

Combined QCD analysis of  $e^+e^-$  data  
at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  to  $172$  GeV

Otmar Biebel

III. Physikalisches Institut, Technische Hochschule Aachen  
D-52056 Aachen, Germany

# Combined QCD analysis of $e^+e^-$ data at $\sqrt{s} = 14$ to 172 GeV

O. Biebel<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>III. Physikalisches Institut A, RWTH Aachen — Physikzentrum,  
Sommerfeldstr., D-53056 Aachen, Germany

A study of the energy dependence of event shape observables is presented. The strong coupling constant  $\alpha_s$  has been determined from the mean values of six event shape observables. Power corrections, employed for the measurement of  $\alpha_s$ , have been found to approximately account for hadronisation effects.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Many years of electron-positron annihilation experiments have yielded a huge amount of data covering a vast region of centre-of-mass energies. For example, at the PEP, PETRA, TRISTAN and LEP colliders annihilation experiments have been performed between  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  and 172 GeV (see e.g. [1] and references therein). Distributions of event shape observables measured from hadronic final states clearly show a dependence on the centre-of-mass energy (e.g. [2]). This violation of the scaling behaviour is due to the running of  $\alpha_s(\mu)$  with the energy scale  $\mu = x_\mu \cdot \sqrt{s}$ .

Every measurement of the value of  $\alpha_s$  from event shape distributions requires the treatment of impacts of the hadronisation of quarks and gluons which cannot be calculated perturbatively. Usually, phenomenological hadronisation models, available from Monte Carlo event generators, are employed to correct for hadronisation effects. An approach, independent of hadronisation models, to account for such non-perturbative effects are power corrections [5,6]. In the following, power corrections to the mean values of event shape distributions are investigated in order to determine the strong coupling constant  $\alpha_s$  from the scaling violation that is seen in the energy dependence of the mean values.

## 2. POWER CORRECTIONS

Non-perturbative contributions to event shape distributions are, on general grounds, expected

to give rise to corrections proportional to reciprocal powers of  $\sqrt{s}$ . Hadronisation effects, for example, should yield a  $1/\sqrt{s}$  correction according to the *tube model* [3] in which hadrons emanate from a tube spanned in rapidity and transverse momentum space between quark and antiquark. Another, more formal, theoretical approach leading to power corrections deals with renormalons [4], that are found in the QCD vacuum polarisation at high order perturbative calculations. Power corrections may also be explained in a more phenomenological ansatz [5] with the behaviour of the strong coupling at low scales  $\mu \ll 1$  GeV.

The perturbative expression for the energy dependence of  $\alpha_s(\mu)$  gives rise to the unphysical Landau pole at  $\mu = \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ . In general, one would, in this energy regime, expect the running such that  $\alpha_s(\mu)$  remains finite but eventually large for all scales down to zero (see e.g. [7]). In the approach of [5] an effective coupling constant

$$\bar{\alpha}_{p-1}(\mu_I) \equiv \frac{p}{\mu_I^p} \int_0^{\mu_I} \frac{d\mu}{\mu} \alpha_s(\mu) \mu^p$$

is introduced that absorbs all non-perturbative details of  $\alpha_s(\mu)$  up to an arbitrary infrared matching scale  $\mu_I \simeq \text{GeV}$ . Using the effective coupling, power corrections to, for example, the mean values of event shapes can be calculated. They turn out to be simply additive to the perturbative calculation  $\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle = \langle \mathcal{F}_{\text{pert.}} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{F}_{\text{pow.}} \rangle$ . The principal structure of the power correction is [5]

$$\langle \mathcal{F}_{\text{pow.}} \rangle \sim a_{\mathcal{F}} \cdot \left( \frac{\mu_I}{\sqrt{s}} \right)^p \cdot \ln^r \left( \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\mu_I} \right).$$

Table 1

Type of power correction to mean values of event shapes. ‘?’ indicates an unknown coefficient.

observable $\mathcal{F}$	$a_{\mathcal{F}}$	power terms
$\langle T \rangle$	-1	$1/\sqrt{s}$
$\langle C \rangle$	$3\pi/2$	$1/\sqrt{s}$
$\langle M_H^2/s \rangle$	$1.0 \pm 0.5$	$1/\sqrt{s}$
$\langle B_T \rangle$	$1.0 \pm 0.5$	$\ln(\sqrt{s})/\sqrt{s} + ? \cdot 1/\sqrt{s}$
$\langle B_W \rangle$	$1.0 \pm 0.5$	$\ln(\sqrt{s})/\sqrt{s} + ? \cdot 1/\sqrt{s}$
$\langle y_{23} \rangle$	?	$? \cdot 1/s + ? \cdot \ln(\sqrt{s})/s$

$$\cdot [\bar{\alpha}_{p-1}(\mu_I) - \{\alpha_s(\mu) + \dots\}]$$

in which  $a_{\mathcal{F}}$  is a coefficient,  $p = 1, 2$  is the power of the  $1/\sqrt{s}$  term,  $r = 0, 1$  is the power of an enhanced power term. All these parameters depend on the particular event shape. The term in curly brackets accounts for the contribution of the perturbative expression for the running of  $\alpha_s(\mu)$  at  $\mu < \mu_I$ . It is known in next-to-leading order ( $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$ ).

The coefficients and parameters of the power corrections have been calculated for many event shape observables (e.g. [5,6]), in particular, for mean values of thrust  $T$ ,  $C$  parameter, heavy jet mass  $M_H^2/s$ , total and wide jet broadening (respectively,  $B_T$  and  $B_W$ ) and the differential 2-jet rate  $y_{23}$  using the Durham scheme (cf. Table 1)

### 3. TEST OF POWER CORRECTIONS

A comparison of the perturbative prediction with power corrections with plain perturbative predictions has been performed. Figure 1 shows the results of two fits for the thrust. The first fit including the dominating  $1/\sqrt{s}$  power correction term obtained  $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 1.8$  for  $\bar{\alpha}_0(\mu_I = 2 \text{ GeV}) = 0.57 \pm 0.01$  with fixed values for  $\alpha_s \equiv 0.122$  and  $x_\mu \equiv 1$ ,\* which is the LEP average from event shapes [1]. The difference to the dashed line in Figure 1 reveals the size of the power corrections. The second fit, using the perturbative prediction only, resulted in  $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f} = 2.4$  for

\*If not stated explicitly,  $\alpha_s$  refers to  $\alpha_s(M_{Z0})$ .




Figure 1. Fits to thrust. Top: The solid line is the result of a fit of  $\bar{\alpha}_0$  with  $\alpha_s$  and  $x_\mu$  fixed. The dashed line is the perturbative prediction only. Bottom: Fit of  $\alpha_s$  and  $x_\mu$  without power corrections.

$\alpha_s = 0.122 \pm 0.001$  and  $x_\mu = 0.07 \pm 0.01$ . The inclusion of power corrections, therefore, improves slightly the description of the data. Thus it allows to determine  $\alpha_s$  without the need for a very small renormalisation scale  $\mu = x_\mu \cdot \sqrt{s}$  which approximates hadronisation effects.

The two jet broadening measures are expected to suffer enhanced power terms. Additionally, non-enhanced corrections are expected but the coefficients are difficult to predict [6]. Due to this, fits have been performed with “enhanced only” power corrections, “non-enhanced only” and a combination of both. Using fixed values for  $\alpha_s$  and  $x_\mu$  as before, the fits obtained  $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f}$  of 4.6, 3.3, 5.2, respectively, for  $\langle B_T \rangle$  and 11.3, 2.5,




Figure 2. Fits to total (top) and wide (bottom) jet broadening: The solid lines are the results of the fits for  $\bar{\alpha}_0$  with  $\alpha_s$  and  $x_\mu$  fixed. The dashed lines are the perturbative prediction only.

5.5, respectively, for  $\langle B_W \rangle$ . Figure 2 shows these results as solid lines, whereas the dashed line represents the plain perturbative prediction. A slight preference for “non-enhanced only” power corrections might be deduced from the fit results for  $\langle B_W \rangle$ . However, the data are still not sufficient to decide in favour of one of the three variations.

For  $\langle y_{23} \rangle$  it is only known that the power correction should be quadratic in  $1/\sqrt{s}$  including an enhanced term [8]. Therefore, the  $a_y$  coefficient has been fitted for, too. Fits have been tried with enhanced and non-enhanced power corrections of the type  $1/\sqrt{s}$  and  $1/s$ . By fixing the values of




Figure 3. Fits to mean differential 2-jet rate: The solid lines are the results of the fits for  $a_y$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_0$  with  $\alpha_s$  and  $x_\mu$  fixed.

$\alpha_s$  and  $x_\mu$  as before, all fits obtained  $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.}$  of unity. The  $a_y$  came out to be of the order  $10^{-4}$  to  $10^{-6}$  and compatible with zero within the errors suggesting that power corrections are negligible for the mean value of the differential 2-jet rate using the Durham scheme.

#### 4. DETERMINATION OF $\alpha_s$

The value of  $\alpha_s$  has been obtained by fitting the perturbative calculation plus power corrections to the data using  $\alpha_s(x_\mu \cdot M_{Z^0})$  and  $\bar{\alpha}_0(\mu_I = 2 \text{ GeV})$  as parameters of the fit. Since the data still cannot yet decide in favour of non-enhanced power corrections for the jet broadening, the enhanced corrections predicted in [6] have been used. For the mean value of the differential 2-jet rate using the Durham scheme the fit has been performed without power corrections as is suggested by the results of Section 3.

Figure 4 exemplifies the results of such fits for thrust,  $C$  parameter and heavy jet mass. For comparison the plain perturbative prediction using the fitted value of  $\alpha_s$  is also shown by the dashed lines. For the central values of  $\bar{\alpha}_0$  and  $\alpha_s$ ,  $x_\mu = 1$  and  $\mu_I = 2 \text{ GeV}$  are used. The systematic uncertainties for  $\bar{\alpha}_0$  are estimated by varying  $x_\mu$  between  $1/2$  and  $2$  and by varying  $a_{\mathcal{F}}$  as stated in Table 1. In addition, the errors of  $\alpha_s$  include

Table 2

Preliminary results and  $\overline{\chi^2} \equiv \chi^2/\text{d.o.f.}$  of the fits. The errors represent experimental uncertainties,  $x_\mu$ , and  $a_{\mathcal{F}}$  variation. For  $\alpha_s$  a variation of  $\mu_I$  is included.

$\mathcal{F}$	$\overline{\alpha}_0(2 \text{ GeV})$	$\alpha_s(M_{Z^0})$	$\overline{\chi^2}$
$\langle T \rangle$	$0.543 \pm 0.014$	$0.120^{+0.007}_{-0.004}$	1.8
$\langle C \rangle$	$0.474 \pm 0.015$	$0.120^{+0.004}_{-0.003}$	2.0
$\langle M_H^2/s \rangle$	$0.457^{+0.212}_{-0.077}$	$0.112^{+0.006}_{-0.005}$	0.8
$\langle B_T \rangle$	$0.342^{+0.064}_{-0.036}$	$0.116^{+0.007}_{-0.006}$	4.2
$\langle B_W \rangle$	$0.264^{+0.048}_{-0.031}$	$0.111^{+0.006}_{-0.004}$	2.3
$\langle y_{23} \rangle$	—	$0.123^{+0.006}_{-0.004}$	0.9

a variation of  $\mu_I$  by  $\pm 1$  GeV. The results of the fits and the  $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.}$  are given in Table 2.

Averaging the six values of  $\alpha_s$  weighted by their total errors, and considering correlations for the errors, yields

$$\alpha_s(M_{Z^0}) = 0.116 \pm 0.001^{+0.006}_{-0.004}$$

where the first error is the experimental uncertainty and the second represent the deviations due to the variation of  $x_\mu$ ,  $\mu_I$ , and  $a_{\mathcal{F}}$  added quadratically. This value agrees with the world average of  $\alpha_s^{\text{w.a.}}(M_{Z^0}) = 0.118 \pm 0.003$  [1,9].

## 5. SUMMARY

Experiments at  $e^+e^-$  colliders have measured distributions of event shape observables over a large centre-of-mass range of  $\sqrt{s} = 14\text{-}172$  GeV. The distributions clearly show a scaling violation which is expected due to the running of the strong coupling constant  $\alpha_s(\mu)$ .

Hadronisation effects contained in these distributions can be explained by soft gluon phenomena. Their theoretical treatment yields corrections proportional to powers of  $1/\sqrt{s}$  in addition to the usual perturbative prediction. Power corrections have been found to be useful approximations of hadronisation effects. They have been applied to determine  $\alpha_s(M_{Z^0}) = 0.116^{+0.006}_{-0.004}$  from the energy dependence of the mean values of thrust,  $C$  parameter, heavy jet mass, total and




Figure 4. Fits to thrust (top),  $C$  parameter (middle) and heavy jet mass (bottom): The solid lines are the results of the fits for  $\overline{\alpha}_0$  and  $\alpha_s$  with  $x_\mu$  fixed. The dashed line is the perturbative prediction for the fitted  $\alpha_s$  only.

wide jet broadening, and of the differential 2-jet rate using the Durham scheme. The study also uncovered that the predicted power corrections are not universal for the event shape distributions considered. Thus, hadronisation effects cannot be explained completely by power behaved corrections.

## REFERENCES

1. S. Bethke: these proceedings and Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 54A (1997), 314.
2. P.A. Movilla Fernández et al.: PITHA 97/27 (August 1997) and hep-ex/9708034, submitted to Z. Phys. **C**
3. B.R. Webber: Cavendish-HEP-94/17, hep-ph/9411384.
4. A.H. Mueller in: P.M. Zerwas and H.A. Kastrup (ed.): *QCD — 20 Years Later*, vol. 1, World Scientific, Singapore, 1993.
5. Yu.L. Dokshitzer, B.R. Webber: Phys. Lett. **B352** (1995) 451.
6. B.R. Webber in: J.F. Laporte and Y. Sirois (ed.): proceedings of the *Workshop on Deep Inelastic Scattering and QCD (DIS 95)*, Paris, France, 24-28 April, 1995, and hep-ph/9510283.
7. D.V. Shirkov: these proceedings and hep-ph/9704333.
8. B.R. Webber: priv. communication.
9. M. Schmelling in: Z. Ajduk and A.K. Wroblewski (ed.): proceedings of the *XXVIII International Conference on High Energy Physics*, Warsaw, Poland, July 25-31 (1996) and hep-ex/9701002.
10. Yu.L. Dokshitzer, B.R. Webber: Cavendish-HEP-97/2, hep-ph/9704298

## QUESTIONS

*L. Trentadue, Parma:*

I repeat here, too, the comment I have already made to the previous talk by P.A. Movilla Fernández. You have not considered in your analysis an event shape variable i.e. the energy-energy correlation for which the  $1/\sqrt{s}$  corrections have for the first time been observed. Such a quantity has same peculiar characteristics: a) It involves

experimentally and theoretically a single hadron distribution so that hadronisation can be seen as a single hadron mechanism instead as a “collective” effect; b) hadronisation can be discussed and included analytically without using a Monte Carlo; c) a complete next-to-leading resummed expression is also known. It would be interesting in my opinion to see the results of your analysis for such a variable too.

*O. Biebel:*

I know about energy-energy correlations which have been investigated already by several experiments. For this study I focussed on new observables for which measurements became available by the work of P.A. Movilla Fernández et al. [2]. Additionally, next-to-leading resummed expressions are known for all of the observables considered in this study. I should point out, that I used the  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$  perturbative predictions only.

*G. Dissertori, CERN:*

$\bar{\alpha}_0$  is a universal parameter, so it should be the same for all observables. From your analysis it looks like this is not the case. Can you comment on this?

*O. Biebel:*

Indeed, a universal  $\bar{\alpha}_0$  is incompatible with the data. I forced  $\bar{\alpha}_0$  to be universal in a combined fit of thrust,  $C$  parameter and heavy jet mass which gave rather comparable values for  $\bar{\alpha}_0$  from the individual fits. The combined fit for these three yielded a huge  $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.}$  and also the fit curve failed to describe the data.

*G. Dissertori, CERN:*

There is a new prediction for power-law corrections to the distribution of thrust. Have you looked at the distributions, too?

*O. Biebel:*

I have not yet tried this. However, according to Yu.L. Dokshitzer and B.R. Webber, the authors of this prediction [10], the calculation is possible only for thrust and cannot be transferred to other observables. They have fit their prediction in the range  $0.05 < 1 - T < 0.35$  to thrust distributions measured at  $\sqrt{s} = 14\text{-}161$  GeV obtaining a sensible fit for  $\alpha_s = 0.1185 \pm 0.0025$  with a  $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.}$  close to unity.