

QCD analysis of xF_3 at NNLO: the theoretical uncertainties

A.L. Kataev¹, G. Parente² and A.V. Sidorov³

¹ Institute for Nuclear Research of the Academy of Sciences of Russia,
117312 Moscow, Russia

² Departamento de Física de Partículas, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain
15706 Santiago de Compostela

³ Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research,
141980 Dubna, Russia

E-mails: gonzalo@fpaxp1.usc.es

Abstract

The next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) QCD analysis of the experimental xF_3 structure function from CCFR data is performed. The theoretical uncertainties of the analysis are discussed.

The study of DIS structure functions has been a fruitful source of information on the structure of the proton and for testing perturbative QCD. Between the most outstanding results of the program of analyzing structure functions in QCD was the early explanation of the scaling violation phenomena. In the last two decades the second order approximation (NLO) has been extensively compared with F_2 and xF_3 data. More recently the third order terms (NNLO) have been fully calculated for the case of the coefficient functions [1] but only partially for the anomalous dimension part ($n = 2, 4, 6, 8$ for singlet and non-singlet operators, and $n = 10$, only in the non-singlet case) [2]. This has allowed the analysis of xF_3 [3, 4] and F_2 (non singlet [5] and singlet [6]) at NNLO.

In this note we review the theoretical uncertainties involved in the analysis of the structure function xF_3 at NNLO. For that task, we firstly remind the method of calculation and the most relevant results of the fits.

The QCD evolution of the moments is given by:

$$\frac{M_n(Q^2)}{M_n(Q_0^2)} = \left(\frac{\alpha_s(Q^2)}{\alpha_s(Q_0^2)} \right)^{\frac{\gamma_{NS}^{(0)}}{2\beta_0}} \frac{AD(n, Q^2)C^{(n)}(Q^2)}{AD(n, Q_0^2)C^{(n)}(Q_0^2)} \quad (1)$$

where AD and C come respectively from the anomalous dimensions and coefficient function terms in the renormalization-group equation (see the explicit forms in [4]). The running coupling constant $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ is obtained from the expression in terms of inverse powers of $\ln(Q^2/\Lambda_{MS}^2)$. Target mass corrections are also added in the calculation of the moments (see [4]).

The moments in Eq. (1) at the initial scale are

$$M_n(Q_0^2) = \int_0^1 dx x^{n-2} A x^b (1-x)^c (1+\gamma x).$$

The structure function is reconstructed from its moments by using the expansion in terms of orthogonal Jacobi polynomials:

$$xF_3 = x^\alpha (1-x)^\beta \sum_{n=0}^{N_{max}} \Theta_n^{\alpha, \beta}(x) \sum_{j=0}^n c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta) M_{j+2}(Q^2) \quad (2)$$

where $c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta)$ are combinatorial coefficients given in terms of Euler Γ -functions of the α and β weight parameters which have been fixed to 0.7 and 3 respectively by the reasons given in [4, 7].

Power corrections are included in the analysis using two different approaches. Firstly, in the form given by the Infrared Renormalon Model (IRR) [8] adding in Eq. (1) the contribution $M_n^{IRR} = \tilde{C}(n) M_n(Q^2) A_2'/Q^2$, with A_2' a free scale parameter. Secondly, adding in the r.h.s. of Eq. (2) the term $h(x)/Q^2$, with $h(x)$ a free parameter for each x -bin of the data set.

Table 1 summarizes the results of the fits to xF_3 CCFR data [9]. For comparison we have applied the same kinematic cuts as in Ref. [9], i.e. $Q^2 > 5$ GeV², $x < 0.7$ and $W^2 > 10$ GeV². At NLO the value of $\Lambda_{MS}^{(4)}$ from our fits is in good agreement with that found in Ref. [9] (337 ± 28 MeV) where both, F_2 and xF_3 structure functions, have been fitted. There is a clear correlation between the effects of the NLO and NNLO approximations and power corrections (see table 1). At NNLO the fits performed with and without power corrections (in

the IRR model) are almost equal. The significant decrease of the magnitude of power corrections in the NNLO fit with IRR model (A'_2 vanished within statistical errors) is also found with the model $h(x)/Q^2$ (see Fig. 1).

Using the value of Λ from the NNLO fit and the running of the coupling up to M_Z^2 , we obtain [4] $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.118 \pm 0.002(stat) \pm 0.005(syst) \pm 0.003(theory)$. The theoretical error takes into account the dependence on the initial Q_0^2 , the influence of the missing higher order terms estimated by Padé approximants and the crossing of the m_b threshold in the calculation of $\alpha_s(M_Z)$.

However, in the analysis there are also involved various approximations and shortcuts which could increase this uncertainty. The calculation of xF_3 with even- n F_2 anomalous dimensions [3], the interpolation to odd values of n [5] and the effect of the reconstruction method through the parameters α , β and the number of polynomials N_{max} (see Eq. (2)) [4, 7], are not expected to affect the accuracy of the analysis.

In addition, we have also studied the effect of using in Eq. (1) the original exponentiated formula for the anomalous dimension part (see Eq. (4) in Ref. [4]). We found a change in Λ of 2 MeV at NLO and much smaller at NNLO. The effect of nuclear corrections has also been addressed by us [4] although it still deserves a more detailed study. The dependence with the number of active flavors (we work with $n_f = 4$) should also be carefully studied (see Ref. [6]).

Finally, the renormalization and factorization scale dependence (we have fixed both equal to Q^2) should also be estimated if one wants to make a meaningful precision test of perturbative QCD. We plan to present this work elsewhere [10].

Acknowledgments

G.P. is grateful to J. Chýla for useful comments and interest on this work. A.L.K. and A.V.S. are supported by RFBR Grant N 99-01-00091. The work of G.P. is supported by CICYT Grant N AEN96-1773 and Xunta de Galicia Grant N XUGA-20602B98.

References

- [1] E.B. Zijlstra and W.L. van Neerven, *Nucl. Phys.* **B383** (1992) 525.
- [2] S.A. Larin, T. van Ritbergen and J.A.M. Vermaseren, *Nucl. Phys.* **B427** (1994) 41; S.A. Larin, et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B492** (1997) 338.
- [3] A.L. Kataev, et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B388** (1996) 179; *ibid* **B417** (1998) 374.

Table 1. Fits to $Q^2 > 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ xF_3 CCFR'97 data. The starting QCD evolution point is $Q_0^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$

	$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ (MeV)	A'_2 (GeV ²)	χ^2/points
LO	264 ± 37	–	113.1/86
	433 ± 53	-0.33 ± 0.06	83.1/86
	331 ± 162	$h(x)$ in Fig.1	66.3/86
NLO	339 ± 42	–	87.6/86
	369 ± 39	-0.12 ± 0.06	82.3/86
	440 ± 183	$h(x)$ in Fig.1	65.7/86
NNLO	326 ± 35	–	77.0/86
	327 ± 35	-0.01 ± 0.05	76.9/86
	372 ± 133	$h(x)$ in Fig.1	65.0/86




Figure 1. $h(x)$ extracted from xF_3 CCFR data.

- [4] A.L. Kataev, G. Parente and A.V. Sidorov, Preprint ICTP IC/99/51, hep-ph/9905310.
- [5] G. Parente, A.V. Kotikov and V.G. Krivokhizhin, *Phys. Lett.* **B333** (1994) 190.
- [6] J. Santiago and F.J. Yndurain, preprint FTUAM 99-8; UG-FT-97/99 (hep-ph/9904344).
- [7] J. Chýla and J. Ramez, *Z. Phys.* **C31** (1986) 151. V.G. Krivokhizhin et al., *Z. Phys.* **C36** (1987) 51; *Z. Phys.* **C48** (1990) 347.
- [8] M. Dasgupta and B.R. Webber, *Phys.Lett.* **B382** (1996) 273.
- [9] CCFR-NuTeV Collab., W.G. Seligman et al., *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **79** (1997) 1213.
- [10] A.V. Kataev et al. work in preparation.