65$.

The results of the fit are presented in Table 1. In all fits only statistical errors are taken into account.

b	$\chi_{d.f.}^2$	α_0	$\alpha_s(M_z^2)_{FP-QCD}$
0.9	83.5/61	0.029 ± 0.014	0.123 ± 0.022
1.0	83.3/61	0.040 ± 0.014	0.126 ± 0.021
1.1	83.1/61	0.048 ± 0.014	0.128 ± 0.021
1.3	82.9/61	0.063 ± 0.013	0.133 ± 0.019
1.5	82.6/61	0.074 ± 0.013	0.136 ± 0.019

Table 1. The results of the LO FP-QCD fit to the CCFR $x F_3$ data. $\chi_{d.f.}^2$ is the χ^2 -parameter normalized to the degree of freedom $d.f.$.

Summarizing the results in the Table one can conclude:

1. The values of $\chi_{d.f.}^2$ are practically the same as in the case of a first order ultraviolet fixed point for the β function [9]. They are slightly smaller than those obtained in the LO QCD analysis [12] of the CCFR data by the same method and indicate a *good description* of the data.

2. It is seen from the Table that α_0 increases with increasing b . The values of b , for which the asymptotic coupling α_0 is acceptable, are found to range in the following interval:

$$0 < b \leq 1.5 . \quad (12)$$

For the values of $b > 1.5$ the corresponding theoretical values for $\alpha(M_z^2)$ obtained by the Eq.(4) are bigger than $\alpha_s(M_z^2)$ determined from the LEP experiments [14]:

$$\alpha_s(M_z^2) = 0.125 \pm 0.005 . \quad (13)$$

For the values of b smaller than 0.9 α_0 can not be determined from CCFR data. The errors in α_0 exceed the mean values of this parameter.

3. The accuracy of determination of α_0 is not good enough. The accuracy increases with increasing b .

4. The values of $\alpha_0 = 0.029, 0.040, 0.048$ corresponding to $b = 0.9, 1.0, 1.1$ are preferred to the other values of α_0 determined from the data.

5. The values of $\alpha_s(M_z^2)$ corresponding to the values of b from the range (12) are in agreement within one standard deviation with $\alpha_s(M_z^2)$ determined from the LEP experiments.

6. The values of the parameters A, B and C are in agreement with the results of [9] and [12]. For illustration we present here the values of these parameters at $Q_0^2 = 3 (GeV/c)^2$ for $b = 1.0$:

$$A = 7.07 \pm 0.20 , \quad B = 0.865 \pm 0.013 , \quad C = 3.43 \pm 0.004 .$$

They are found to be independent of b and α_0 . We have found also that multiplying the R.H.S. of (11) by term $(1 + \gamma x)$ one can not improve the fit.

Summary.

The CCFR deep inelastic neutrino-nucleon scattering data have been analyzed in the framework of the *Fixed point* QCD. It has been demonstrated that the data for the nucleon structure function $xF_3(x, Q^2)$ are in good agreement with the LO predictions of this quantum field theory model using the assumption that α_0 is a *second order ultraviolet fixed point* of the β function and α_0 is *small*. Some constraints on the behaviour of the β function near α_0 have been found from the data. The values for α_0

$$0.029 \leq \alpha_0 \leq 0.048 ,$$

corresponding to the β function parameter b in the range

$$0.9 \leq b \leq 1.1$$

are preferred to the other ones determined from the data.

In conclusion, taking into account also our previous results [9] in the case of β function with a *first order* fixed point, we find that the CCFR data, the most precise data on deep inelastic scattering at present, *do not eliminate* the FP-QCD and therefore other tests have to be made in order to distinguish between QCD and FP-QCD.

After completion of this work we learned about the paper [15] where the measured inclusive cross section in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8 \text{ TeV}$ has been presented. It has been shown that the cross section for jets with $E_t > 200 \text{ GeV}$ is significantly higher than predictions based on perturbative QCD.

Having in mind that at such large energies $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ in FP-QCD runs slower than its perturbatively predicted rate we hope this fact could help to explain the deviation from the perturbative QCD predictions mentioned above.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to A.L. Kataev and C.V. Mihaylov for useful discussions and remarks. One of us (D.S) would like to thank also I.T. Todorov for calling his attention to the papers of A. Patrascioiu and E. Seiler, in which the problem on vanishing of the β function in QCD at nonzero coupling is discussed.

This research was partly supported by the Russian Fond for Fundamental Research Grant N 96-02-17435-a and by the Bulgarian Science Foundation under Contract Ph 510.

References

- [1] G. Altarelli, in Proc. of the "QCD-20 Years Later" Conf. 9-13 June 1992, Aachen; World Scientific 1993, v. 1., p. 172; Ed. by P. M. Zerwas and H. A. Kastrup. S. Bethke. Proc. QCD-94 Conference, Montpellier, France, July 1994.
- [2] A. M. Polyakov, *ZHETF* **59** (1970) 542. G. Mack, *Nucl. Phys.* **B35** (1971) 592; A. V. Efremov and I.F. Ginzburg, *Phys. Lett.* **B36** (1972) 371; D. Bailin and A. Love, *Nucl. Phys.* **B75** (1974) 159.
- [3] M. Glück and E.Reya, *Phys. Rev.* **D.16** (1977) 3242; *Nucl. Phys.* **B156** (1979) 456.
- [4] S. I. Bilenkaya and D. B. Stamenov, *Sov. J. of Nucl. Phys.* **31** (1980) 122.
- [5] D.H.Coward et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **20** (1968) 292; E.D. Bloom et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23** (1969) 930; H. Breidenbach et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **23** (1969) 935.
- [6] R.G. Roberts and M.R. Whalley, *J. Phys. G.; Nucl. Part. Phys.* **17** (1991) D1-D151.

- [7] A. Patrascioiu and E. Seiler, *Expected Deviations from Perturbative QCD at 1 TeV or Less*, preprint MPI-Ph/92-18; *Scaling, Asymptotic Scaling and Improved Perturbation Theory*, preprint MPI-Ph/93-34; J. Finberg, U. Heller and F. Karsh, *Nucl. Phys.* **B392** (1993) 493, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74** (1995) 1924.
- [8] CCFR Collab., S. R. Mishra et al., Nevis Preprint N 1459 (1992); CCFR Collab., W. C. Leung et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B317** (1993) 655; CCFR Collab., P. Z. Quintas et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71** (1993) 1307.
- [9] A.V. Sidorov and D. B. Stamenov, *Phys. Lett.* **B357** (1995) 423.
- [10] V. G. Krivokhizhin et al., *Z. Phys.* **C36** (1987) 51;
V. G. Krivokhizhin et al., *Z. Phys.* **C48** (1990) 347.
- [11] G. Parisi and N. Surlas, *Nucl. Phys.* **B151** (1979) 421;
I. S. Barker, C. B. Langensiepen and G. Shaw, *Nucl. Phys.* **B186** (1981) 61.
- [12] A. L. Kataev and A.V. Sidorov, *Phys. Lett.* **B331** (1994) 179.
- [13] O. Nachtmann, *Nucl. Phys.* **B63** (1973) 237;
S. Wandzura, *Nucl. Phys.* **B122** (1977) 412.
- [14] G. Altarelli, Talk at the Four Seas Conference, Trieste, Italy, June, 1955.
- [15] F. Abe et al., *Inclusive Jet Cross Section in $p\bar{p}$ collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV*, Fermilab preprint PUB-96/020-E, 1996.