

PREPRINT

Revised

IC/99/51

US-FT/13-99

hep-ph/9905310

Version of December 1999

## Higher twists and $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ extractions from the NNLO QCD analysis of the CCFR data for the $xF_3$ structure function.

**A.L. Kataev**

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

**G. Parente**

Department of Particle Physics, University of Santiago de Compostela,  
15706 Santiago de Compostela, Spain

**A.V. Sidorov**

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

### Abstract

A detailed next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) QCD analysis is performed for the experimental data of the CCFR collaboration for the  $xF_3$  structure function. Theoretical ambiguities of the results of our NNLO fits are estimated by application of the Padé resummation technique and variation of the factorization and renormalization scales. The NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO  $\alpha_s(Q^2)$   $\overline{MS}$ -matching conditions are used. In the process of the fits we are taking account of twist-4  $1/Q^2$ -terms. We found that the amplitude of the  $x$ -shape of the twist-4 factor is decreasing in NLO and NNLO, though some remaining twist-4 structure seems to retain in NNLO in the case when only statistical uncertainties are taken into account. The question of the stability of these results to the application of the [0/2] Padé resummation technique is considered. Our NNLO results for  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  values, extracted from the CCFR  $xF_3$  data, are  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.118 \pm 0.002(stat) \pm 0.005(syst) \pm 0.003(theory)$  provided the twist-4 contributions are fixed through the infrared renormalon model and  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.121_{-0.010}^{+0.007}(stat) \pm 0.005(syst) \pm 0.003(theory)$  provided the twist-4 terms are considered as free parameters.

PACS: 12.38.Bx; 12.38.Cy; 13.85.Hd

*Keywords:* next-to-next-to-leading order,  $1/Q^2$  power corrections, structure functions, deep-inelastic neutrino scattering

## 1. Introduction.

Deep-inelastic lepton-nucleon scattering (DIS) belongs to classical and constantly studied processes in modern particle physics. The traditionally measurable characteristics of  $\nu N$  DIS are SFs (structure functions)  $F_2$  and  $xF_3$ . It should be stressed that the program of getting information about the behavior of SFs of  $\nu N$  DIS is among the aims of the experimental program of Fermilab Tevatron and CCFR/NuTeV collaboration, in particular. The CCFRR collaboration started to study the  $\nu N$  scattering process in 1980 [1]. The data for SFs of  $\nu N$  DIS, obtained by a follower of the CCFRR collaboration, namely, the CCFR group, were distributed among the potential users in the beginning of 1997 [2], while the final results of the original CCFR DGLAP [3] NLO analysis of these data were presented in the journal publication of Ref.[2].

This experimental information was already used in the process of different NLO analyses, performed by CTEQ, MRST, and GRV groups (see Refs.[4, 5, 6], respectively). Subsequent steps of performing NLO and the first NNLO analysis of the CCFR data with the help of the Jacobi polynomial - Mellin moments version of the DGLAP method were made in Refs.[7]-[12] (definite stages in the development of this formalism are described in Refs.[13]-[15]).

In the process of the analysis of Refs.[9]-[12], the authors used important information about the NNLO corrections to the coefficient functions [16] and results of the complicated analytic calculations of the NNLO corrections to the anomalous dimensions of the NS moments with  $n = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10$  [17], supplemented with the estimated values of the NNLO coefficients of the anomalous dimensions of  $n = 3, 5, 7, 9$  NS moments, which were obtained in Ref.[9] with the help of the smooth interpolation procedure, previously proposed in Ref.[18]. Moreover, the attempts to obtain the shape of the twist-4 contributions and to study the predictive abilities of the IR-renormalon (IRR) model of Ref.[19] were made (for certain details of modeling the effects of the power-suppressed contributions to  $xF_3$  and other measurable physical quantities in the IRR language see Ref.[20] and Ref.[21] respectively, for more details, see the review of Ref.[22]).

However, an important question of estimating theoretical uncertainties of the NNLO analysis of the CCFR data of Ref.[11] was not analyzed in detail. These uncertainties can be specified in part after taking into account

- 1) differences in the definitions of  $\alpha_s(Q^2)$  matching conditions (see e.g. Refs.[23, 24, 25, 26]), which are responsible for penetrating into the energy region, characteristic of  $f = 5$  numbers of flavours, where the pole of the  $Z^0$ -boson manifests itself;

- 2) NNLO QCD contribution to the matching condition of Ref.[23] (corrected in Ref.[27]), the 4-loop coefficient of the QCD  $\beta$ -function [28], which is entering into the N<sup>3</sup>LO approximation of the renormalization group evolution equation for the Mellin moments, the N<sup>3</sup>LO expression for the coupling constant and to the calculated N<sup>3</sup>LO-term [29] of the matching condition;

- 3) theoretical uncertainties due to non-calculated N<sup>3</sup>LO contributions to the coefficient functions and the anomalous-dimension functions;

- 4) in the NNLO it is also desirable to carefully analyse the dependence of the results obtained on the choice of the Jacobi polynomial parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (see definitions below). These parameters are entering into the theoretical expression for the reconstructed

structure function (in the NLO the problem of their fixation was studied in detail in Ref.[15]). This analysis is of relevant importance in view of doubts in the applicability of the Jacobi evolution method (see Ref.[30]), which, however, were immediately dispelled in Ref.[31];

5) last, but not least, uncertainties are related to problems of the sensitivity of the obtained results to the choice of factorization and renormalization scales. It is worth noting that these problems are in relation with fixing the ambiguities due to already calculated and uncalculated N<sup>3</sup>LO QCD effects, which can be modelled using the Padé resummation technique.

This work is devoted to the analysis of important problems outlined above and to a more detailed determination of values of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  and the  $x$ -shape of the twist-4 power-suppressed term in available orders of perturbative QCD taking into account the effects listed above. We supplement the NNLO fits of Ref.[11] by the N<sup>3</sup>LO analysis based on the application of the Padé resummation technique (for a review, see Ref.[32]), developed in QCD in a definite form in Refs.[33, 34], and considered previously as a possible method of fixing theoretical uncertainties in the analysis of DIS data in Ref.[35]. It should be stressed that *a posteriori* this technique gives results similar to those obtained by different methods of fixing scale-scheme dependence ambiguities (compare the results of Ref.[36] with the results of Refs.[33, 34] obtained by using the Padé resummation technique). Thus, our analysis could be considered as an attempt to estimate perturbative QCD uncertainties beyond the NNLO level. Moreover, it could give us a hint whether the outcomes of our NNLO fits, related to perturbative and non-perturbative sectors, are affected upon including the explicitly calculated and estimated N<sup>3</sup>LO QCD effects.

Another new important ingredient of our analysis, discussed in brief in Ref.[37], is the analysis of the problem of the initial scale choice. In particular, we will demonstrate that due to unnaturally large NNLO corrections to the renormalization-group improved  $n=2$  Mellin moment of  $xF_3$ , it is essential to choose the value of the initial point in a vicinity of the scale  $Q_0^2=20 \text{ GeV}^2$ .

## 2. The theoretical background of the QCD analysis.

Let us define the Mellin moments for NS SF  $xF_3(x, Q^2)$ :

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

where  $n = 2, 3, 4, \dots$ . These moments obey the following renormalization group equation

$$\left( \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu} + \beta(A_s) \frac{\partial}{\partial A_s} + \gamma_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s) \right) M_n^{NS}(Q^2/\mu^2, A_s(\mu^2)) = 0 \quad (2)$$

where  $A_s = \alpha_s/(4\pi)$ . The renormalization group functions are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mu \frac{\partial A_s}{\partial \mu} &= \beta(A_s) = -2 \sum_{i \geq 0} \beta_i A_s^{i+2} \\ \mu \frac{\partial \ln Z_n^{NS}}{\partial \mu} &= \gamma_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \gamma_{NS}^{(i)}(n) A_s^{i+1} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $Z_n^{NS}$  are renormalization constants of the corresponding NS operators. The solution of the renormalization group equation can be represented in the following form :

$$\frac{M_n^{NS}(Q^2)}{M_n^{NS}(Q_0^2)} = \exp \left[ - \int_{A_s(Q_0^2)}^{A_s(Q^2)} \frac{\gamma_{NS}^{(n)}(x)}{\beta(x)} dx \right] \frac{C_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s(Q^2))}{C_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s(Q_0^2))} \quad (4)$$

where  $M_n^{NS}(Q_0^2)$  is a phenomenological quantity related to the initial- scale dependent factor. At a fixed momentum transfer  $Q_0^2$ , it will be parameterized in the simple form

$$M_n^{NS}(Q_0^2) = \int_0^1 x^{n-2} A(Q_0^2) x^{b(Q_0^2)} (1-x)^{c(Q_0^2)} (1 + \gamma(Q_0^2)x) dx \quad (5)$$

with  $\gamma \neq 0$  or  $\gamma = 0$ . It is identical to the form used by the CCFR collaboration [2]. In principle, following the models of parton distributions used in Refs.[5, 6], one can in Eq.(5) add a term proportional to  $\sqrt{x}$ . However, since this term is important only in the region of rather small  $x$ , we neglect it in our analysis.

In N<sup>3</sup>LO, the coefficient function  $C_{NS}^{(n)}$  can be defined as

$$C_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s) = 1 + C^{(1)}(n)A_s + C^{(2)}(n)A_s^2 + C^{(3)}(n)A_s^3, \quad (6)$$

while the corresponding expansion of the anomalous-dimension term is

$$\exp \left[ - \int^{A_s(Q^2)} \frac{\gamma_{NS}^{(n)}(x)}{\beta(x)} dx \right] = (A_s(Q^2))^{\gamma_{NS}^{(0)}(n)/2\beta_0} \times AD(n, A_s) \quad (7)$$

where

$$AD(n, A_s) = [1 + p(n)A_s(Q^2) + q(n)A_s(Q^2)^2 + r(n)A_s(Q^2)^3] \quad (8)$$

and  $p(n)$ ,  $q(n)$  and  $r(n)$  have the following form:

$$p(n) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\gamma_{NS}^{(1)}(n)}{\beta_1} - \frac{\gamma_{NS}^{(0)}(n)}{\beta_0} \right) \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0} \quad (9)$$

$$q(n) = \frac{1}{4} \left( 2p(n)^2 + \frac{\gamma_{NS}^{(2)}(n)}{\beta_0} + \gamma_{NS}^{(0)}(n) \frac{(\beta_1^2 - \beta_2\beta_0)}{\beta_0^3} - \gamma_{NS}^{(1)}(n) \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0^2} \right) \quad (10)$$

$$r(n) = \frac{1}{6} \left( -2p(n)^3 + 6p(n)q(n) + \frac{\gamma_{NS}^{(3)}(n)}{\beta_0} - \frac{\beta_1\gamma_{NS}^{(2)}(n)}{\beta_0^2} - \frac{\beta_2\gamma_{NS}^{(1)}(n)}{\beta_0^2} + \frac{\beta_1^2\gamma_{NS}^{(1)}(n)}{\beta_0^3} - \frac{\beta_1^3\gamma_{NS}^{(0)}(n)}{\beta_0^4} - \frac{\beta_3\gamma_{NS}^{(0)}(n)}{\beta_0^2} + \frac{2\beta_1\beta_2\gamma_{NS}^{(0)}(n)}{\beta_0^3} \right) \quad (11)$$

The coupling constant  $A_s(Q^2)$  can be expressed in terms of the inverse powers of  $L = \ln(Q^2/\Lambda_{MS}^2)$  as  $A_s^{NLO} = A_s^{LO} + \Delta A_s^{NLO}$ ,  $A_s^{NNLO} = A_s^{NLO} + \Delta A_s^{NNLO}$  and  $A_s^{N^3LO} = A_s^{NNLO} + \Delta A_s^{N^3LO}$ , where

$$A_s^{LO} = \frac{1}{\beta_0 L} \quad (12)$$

$$\Delta A_s^{NLO} = -\frac{\beta_1 \ln(L)}{\beta_0^3 L^2}$$

$$\Delta A_s^{NNLO} = \frac{1}{\beta_0^5 L^3} [\beta_1^2 \ln^2(L) - \beta_1^2 \ln(L) + \beta_2 \beta_0 - \beta_1^2] \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta A_s^{N^3LO} = \frac{1}{\beta_0^7 L^4} [\beta_1^3 (-\ln^3(L) + \frac{5}{2} \ln^2(L) + 2 \ln(L) - \frac{1}{2}) - 3 \beta_0 \beta_1 \beta_2 \ln(L) + \beta_0^2 \frac{\beta_3}{2}] \quad (14)$$

Notice that in our normalization the numerical expressions for  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$  read

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0 &= 11 - 0.6667f \\ \beta_1 &= 102 - 12.6667f \\ \beta_2 &= 1428.50 - 279.611f + 6.01852f^2 \\ \beta_3 &= 29243.0 - 6946.30f + 405.089f^2 + 1.49931f^3 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where the expression for  $\beta_3$  was obtained in Ref.[28]. The inverse-log expansion for  $\Delta A_s^{N^3LO}$  which incorporates the information about the coefficient  $\beta_3$  was presented in Ref.[29].

A few words are to be said about the approximation used for the anomalous-dimension function  $\gamma_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s)$ . The analytic expression for its one-loop coefficient is well-known:  $\gamma_{NS}^{(0)}(n) = (8/3)[4\sum_{j=1}^n(1/j) - 2/n(n+1) - 3]$ . In the cases of both  $F_2$  and  $xF_3$ , numerical expressions for  $\gamma_{NS}^{(1)}(n)$ -coefficients are given in Table 1.

n	$\gamma_{NS,F_2}^{(1)}(n)$	$\gamma_{NS,F_3}^{(1)}(n)$	$\gamma_{NS}^{(2)}(n)$	$\gamma_{NS}^{(3)}(n) _{[1/1]}$	$\gamma_{NS}^{(3)}(n) _{[0/2]}$
2	71.374	71.241	612.1	5259	5114
3	100.801	100.782	837.4	6959	6900
4	120.145	120.140	1005.8	8421	8414
5	134.905	134.903	1135.8	9563	9562
6	147.003	147.002	1242.0	10493	10482
7	157.332	157.332	1334.0	11310	11280
8	166.386	166.386	1417.5	12077	12012
9	174.468	174.468	1493.5	12784	12706
10	181.781	181.781	1559.0	13370	13271
11	188.466	188.466	?	?	?
12	194.629	194.629	?	?	?
13	200.350	200.350	?	?	?
14	205.689	205.689	?	?	?

**Table 1.** The used numerical expressions for NLO and NNLO coefficients of anomalous dimensions of moments of the NS SFs at  $f = 4$  number of flavours and the N<sup>3</sup>LO Padé estimates.

These results are normalized to the case of  $f = 4$  numbers of active flavours. In the same Table we present the numerical expressions for  $\gamma_{NS}^{(2)}(n)$ , used in the process of fits.

In the cases of  $n = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10$  they follow from the explicit calculations of  $\gamma_{NS,F_2}^{(2)}(n)$ -terms [17], normalized to  $f = 4$ , while the  $n = 3, 5, 7, 9$  numbers are fixed by using the smooth interpolation procedure originally proposed in Ref.[18]. Note in advance, that since  $\gamma_{NS,F_3}^{(2)}(n)$ -coefficients differ from  $\gamma_{NS,F_2}^{(2)}(n)$ -terms, though by presumably small additional contributions (for discussions, see Ref.[9]), it would be interesting to verify the accuracy of the expression for  $\gamma_{NS}^{(2)}(n)$ , used in the process of our NNLO  $xF_3$  fits, by explicit analytic calculations of the NNLO contributions to anomalous dimensions of odd moments of the  $xF_3$  structure function.

Let us now describe the procedure of fixing other theoretical uncertainties. After the work of Ref.[33] it becomes rather popular to model the effects of higher order terms of perturbative series in QCD by the expanded Padé approximants.

In the framework of this technique, the values of terms  $C^{(3)}(n)$  and  $r(n)$  could be expressed as

$$\text{Pade } [1/1] : \quad C^{(3)}(n) = [C^{(2)}(n)]^2 / C^{(1)}(n) \quad (16)$$

$$r(n) = q(n)^2 / p(n) \quad (17)$$

$$\text{Pade } [0/2] : \quad C^{(3)}(n) = 2C^{(1)}(n)C^{(2)}(n) - [C^{(1)}(n)]^3 \quad (18)$$

$$r(n) = 2p(n)q(n) - [p(n)]^3 \quad (19)$$

The numerical values for  $p(n)$  and  $q(n)$ , obtained from the results of Table 1 and definitions of Eqs.(9)-(11), together with the values of the coefficients  $C^{(1)}(n)$  and  $C^{(2)}(n)$  (which come from the calculations of Ref.[16]), are presented in Table 2.

n	$p(n)$	$q(n)$	$r(n) _{[1/1]}$	$r(n) _{[0/2]}$	$C^{(1)}(n)$	$C^{(2)}(n)$	$C^{(3)}(n) _{[1/1]}$	$C^{(3)}(n) _{[0/2]}$
2	1.646	4.232	10.829	9.476	-1.778	-47.472	-1268	174
3	1.941	4.774	11.738	11.218	1.667	-12.715	97	-47
4	2.050	5.546	15.003	14.123	4.867	37.117	283	246
5	2.115	6.134	17.790	16.486	7.748	95.408	1175	1013
6	2.165	6.595	20.087	18.407	10.351	158.291	2421	2168
7	2.210	7.039	22.421	20.318	12.722	223.898	3940	3638
8	2.252	7.525	25.138	22.471	14.900	290.884	5679	5360
9	2.294	8.018	28.027	24.715	16.915	358.587	7602	7291
10	2.334	8.375	30.049	26.382	18.791	426.442	9677	9391

**Table 2.** The values for NLO and NNLO QCD contributions used in our fits and the N<sup>3</sup>LO Padé estimates.

In the same Table, we also give the estimates for  $r(n)$  and  $C^{(3)}(n)$ , obtained by using the expanded [1/1] and [0/2] Padé approximants formulae of Eqs.(16)-(19). For completeness, in the last two columns of Table 1 we also present the estimates for N<sup>3</sup>LO contributions to the anomalous dimension function  $\gamma_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s)$ , obtained with the help of the expanded

[1/1] and [0/2] Padé approximants. One can see that the results of applications of [1/1] and [0/2] Padé approximants for  $\gamma_{NS}^{(3)}(n)$  are almost identical to each other.

Using the numbers presented in Table 1, one can construct Padé motivated expressions for  $r(n)$  by substituting the estimates for  $\gamma_{NS}^{(3)}(n)$  into Eq.(11). It should be stressed, that the obtained estimates for  $r(n)$  qualitatively agree with the ones presented in Table 2 within the “Padé world” only, namely only in the case of application, in Eq.(11), of the [1/1] or [0/2] Padé estimate for the four-loop coefficient of the QCD  $\beta$ -function  $\beta_3$ . However, in the case of  $f = 4$  the direct application of the [1/1] and [0/2] Padé approximants underestimates the calculated value of  $\beta_3$  by a factor of over 2.5 ( $\beta_3|_{[1/1]} \approx 3217$ ;  $\beta_3|_{[0/2]} \approx 3058$ ). In view of this, the application of Eq.(11) with the Padé estimated values of  $\gamma_{NS}^{(3)}(n)$  and the explicit expression for  $\beta_3$ -coefficient give estimates of  $r(n)$ , drastically different from the ones presented in Table 2 (for example, for the case of application of [0/2] Padé estimates it gives  $r(2) \approx 16.6, \dots, r(10) \approx 49.3$ ).

It is already known that the accuracy of estimates of the N<sup>3</sup>LO coefficient of the QCD  $\beta$ -function can be improved by some additional fits of the polynomial dependence of  $\beta_3$  on the number of flavours  $f$  and by applying the asymptotic Padé approximant (APAP) formula [38]. Therefore, it might be interesting to consider the possibility of making Padé estimates of N<sup>3</sup>LO contributions to  $\gamma_{NS}(A_s)$  (see Table 1) more theoretically motivated. Analogous steps were already done in Ref.[39] in the analysis of the status of N<sup>3</sup>LO Padé estimates for the anomalous dimension function of quark mass. The agreement of the obtained estimates with the calculated four-loop QCD results of Ref.[40, 41] turned out to be reasonable. One can hope that the application of similar procedure for the APAP estimates of  $\gamma_{NS}^{(3)}$ -terms and the substitution of the results obtained in Eq.(11) (together with the explicit expression for the  $\beta_3$ -term) might improve the agreement with the estimates presented in Table 2. At this step we consider the estimates presented in Table 2 as suitable results for modelling the unknown effects of the N<sup>3</sup>LO corrections, which depend on the N<sup>3</sup>LO expression for the coupling constant  $A_s$ .

Within this approach, the uncertainties of the results of NNLO fits can be estimated by modelling  $q(n)$  and  $C^{(2)}(n)$  by using the [0/1] Padé approximants, which give  $q(n)|_{[0/1]} = [p(n)]^2$  and  $C^{(2)}(n)|_{[0/1]} = [C^{(1)}(n)]^2$ . The estimated values of  $q(n)|_{[0/1]}$  are correct in sign for  $n \geq 2$ , while for  $C^{(2)}(n)$  the same feature takes place in the case of  $n \geq 4$  moments. Moreover, for  $n \geq 4$  the relative values of ratios  $q(n)|_{[0/1]}/q(n)$  are varying from 1.3 to 1.5, while similar ratios for NLO contributions to the coefficient function  $C^{(2)}(n)|_{[0/1]}/C^{(2)}(n)$  are changing from 1.6 at  $n = 4$  to 1.2 at  $n = 10$ . This precision seems to be rather acceptable for the [0/1] Padé estimates, which in the case of each concrete fixed value of  $n$  are based on one input term of the corresponding perturbative series.

It should also be stressed that the uncertainties in values of  $r(n)$  are not so important, since the results of our fits are more sensitive to the form of predictions of the Padé approximations for the N<sup>3</sup>LO contributions to the coefficient function (namely,  $C^{(3)}(n)$ -terms).

From the results presented in Table 2 one can conclude that the theoretical series for  $C_{NS}^{(n)}$  for large  $n$  ( $n \geq 4$ ), relevant to the behavior of  $xF_3(x, Q^2)$  in the intermediate and large  $x$ -region, probably have sign constant structure with asymptotically increasing

positive coefficients. Therefore, the applications of the expanded [1/1] and [0/2] Padé approximants for estimating the terms  $C^{(3)}(n)$  with  $n \geq 4$  (which in both cases have the same positive sign and the same order of magnitude) might be considered as the useful ingredient for the N<sup>3</sup>LO Padé-motivated fits.

However, in the cases of coefficient functions of  $n = 2, 3$  moments of  $x F_3$  our intuition suggest nothing about the sign and order of magnitude of the third term in perturbative series  $C_{NS}^{(2)}(A_s) = 1 - 1.78A_s - 47.47A_s^2$  and  $C_{NS}^{(3)}(A_s) = 1 + 1.67A_s - 12.71A_s^2$ . Indeed, in these two cases the manipulations with [1/1] and [0/2] Padé approximants give drastically different estimates for the terms  $C^{(3)}(n)$  which for  $n = 2, 3$  differ both in sign and size (see Table 2). It is possible that this feature is related to the fact that for  $n = 2, 3$  the coefficients of  $C_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s)$  have no immediate  $(+1)^m m!$  growth, but exhibit some zigzag structure manifesting itself in the cases of definite perturbative series of quantum field theory models (for discussions, see e.g. Ref.[42]). This might give additional theoretical uncertainties of modelling higher-order perturbative QCD predictions for  $x F_3(x, Q^2)$  in the region of relatively small  $x$ .

In view of the questionable asymptotic behavior of the NNLO series for coefficient functions of the NS moments with low  $n$  ( $n = 2, 3$ ), we also use the idea of Ref.[35] and consider non-expanded Padé approximants in the process of analysis of the DIS data.

Let us recall that the corresponding non-expanded [1/1] Padé approximants can be defined as

$$AD(n, A_s)|_{[1/1]} = \frac{1 + a_1^{(n)} A_s}{1 + b_1^{(n)} A_s} \quad (20)$$

$$C_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s)|_{[1/1]} = \frac{1 + c_1^{(n)} A_s}{1 + d_1^{(n)} A_s} \quad (21)$$

where  $a_1^{(n)} = \left( [p(n)]^2 - q(n) \right) / p(n)$ ,  $b_1^{(n)} = -q(n) / p(n)$  and  $c_1^{(n)} = \left( [C^{(1)}(n)]^2 - C^{(2)}(n) \right) / C^{(1)}(n)$ ,  $d_1^{(n)} = -C^{(2)}(n) / C^{(1)}(n)$ .

The explicit expressions for the non-expanded [0/2] Padé approximants read:

$$AD(n, A_s)|_{[0/2]} = \frac{1}{1 + b_1^{(n)} A_s + b_2^{(n)} A_s^2} \quad (22)$$

$$C_{NS}^{(n)}(A_s)|_{[0/2]} = \frac{1}{1 + d_1^{(n)} A_s + d_2^{(n)} A_s^2} \quad (23)$$

where  $b_1^{(n)} = -p(n)$ ,  $b_2^{(n)} = p(n)^2 - q(n)$ ,  $d_1^{(n)} = -C^{(1)}(n)$  and  $d_2^{(n)} = [C^{(1)}(n)]^2 - C^{(2)}(n)$ . Since we consider the applications of both [1/1] and [0/2] Padé approximants as attempts to model the behavior of the perturbative series for the NS Mellin moments beyond the NNLO level, we use, in Eqs.(20)-(23), the N<sup>3</sup>LO expression for the coupling constant  $A_s$ , defined through Eqs.(12)-(14). It is worth mentioning here that quite recently the expanded and non-expanded Padé approximants were successfully used to study the N<sup>3</sup>LO approximation of the ground state energy in quantum mechanics [43] and the behavior of the  $\beta$ -function for the quartic Higgs coupling in the Standard Electroweak Model [44].



The next step is the reconstruction of the structure function  $xF_3(x, Q^2)$  with both target mass corrections and twist-4 terms taken into account. The reconstructed SF can be expressed as:

$$xF_3^{N_{max}}(x, Q^2) = w(\alpha, \beta)(x) \sum_{n=0}^{N_{max}} \Theta_n^{\alpha, \beta}(x) \sum_{j=0}^n c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta) M_{j+2, xF_3}(Q^2) + \frac{h(x)}{Q^2} \quad (24)$$

where  $\Theta_n^{\alpha, \beta}$  are the Jacobi polynomials,  $c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta)$  contain  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  dependent Euler  $\Gamma$ -functions where  $\alpha, \beta$  are the Jacobi polynomials parameters, fixed by the minimization of the error in the reconstruction of the SF, and  $w(\alpha, \beta) = x^\alpha(1-x)^\beta$  is the corresponding weight function. To take into account the target mass corrections, the Nachtmann moments

$$M_{n, xF_3} \rightarrow M_{n, xF_3}^{TMC}(Q^2) = \int_0^1 \frac{dx \xi^{n+1}}{x^2} F_3(x, Q^2) \frac{1 + (n+1)V}{(n+2)}, \quad (25)$$

can be used, where  $\xi = 2x/(1+V)$ ,  $V = \sqrt{1 + 4M_{nucl}^2 x^2/Q^2}$  and  $M_{nucl}$  is the mass of a nucleon. However, to simplify the analysis, it is convenient to expand equation (25) into a series in powers of  $M_{nucl}^2/Q^2$  [45]. Taking into account the order  $O(M_{nucl}^4/Q^4)$  corrections, we get

$$M_{n, xF_3}^{TMC}(Q^2) = M_{n, xF_3}^{NS}(Q^2) + \frac{n(n+1)}{n+2} \frac{M_{nucl}^2}{Q^2} M_{n+2, xF_3}^{NS}(Q^2) + \frac{(n+2)(n+1)n}{2(n+4)} \frac{M_{nucl}^4}{Q^4} M_{n+4, xF_3}^{NS}(Q^2) + O\left(\frac{M_{nucl}^6}{Q^6}\right), \quad (26)$$

We have checked that the order  $O(M_{nucl}^4/Q^4)$  terms in Eq.(26) have a rather small effect in the process of concrete fits. Therefore, in what follows we will use only the first two terms in the r.h.s. of Eq.(26).

The form of twist-4 contributions  $h(x)$  in Eq.(24) was first fixed as

$$\frac{h(x)}{Q^2} = w(\alpha, \beta) \sum_{n=0}^{N_{max}} \Theta_n^{\alpha, \beta}(x) \sum_{j=0}^{(n)} c_j^{(n)}(\alpha, \beta) M_{j+2, xF_3}^{IRR}(Q^2) \quad (27)$$

where

$$M_{n, xF_3}^{IRR}(Q^2) = \tilde{C}(n) M_{n, xF_3}^{NS}(Q^2) \frac{A_2'}{Q^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{Q^4}\right) \quad (28)$$

with  $A_2'$  taken as a free parameter and  $\tilde{C}(n)$  defined following the IRR model estimates of Ref.[19] as  $\tilde{C}(n) = -n - 4 + 2/(n+1) + 4/(n+2) + 4S_1(n)$  ( $S_1(n) = \sum_{j=1}^n 1/j$ ). It should be stressed that the multiplicative QCD expression  $M_{n, xF_3}^{NS}(Q^2)$  in Eq.(28), generally speaking different from the intrinsic coefficient function of the twist-4 contribution,

leads to theoretical uncertainties in the contributions of higher-order QCD corrections to the twist-4 part of  $xF_3(x, Q^2)$ . This could provide additional theoretical errors in the studies of the status of the IRR-model predictions for the twist-4 terms in NNLO.

To analyze this question at a more definite theoretical level, it is instructive to model the function  $h(x)$  by additional free parameters of the fits, not related to the IRR-model predictions.

We will estimate the uncertainties of the values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ , and thus  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ , by studying the factorization and renormalization scale dependence of the outcomes of the fits. We will also analyze the stability of extracted values of the IRR-model parameter  $A_2'$  and the twist-4 function  $h(x)$  to the explicitly calculated N<sup>3</sup>LO QCD corrections and other unknown N<sup>3</sup>LO terms (modelled with the help of the Padé resummation technique) included into the fits of concrete data. Our aim will also be the study of the influence of the choice of the initial scale on the results of Ref.[11] and especially on those, which describe the  $x$ -shape of  $h(x)$  for  $xF_3$  within the method adopted by us.

**3 (a). The analysis of the experimental data: the extraction of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  vs  $\alpha_s$  value.**

The results for our NLO and NNLO fits, made for the case of number of active flavours  $f = 4$ , are presented in Table 1 of Ref.[11], where the values of the parameters for the model of  $xF_3$   $A, b, c, \gamma \neq 0$  (related to the parton distribution parameters) are also given. The results of Ref.[11] were obtained by using the fixed value of the initial point  $Q_0^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$  and the fixed weight function of the Jacobi polynomials reconstruction formula of Eq.(24), namely  $x^{0.7}(1-x)^3$ . Note, that this form is similar to the  $x$ -shape of the NS structure function itself. Indeed, the value of the parameters  $\beta = 3$  is in agreement with the quark-counting rules of Ref.[46], while the value  $\alpha = 0.7$  is close to the value of the parameter, which describe the Regge theory behaviour of NS SF at small  $x$ .

In this section, we will present more definite arguments in favour of the used form of the Jacobi polynomial weight function and will study the initial  $Q_0^2$ - scale dependence of the results for  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ , extracted in different orders of perturbation theory.

We will also construct the N<sup>3</sup>LO  $Q^2$ -evolution equations for the Mellin moments using the Padé approximants, written down both in the expanded and non-expanded forms. In the process of these “approximate” N<sup>3</sup>LO fits, the explicit N<sup>3</sup>LO expression for the QCD running coupling constant  $A_s$ , defined in Eqs.(12)-(15), will be used. Thus, from the fits we obtain the N<sup>3</sup>LO estimates of the parameter  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  (and therefore  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ ), and of the common factor  $A_2'$  of the IRR model. The comments on attempts to apply the scheme-invariant analysis for estimating the renormalization-scheme dependence of the results obtained will also be presented.

It should be stressed that despite the general theoretical preference of applications of the diagonal Padé approximants (for a recent analysis, see, e.g., Ref.[47]), the N<sup>3</sup>LO [1/1] Padé approximant description of the CCFR'97 experimental data turned out to be not acceptable in our case, since it produces a rather high value of  $\chi^2$ :  $\chi^2/nep > 2$  (where  $nep = 86$  is the number of experimental points, taken into account in the case of the cut  $Q^2 > 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ ). However, the application of [0/2] Padé approximants produced reasonable results. We think that the non-applicability of the [1/1] Padé method in the process of

fitting CCFR  $xF_3$  data with the help of the Jacobi polynomial approach can be related to a rather large value of the ratio  $[C^{(3)}(2)/C^{(2)}(2)]|_{[1/1]}$  in the expression for the NS moment  $M_{2,xF_3}^{NS}$  (see Table 2).

A similar effect of the preference of the  $[0/2]$  Padé approximant analysis over the  $[1/1]$  one was found in Ref.[34] from the comparison of QCD theoretical predictions for the polarized Bjorken sum rule (which are closely related to the QCD predictions for the first moment of  $xF_3$ , namely, for the Gross-Llewellyn Smith sum rule) with the available experimental data.

Considering the problem of minimization of the dependence of the results of the fits on free parameters  $\alpha, \beta$ , we found several minima on the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ - plane at  $Q_0^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ :

1. Minimum A:  $\alpha/\beta \approx -0.6/0.55$ .

At this minimum we got reasonable LO, NLO and NNLO values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  for  $N_{max} = 6$ . However, the appearance of this minimum strongly depends on the number of moments taken into account. For example, in the case of  $N_{max} = 10$  we were unable to find this minimum at LO and NLO, so we consider this minimum as a spurious one;

2. Minimum B :  $\alpha/\beta \approx -0.5/-0.9$ .

This minimum appears in LO and NLO. However, this minimum does not appear in NNLO, so we consider it as non-applicable for our NNLO fits.

3. Minimum C:  $\alpha/\beta \approx 0.8/1.3$ .

For  $N_{max} = 6$  the LO and NLO values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  can be obtained. However, in NNLO this minimum does not manifest itself. Moreover, it disappears in LO and NLO for the case of  $N_{max} = 10$ . Therefore, we consider it as the spurious one also.

4. Minimum D:  $\alpha/\beta \approx 0.6/-0.99$ .

It should be stressed that in LO and NLO this minimum appears only for  $N_{max} = 6$  and disappears for  $N_{max} = 10$ . Moreover, the obtained value of  $\beta$  results in the unnatural singular  $1/(1-x)$  behaviour of the Jacobi polynomial weight function  $w(\alpha, \beta)$ . In view of this we consider this minimum as the unphysical one.

5. Minimum E:  $\alpha/\beta \sim 0.7/3.0$ .

It is the minimum at which we worked earlier in Refs.[11, 12]. At this minimum the results of LO and NLO fits are in agreement with the ones obtained in Refs.[11, 12]. It should be noted that in LO and NLO this minimum is stable due to variation of  $Q_0^2$  and to the inclusion of higher Mellin moments into the reconstruction formulae of Eq.(24) and Eq.(27) (we checked this statement, repeating the fits for  $N_{max} = 10$ ). In NNLO this minimum appears at  $Q_0^2$  higher than  $10 \text{ GeV}^2$ .

Since the values of parameters  $\alpha, \beta$  at Minimum E are identical to the initially considered ones(  $\alpha = 0.7, \beta = 3$ ) and in view of the stability of the results of the LO and NLO

fits to the value of the initial scale  $Q_0^2$ , we consider this minimum as the physical one and will work in its vicinity, fixing  $\alpha = 0.7$  and  $\beta = 3$  as earlier.

To study the dependence from the choice of the initial scale in more detail and thus to check the reliability of the results, obtained in Refs.[11, 12], we performed LO, NLO and NNLO fits for different values of the initial scale without taking account of twist-4 contributions, but with target mass corrections included (see Ref.[37]). The results for  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  are presented in Table 3.

$Q_0^2$ ( $GeV^2$ )	5	8	10	20	50	100
LO	266±35	266±35	265±34	264±35	264±36	263±36
LO*	382±38	380±41	380±40	379±46	378±43	377±42
NLO	341±30	340±40	340±35	339±36	337±34	337±37
NLO*	322±29	321±33	321±33	320±34	319±36	318±36
NNLO	293±30	312±33	318±33	326±35	326±36	325±36
NNLO*	284±28	312±33	318±33	326±35	326±36	325±36
N <sup>3</sup> LO [0/2]	293±29	323±32	330±35	335±37	326±36	319±35

**Table 3.** The  $Q_0^2$  dependence of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  [MeV]. The LO\* means that in the LO-fits NLO  $\alpha_s$  is used; NLO\* (NNLO\*) indicates that in the NLO (NNLO) fits NNLO (N<sup>3</sup>LO)  $\alpha_s$  is used. The N<sup>3</sup>LO [0/2] marks the results of the expanded [0/2] Padé fits with  $\alpha_s$  defined in N<sup>3</sup>LO.

One can see that the LO and NLO results are stable to the variation of  $Q_0^2$ . The results of LO\* fits are higher than the LO ones, and from this level other perturbative QCD effects tend to decrease the values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  up to the level of the NNLO\*-fits.

The NNLO results are sensitive to the variation of the initial scale  $Q_0^2$ . The values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  become stable for  $Q_0^2 \geq 10 GeV^2$  only. The same effect manifests itself for the results of the expanded [0/2] Padé approximant fits, which incorporate the explicit information about the N<sup>3</sup>LO expression for the coupling constant  $A_s$ . We think that this effect might be related to a rather peculiar behaviour of the NNLO perturbative QCD expression of  $n = 2$  moment. Indeed, taking into account the exact numerical values of the coefficients  $p(2)$ ,  $q(2)$ ,  $C^{(1)}(2)$  and  $C^{(2)}(2)$  from Table 2, we find that the perturbative behaviour of this moment is determined by the following perturbative series

$$AD(2, A_s)C_{N,S}^{(2)}(A_s) = 1 - 0.132A_s(Q^2) - 46.155A_s^2(Q^2) + \dots \quad (29)$$

where the relatively large  $A_s^2$  coefficient is dominated by the NNLO term of the coefficient function of  $n = 2$  moment. Thus we think that it is more appropriate to start the NNLO QCD evolution from the initial scale  $Q_0^2 = 20 GeV^2$ , where the numerical value of the  $A_s^2$  contribution in Eq.(29) is smaller. Note that this choice of the initial scale is also empirically supported by the fact that it coincides with the middle of  $Q^2$  kinematic region of the CCFR data.

In Table 4 we present the results of our new fits for  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  and IRR-model parameter  $A_2'$  obtained in LO, NLO, NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO (modelled by the expanded and non-expanded Padé approximants) in the cases of both  $\gamma \neq 0$  and  $\gamma = 0$ .

	$\gamma$ - free			$\gamma = 0$ - fixed			
$Q^2 >$	$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ (MeV)	$A'_2$ (HT)	$\chi^2$ /points	$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ (MeV)	$A'_2$ (HT) ( $GeV^2$ )	$\chi^2$ /points	
5 $GeV^2$	LO	264±35	–	113.1/86	241±35	–	121.7/86
		433±52	-0.33±0.06	82.8/86	398±71	-0.31±0.08	121.7/86
	NLO	339±36	–	87.6/86	313±36	–	95.2/86
		369±45	-0.12±0.06	82.3/86	341±36	-0.11±0.05	92.3/86
	NNLO	326±35	–	77.0/86	314±35	–	86.1/86
		326±35	-0.01±0.05	76.9/86	315±34	-0.02±0.05	86.3/86
	N <sup>3</sup> LO (n.e.)	332±28	–	76.9/86	314±28	–	86.3/86
		333±27	-0.04±0.05	76.3/86	315±27	-0.04±0.05	85.7/86
N <sup>3</sup> LO	335±37	–	77.9/86	328±37	–	85.1/86	
	340±37	-0.04±0.05	77.2/86	335±37	-0.05±0.05	84.2/86	
10 $GeV^2$	LO	287±42	–	77.3/63	283±39	–	78.1/63
		529±77	-0.52±0.12	57.8/63	515±75	-0.50±0.12	59.5/63
	NLO	349±40	–	63.9/63	344±44	–	64.8/63
		436±55	-0.24±0.10	58.3/63	427±55	-0.23±0.10	59.5/63
	NNLO	338±30	–	57.4/63	337±40	–	58.7/63
		354±45	-0.06±0.09	56.9/63	352±42	-0.03±0.09	58.2/63
	N <sup>3</sup> LO (n.e.)	348±41	–	57.3/63	347±41	–	58.0/63
		373±48	-0.09±0.09	56.2/63	373±48	-0.09±0.09	56.9/63
N <sup>3</sup> LO	344±40	–	56.8/63	345±30	–	57.3/63	
	362±46	-0.07±0.09	56.2/63	363±46	-0.07±0.09	56.6/63	
15 $GeV^2$	LO	319±48	–	58.5/50	320±47	–	58.5/50
		530±89	-0.56±0.18	49.9/50	525±45	-0.56±0.20	50.0/50
	NLO	365±46	–	52.3/50	366±46	–	52.3/50
		440±71	-0.25±0.17	50.3/50	438±69	-0.24±0.17	50.3/50
	NNLO	343±44	–	50.4/50	341±44	–	50.8/50
		350±56	-0.03±0.15	50.3/50	347±55	-0.03±0.15	50.8/50
	N <sup>3</sup> LO (n.e.)	348±45	–	50.3/50	348±45	–	50.4/50
		358±57	-0.04±0.14	50.2/50	357±56	-0.04±0.15	50.3/50
N <sup>3</sup> LO	342±43	–	50.2/50	343±41	–	50.3/50	
	347±58	-0.02±0.15	50.2/50	347±54	-0.02±0.15	50.2/50	

**Table 4.** The results of extractions of the parameter  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  and the IRR coefficient  $A'_2$ , (in  $GeV^2$ ) defined in Eq.(23), from LO, NLO, NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO non-expanded (n.e.) and expanded Padé fits of CCFR'97 data. In the fits we take  $Q_0^2=20 GeV^2$

Looking carefully at Table 4 we arrive at the following conclusions:

- The results of LO and NLO fits are identical to the ones obtained in Ref.[11].
- Our fits demonstrate that the NNLO values of the parameter  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  depend on the choice of the initial scale  $Q_0^2$ . In the case of  $Q_0^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$  the NNLO perturbative QCD contributions are less important, than in the case  $Q_0^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ , earlier considered in Ref.[11]. Indeed, for different  $Q^2$ -cuts they change slightly the NLO values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ , provided twist-4 corrections are switched off.
- As was mentioned previously, this effect might be related to the peculiar behaviour of the NNLO perturbative expression for  $n = 2$  moment of  $xF_3$  (see Eq.(29)) and, therefore, to the theoretical uncertainty of the NNLO behaviour of  $xF_3$  at small  $x$ . We checked this conclusion by comparing the results of the NLO and NNLO  $Q_0^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ -fits of the CCFR'97 data cut at  $x > 0.04$ . The result of these test-fits demonstrate the tendency, identical to the one revealed after moving the initial scale to  $Q_0^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$ , namely, the minimization of the difference between the values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ , extracted in NLO and NNLO.
- However, in the case when the IRR-model for the twist-4 corrections are included into the analysis, the effects of the NNLO corrections are still important and decrease both the value of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  and the IRR-model parameter  $A'_2$ , making the first one almost identical to the NNLO value of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ , obtained without twist-4 terms. The latter one is compatible with zero within statistical error bars. A similar feature was also observed in the case of the fits, made in Ref.[11] for the initial scale  $Q_0^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ . This property confirms the conclusion of Ref.[11] that the results of the NNLO fits are less sensitive to the parameter of the IRR-model of the twist-4 term. A similar conclusion was also recently made in Ref.[48] while comparing the experimental data for the DIS R-ratio with the available NNLO perturbative QCD results of Ref.[49], although the earlier analysis of the experimental data for this quantity with a different kind of the HT model leaves still room for the power suppressed behaviour [50, 51].
- The values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ , obtained from the fits with the [0/2] Padé estimates (both in the expanded and non-expanded variants) turn out to be almost insensitive to the choice of the  $Q^2$ -cut of the data, the value of  $\gamma$  and thus incorporation of the  $(1+\gamma x)$ -factor in the parton distribution model. The latter fact, in turn, can indicate that the change of the model  $xF_3(x, Q_0^2) = A(Q_0^2)x^{b(Q_0^2)}(1-x)^{c(Q_0^2)}(1+\gamma(Q_0^2)x)$  to  $xF_3(x, Q_0^2) = A(Q_0^2)x^{b(Q_0^2)}(1-x)^{c(Q_0^2)}(1+\gamma(Q_0^2)x + \epsilon(Q_0^2)\sqrt{x})$ , used in the MRST and GRV fits, might affect the obtained results only slightly;
- Large errors in definite results for  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ , presented in Table 4, reflect the correlations of these uncertainties with the errors of the IRR-model parameter  $A'_2$ ;

- The property  $\chi_{LO}^2 > \chi_{NLO}^2 > \chi_{NNLO}^2 \sim \chi_{N^3LO}^2$  reflects the importance of the effects of higher order perturbative QCD corrections in the process of fits of the concrete experimental data;
- For all  $Q^2$ -cuts the expanded N<sup>3</sup>LO results for  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  are almost identical to the ones obtained with the expansion of the Padé approximants in Taylor series. Moreover, the  $\chi^2$ -criterion does not discriminate between these two variants of the Padé motivated fits (see especially the results, obtained for the cuts  $Q^2 > 10 \text{ GeV}^2$  and  $Q^2 > 15 \text{ GeV}^2$ ). In our future studies we will consider the results of applications of the expanded Padé approximants.

The results of the the NNLO fits, made with the help of the Jacobi polynomial expansions method, are compared to the available CCFR'97 data in Fig.1. Drawing the theoretical curves we used Eq.(24) with zero twist-4 contributions. The value of the QCD scale parameter, which governs the theoretical behaviour of the moments of  $xF_3$  SF, turned out to be  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)} = 326 \pm 35 \text{ MeV}$  (the  $\chi^2$  of the corresponding fits is 77.0/86). The values of the corresponding parameters of the  $xF_3$  model at  $Q_0^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$  are :  $A = 4.70 \pm 0.34$ ,  $b = 0.65 \pm 0.03$ ,  $c = 3.88 \pm 0.08$ ,  $\gamma = 0.80 \pm 0.28$ . One can see that the NNLO results of the fits without twist-4 corrections are in good agreement with the CCFR'97 experimental data for  $xF_3$  .

To determine now the values of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ , we transformed  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  through the threshold of the production of the fifth flavour,  $M_5$ . This is done using the LO, NLO, NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO variants of the  $\overline{MS}$ -scheme matching conditions, derived in Ref.[29] following the lines of Ref.[23]. The related values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(5)}$  can be obtained with the help of the following equation:




Fig.1 The comparison of the CCFR'97 data with the results of our NNLO Jacobi polynomial fits.

$$\beta_0^{f+1} \ln \frac{\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(f+1)2}}{\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(f)2}} = (\beta_0^{f+1} - \beta_0^f) L_h + \delta_{NLO} + \delta_{NNLO} + \delta_{N^3LO} \quad (30)$$

$$\delta_{NLO} = \left( \frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} - \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \right) \ln L_h - \frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} \ln \frac{\beta_0^{f+1}}{\beta_0^f} \quad (31)$$

$$\delta_{NNLO} = \frac{1}{\beta_0^f L_h} \left[ \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \left( \frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} - \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \right) \ln L_h + \left( \frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \right)^2 - \frac{\beta_2^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} + \frac{\beta_2^f}{\beta_0^f} - C_2 \right] \quad (32)$$

$$\delta_{N^3LO} = \frac{1}{(\beta_0^f L_h)^2} \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} - \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \right) \ln^2 L_h + \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \left[ -\frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} \left( \frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} - \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \right) + \frac{\beta_2^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} - \frac{\beta_2^f}{\beta_0^f} + C_2 \right] \ln L_h + \frac{1}{2} \left( -\left( \frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} \right)^3 - \left( \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \right)^3 - \frac{\beta_3^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} + \frac{\beta_3^f}{\beta_0^f} \right) + \frac{\beta_1^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} \left( \left( \frac{\beta_1^f}{\beta_0^f} \right)^2 + \frac{\beta_2^{f+1}}{\beta_0^{f+1}} - \frac{\beta_2^f}{\beta_0^f} + C_2 \right) - C_3 \right] \quad (33)$$



where  $C_2 = -7/24$  was calculated in Ref.[27] (see also Erratum to Ref.[23]) and the analytic expression for  $C_3$ , namely  $C_3 = -(80507/27648)\zeta(3) - (2/3)\zeta(2)((1/3)\ln 2 + 1) - 58933/124416 + (f/9)[\zeta(2) + 2479/3456]$  was recently found in Ref.[29]. Here  $\beta_i^f$  ( $\beta_i^{f+1}$ ) are coefficients of the  $\beta$ -function with  $f$  ( $f + 1$ ) numbers of active flavours,  $L_h = \ln(M_{f+1}^2/\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(f)2})$  and  $M_{f+1}$  is the threshold of the production of a quark of the  $(f + 1)$  flavour. In our analysis we will take  $f = 4$  and  $m_b \approx 4.8 \text{ GeV}$  and vary the threshold of the production of the fifth flavour from  $M_5^2 = m_b^2$  to  $M_5^2 = (6m_b)^2$  in accordance with the proposal of Ref.[26]. The difference between different prescriptions of fixing the matching point is included into the estimate of the theoretical uncertainties of the final results for  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ .

In the case of the non-zero values of the twist-4 function  $h(x) \neq 0$ , the results of the fits are presented in Table 5 in the next Section.

It should be stressed that we consider the outcomes of our N<sup>3</sup>LO approximate fits as theoretical uncertainties of the NNLO results in the same manner as the results of the NNLO analysis are considered as the measure of theoretical uncertainties of the NLO results. In particular, we introduce the characteristic deviations  $\Delta^{NNLO} = |(\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)})^{N^3LO} - (\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)})^{NNLO}|$ ,  $\Delta^{NLO} = |(\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)})^{NNLO} - (\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)})^{NLO}|$ .

When the twist-4 terms are included into the fits, the difference  $\Delta^{NNLO} = |(\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)})^{N^3LO} - (\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)})^{NNLO}|$  is smaller than the NLO correction term  $\Delta^{NLO} = |(\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)})^{NNLO} - (\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)})^{NLO}|$ . A similar tendency  $\Delta^{NNLO} < \Delta^{NLO}$  takes place in the case of the fits without twist-4 corrections. These observed properties demonstrate the reduction of theoretical errors due to cutting the analyzed perturbation series in different orders.

It is known that the inclusion of higher-order perturbative QCD corrections in the comparison with experimental data decreases the scale-scheme theoretical errors of the results for  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  and thus  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  (see e.g. Refs.[52, 18, 34]). Among the ways of probing the scale-scheme uncertainties are the scheme-invariant methods, namely the principle of minimal sensitivity, the effective charge approach ( which is known to be identical to the scheme-invariant perturbation theory) and the BLM approach (for a review of these methods see e.g. Ref.[53]). The scheme-invariant methods were already used to estimate the unknown higher order corrections in SFs (see Ref.[51], where a strong decrease of the value of the QCD scale parameter was found in the NLO scheme-invariant fit of the experimental data for the NS part of the  $F_2$  ). It was also used to try to estimate the unknown at present N<sup>3</sup>LO corrections to definite physical quantities [36], and DIS sum rules among others. Note that the predictions of Ref.[36] turned out to be in agreement with the results of applications of the Padé resummation technique (see Ref.[33]). Therefore, we can conclude that the application of the methods of the Padé approximants should lead to the reduction of the scale-scheme dependence uncertainties of the values of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  in the analysis of the CCFR data.

To consider the applicability of the Padé resummation technique for fixing scale-scheme dependence ambiguities, we performed the scheme-invariant fits following the ideas of Ref.[54]. We found that in NNLO the application of the effective charge approach gave a rather high value of  $\chi^2$  ( $\chi^2 \sim 111/86$ ). This, in a turn, can be related to the appearance of

*large* and *positive* values of the NNLO terms  $\beta_2(n)_{eff}$  of the effective-charges  $\beta$ -functions, which are the important ingredients of the scheme-invariant approach of Ref.[54]. Similar problems have also been observed in the case of the scheme-invariant applications to the study of the NNLO perturbative QCD predictions to other renormalization-group invariant quantities (see Refs.[55, 41, 56] for discussions). In this work we avoid the detailed investigation of this problem. However, in Sec.4 we will discuss the results, which were obtained after variation of the factorization and renormalization scales without using the freedom in the choice of the scheme-dependent NLO and NNLO corrections to the anomalous dimension functions and NNLO corrections to the QCD  $\beta$ -function.

We now present the values of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ , extracted from the fits of the CCFR'97 experimental data for  $xF_3$ , obtained with the twist-4 contribution, modelled through the IRR model of Ref.[19]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NLO HT of Ref.}[19] \alpha_s(M_Z) &= 0.120 \pm 0.003(stat) \\ &\pm 0.005(syst) \pm 0.004(theory) \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NNLO HT of Ref.}[19] \alpha_s(M_Z) &= 0.118 \pm 0.002(stat) \\ &\pm 0.005(syst) \pm 0.003(theory) . \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Anticipating the considerations of Sec.3(b) we also present the results of NLO and NNLO extractions of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  with the twist-4 contribution, modelled by additional free parameters of the fit:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NLO HT free } \alpha_s(M_Z) &= 0.123_{-0.010}^{+0.008}(stat) \\ &\pm 0.005(syst) \pm 0.004(theory) \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NNLO HT free } \alpha_s(M_Z) &= 0.121_{-0.009}^{+0.007}(stat) \\ &\pm 0.005(syst) \pm 0.003(theory) . \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

Systematic uncertainties are taken from the CCFR experimental analysis, presented in the first work of Ref.[2], and the theoretical uncertainties in the results of Eqs.(34),(36) [Eqs.(35),(37)] are estimated by differences between central values of the outcomes of the NNLO and NLO [N<sup>3</sup>LO and NNLO] fits, presented in Tables 4,5, plus in the application of the  $\overline{MS}$ -scheme matching condition (which following the considerations of Ref.[26] was estimated as  $\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z) = \pm 0.002$ ). In the process of fixing the theoretical errors with the consideration of the N<sup>3</sup>LO corrections we take into account the differences between applications of the expanded and non-expanded Padé approximants.

It can be seen that due to a large overall number of the fitted parameters the results of Eqs.(36),(37) for  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  obtain large statistical uncertainties. As can be seen from the results of Eq.(34),(35) for the QCD coupling constant, it is possible to decrease their values by fixing the concrete form of the twist-4 parameter  $h(x)$ . However, if one is interested

in the extraction of the form of the twist-4 parameter  $h(x)$ , one should take for granted these intrinsic theoretical uncertainties of the value of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ .

**3 (b). The analysis of the experimental data: the extraction of the shape of the twist-4 terms.**

Apart from the perturbative QCD contributions, the expressions for DIS structure functions should contain power-suppressed high-twist terms, which reflect possible non-perturbative QCD effects. The studies of these terms have a rather long history. At the beginning of these studies it was realized that the twist-4 contributions to structure functions should have the pole-like behavior  $\sim 1/((1-x)Q^2)$  [57, 58]. This behavior was used in the phenomenological investigations of the earlier less precise DIS  $\nu N$  data [59, 60, 61], which together with other different procedures of analyzing neutrino DIS data [62, 63] was considered as the source of the information about scaling violation parameters. The development of the renormalon technique (See Refs.[21, 19, 20] and Ref.[22] for a detailed review) pushed ahead a more detailed phenomenological analysis of the possibility of detecting higher-twist components in the most precise DIS data available at present, obtained by BCDMS, SLAC, CCFR and other collaborations. It turned out that despite the qualitative status of the renormalon approach, a satisfactory description of the results of the QCD NLO  $F_2$  analysis [64] in terms of the IRR technique was achieved [19, 21]. The next step was to clarify the status of the predictions of Ref.[19] for the form and sign of the twist-4 contributions to  $xF_3$ . The study of this problem was done in Ref.[11] (see also Ref.[10]). In this section, we discuss the results of a more refined analysis of the behavior of the twist-4 contributions to  $xF_3$  in LO, NLO, NNLO and beyond.

In Table 4 we present the dependence of the extracted value of the parameter  $A'_2$  on different orders of perturbative QCD predictions,  $Q^2$ -cuts of the CCFR experimental data and the coefficient  $\gamma$  of the parton distribution model for  $xF_3$ , fixing the factorization scale  $Q_0^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$ . Note that the parameter  $A'_2$  was introduced in the IRR model of Eq.(28), taken from Ref.[19], and fixed there as  $A'_2 \approx -0.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ , which is necessary for the description of the fitted twist-4 results of Ref.[64] for  $F_2$  in the IRR language. We found that the value of this parameter, extracted in LO and NLO, is negative, differs from zero for about one standard deviation and qualitatively agrees with the IRR-motivated guess of Ref.[19]. Moreover, the results of our LO and NLO fits are also in agreement with the value of the parameter  $h = -0.38 \pm 0.06 \text{ GeV}^2$  of a different model of the twist-4 contribution to  $xF_3$ , namely  $xF_3(x, Q^2)h/((1-x)Q^2)$ , extracted previously in Ref.[61] from the old  $\nu N$  DIS data.

It is interesting to notice that the results of Table 4 reveal that for larger  $Q^2$ -cuts  $10 - 15 \text{ GeV}^2$  the values of  $A'_2$  in the LO and NLO fits are less sensitive to the included number of experimental points than in the case of the low  $Q^2$  cut ( $5 \text{ GeV}^2$ ). This feature can be related to the logarithmic increase of the QCD coupling constant  $A_s$  at lower  $Q^2$ . However, since we are interested in the extraction of the power-suppressed twist-4 contribution, we concentrate on the discussion of more informative, from our point of view, fits with low  $Q^2$ -cut  $5 \text{ GeV}^2$ , which contain more experimental points and thus are more statistically motivated.

We now turn to a pure phenomenological extraction of the twist-4 contribution  $h(x)$  to  $xF_3$  (see Eq.(24)), which is motivated by the work of Ref.[64] for  $F_2$ . In the framework

of this approach the  $x$ -shape of  $h(x)$  is parametrized by additional parameters  $h_i = h(x_i)$ , where  $x_i$  are points of the experimental data binning. The results of the multiloop extractions of these parameters are presented in Table 5 and are illustrated in Fig.2.

	LO	NLO	NNLO	N <sup>3</sup> LO (Pade)
$\chi_{d.f.}^2$	66.3/86	65.7/86	65.0/86	64.8/86
A	$5.33 \pm 1.33$	$4.71 \pm 1.14$	$4.79 \pm 0.75$	$5.14 \pm 0.73$
b	$0.69 \pm 0.08$	$0.66 \pm 0.08$	$0.66 \pm 0.05$	$0.68 \pm 0.05$
c	$4.21 \pm 0.17$	$4.09 \pm 0.14$	$3.95 \pm 0.19$	$3.84 \pm 0.23$
$\gamma$	$1.15 \pm 0.94$	$1.34 \pm 0.86$	$0.96 \pm 0.57$	$0.57 \pm 0.52$
$\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)} [MeV]$	$331 \pm 162$	$440 \pm 183$	$372 \pm 133$	$371 \pm 127$
$x_i$	$h(x_i) [GeV^2]$			
0.0125	$0.209 \pm 0.346$	$0.235 \pm 0.325$	$0.263 \pm 0.315$	$0.304 \pm 0.313$
0.0175	$0.067 \pm 0.281$	$0.114 \pm 0.283$	$0.133 \pm 0.263$	$0.170 \pm 0.257$
0.025	$0.153 \pm 0.215$	$0.242 \pm 0.226$	$0.244 \pm 0.206$	$0.268 \pm 0.199$
0.035	$-0.013 \pm 0.205$	$0.132 \pm 0.236$	$0.112 \pm 0.211$	$0.110 \pm 0.195$
0.050	$0.038 \pm 0.159$	$0.256 \pm 0.240$	$0.214 \pm 0.200$	$0.171 \pm 0.168$
0.070	$-0.141 \pm 0.139$	$0.144 \pm 0.258$	$0.106 \pm 0.202$	$0.017 \pm 0.151$
0.090	$-0.177 \pm 0.127$	$0.144 \pm 0.254$	$0.142 \pm 0.202$	$0.026 \pm 0.142$
0.110	$-0.343 \pm 0.127$	$-0.009 \pm 0.237$	$0.045 \pm 0.205$	$-0.080 \pm 0.146$
0.140	$-0.408 \pm 0.116$	$-0.085 \pm 0.174$	$0.060 \pm 0.187$	$-0.049 \pm 0.140$
0.180	$-0.351 \pm 0.173$	$-0.072 \pm 0.128$	$0.154 \pm 0.161$	$0.093 \pm 0.145$
0.225	$-0.547 \pm 0.244$	$-0.351 \pm 0.180$	$-0.098 \pm 0.128$	$-0.103 \pm 0.127$
0.275	$-0.548 \pm 0.334$	$-0.472 \pm 0.321$	$-0.228 \pm 0.185$	$-0.193 \pm 0.169$
0.350	$-0.295 \pm 0.414$	$-0.390 \pm 0.470$	$-0.154 \pm 0.264$	$-0.104 \pm 0.234$
0.450	$-0.098 \pm 0.410$	$-0.307 \pm 0.504$	$-0.146 \pm 0.330$	$-0.125 \pm 0.303$
0.550	$0.095 \pm 0.324$	$-0.134 \pm 0.415$	$-0.121 \pm 0.323$	$-0.138 \pm 0.317$
0.650	$0.380 \pm 0.211$	$0.215 \pm 0.262$	$0.140 \pm 0.245$	$0.111 \pm 0.251$

**Table 5.** The results of extractions of the HT contribution  $h(x)$  to  $xF_3$  and the parameters  $A, b, c, \gamma$  with the corresponding statistical errors. The QCD fits of CCFR'97 data were performed taking into account TMC in LO, NLO ( $N_{max} = 10$ ), NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO ( $N_{max} = 6$ ). In the latter case the expanded [0/2] Padé approximants were used. The fits are done for  $Q_0^2 = 20 GeV^2$ .




Fig.2. The  $x$ -shape of  $h(x)$  extracted from the fits of CCFR'97 data in the case of fixing the initial scale at  $Q_0^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$

Looking carefully at Table 5 and Fig.2 we observe the following features:

1. The  $x$ -shape of the twist-4 parameter is not inconsistent with the expected rise of  $h(x)$  for  $x \rightarrow 1$  [57, 58] in all orders of perturbation theory;
2. the values of parameters  $h(x_i)$  at the upper and lower points of the kinematic region ( $x_{16}=0.650$  and  $x_1=0.0125$ ) are stable to the inclusion of higher order perturbative QCD corrections and application of the Padé resummation technique. At large values of  $x$  this feature is in agreement with the previous statement;
3. the function  $h(x)$  seems to cross zero twice: at small  $x$  of order 0.03 and larger  $x$  about 0.4. It should be noted that the sign-alternating behavior of the twist-4 contributions to DIS structure functions was qualitatively predicted in Ref.[60];
4. in LO and NLO our results are in qualitative agreement with the IRR prediction of Ref.[19] (for discussions, see Ref.[22]);
5. in NNLO this agreement is not so obvious, though a certain indication to the manifestation of the twist-4 term survives even in NNLO;

6. however, in NNLO we observe the minimization of the amplitude of the  $h(x)$ -variation. Thus we conclude that the inclusion of the NNLO corrections into the game might "shadow" the effects of the power suppressed terms in NNLO. This property was previously observed in LO as a result of the analysis of less precise DIS neutrino data in Ref.[59]. In the modern experimental situation, namely, in the analysis of more precise DIS neutrino data of the CCFR collaboration, we observe this feature in NNLO;
7. we checked the reliability of this NNLO foundation by going beyond this perturbative approximation using the method of Padé approximants. The result of this analysis reveals a relative stability of the NNLO results for  $h(x)$ ;
8. the property of minimization of the  $x$ -shape of  $h(x)$  in NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO is identical to the effect of decreasing the IRR model parameter  $A'_2$  in NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO (see Table 4);
9. these observed properties clarify why the results of the NNLO and N<sup>3</sup>LO fits for  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ , presented in Tables 4,5 practically do not depend on the inclusion of the twist-4 contribution using the IRR model. Indeed, at this level the twist-4 terms manifest themselves less obviously.

From our point of view, statements (8)-(9) reflect self-consistency of the results of our different fits with twist-4 terms included in different ways.

#### 4. The factorization and renormalization scales uncertainties.

As it is known from the work of Ref.[64] it is rather instructive to study the sensitivity of the results to the variation of renormalization and factorization scales. We will study the question of factorization-renormalization scale dependence within the class of  $\overline{MS}$ -scheme only. This means that we will change only the scales without varying the scheme-dependent coefficients of anomalous dimensions beta-function.

The arbitrary factorization scale is entering in the following equation:

$$A_s(Q^2/\mu_{\overline{MS}}^2) = A_s(Q^2/\mu_F^2) \left[ 1 + k_1 A_s(Q^2/\mu_F^2) + k_2 A_s^2(Q^2/\mu_F^2) \right] \quad (38)$$

where  $\mu_F^2$  is the factorization scale and

$$\begin{aligned} k_1 &= -\beta_0 \ln\left(\frac{\mu_{\overline{MS}}^2}{\mu_F^2}\right) \\ k_2 &= k_1^2 + \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0} k_1 \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Let us choose the factorization scale as  $\mu_F^2 = \mu_{\overline{MS}}^2 k_F$ .

Then we have:

$$k_1 = \beta_0 \ln(k_F) \quad (40)$$

In this case after application of the renormalization group equation and substitution of Eq.(38) into Eqs.(7,8) of Sec.2 we get

$$\exp\left[-\int^{A_s(Q^2 k_F)} \frac{\gamma_{NS}^{(n)}(x)}{\beta(x)} dx\right] = (A_s(Q^2 k_F))^a \times \overline{AD}(n, A_s(Q^2 k_F)) \quad (41)$$

where  $a = \gamma_{NS}^{(0)}/2\beta_0$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{AD}(n, A_s(Q^2 k_F)) &= 1 + \left[p(n) + ak_1\right] A_s(Q^2 k_F) \\ &+ \left[q(n) + p(n)k_1(a+1) + \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_0} k_1 a + \frac{a(a+1)}{2} k_1^2\right] A_s^2(Q^2 k_F) \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

where

$$k_1 = \ln(k_F)\beta_0 \quad (43)$$

Now let us study the factorization and renormalization scale dependence in the case when  $k_R = k_F = k$  (see, e.g., Ref.[65]). In this case we should modify the coefficient function in Eq.(6) only as

$$C_{NS}^{(n)} = 1 + C^{(1)}(n)A_s(Q^2 k) + \left[C^{(2)}(n) + C^{(1)}(n)\beta_0 \ln(k)\right] A_s^2(Q^2 k) \quad (44)$$

The commonly accepted practice is vary  $k$  in the interval  $1/4 \leq k \leq 4$  (see, e.g., Ref.[65])

We repeated our fits, described in Sec.3a, both without and with IRR model of the twist-4 terms in the cases of  $k = 1/4$  and  $k = 4$ . The obtained results are presented in Table 6:

Order	k	$\Delta_k$	$A'_2 (HT)$	$\chi^2/\text{points}$
NLO	4	116	—	99.1/86
	4	213	- 0.22±0.06	84.2/86
	1/4	-61	—	80.4/86
	1/4	-99	+ 0.02±0.05	80.2/86
NNLO	4	35	—	83.5/86
	4	66	- 0.11±0.06	83.5/86
	1/4	-51	—	87.3/86
	1/4	-45	+ 0.09±0.05	84.5/86

**Table 6.** The results of NLO and NNLO fits of CCFR'97  $xF_3$  data for  $Q^2 > 5 \text{ GeV}^2$  with different values of factorization/renormalization scales.  $\Delta_k (MeV) = \Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}(k) - \Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}(k = 1)$ . The value of the IRR model coefficient is given in  $\text{GeV}^2$ . The initial scale is fixed as  $Q_0^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$ .

The factorization/renormalization scale ambiguities of the NLO (NNLO) values of  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$  are giving the estimate of theoretical errors of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ , which can be compared with the ones, given in Sec.3 (see Eqs.(34),(35)). Transforming the results of Table 6 into the related errors of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  with the help of NLO and NNLO variants of the matching condition of Eq.(30) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)_{NLO} &= \begin{array}{l} +0.009 \\ -0.007 \end{array} \\ \Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)_{NNLO} &= \begin{array}{l} +0.003 \\ -0.002 \end{array}\end{aligned}\quad (45)$$

in the case when HT are included through the IRR model and

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)_{NLO} &= \begin{array}{l} +0.006 \\ -0.004 \end{array} \\ \Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)_{NNLO} &= \begin{array}{l} +0.003 \\ -0.002 \end{array}\end{aligned}\quad (46)$$

in the case when HT-terms are neglected.

One can see, that the inclusion of the HT terms even through the definite model leads to the increase of theoretical uncertainties of the NLO value of the  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ . However, for the value of  $k = 1/4$  the fitted value of  $A_2'(HT)$  is lying closer to zero. This feature demonstrates once more that the inclusion of the NNLO corrections, modeled using the renormalization/factorization scale dependence have the tendency to decrease the fitted value of IRR model parameter. Another interesting observation is that at the NNLO the scale-dependence is drastically smaller.

It should be stressed, that the results obtained without HT terms are in agreement with the results of the NLO and NNLO NS analysis of theoretical predictions for the NS part of  $F_2$  SF, which were obtained recently in Ref.[65] with the help of DGLAP approach. Moreover, considering the case when  $k_F \neq k_R$  and varying both parameters within the interval  $1/4 \leq k_F \leq 4$  and  $1/4 \leq k_R \leq 4$ , we found that in NNLO the results of Table 6 depend only slightly on the choice of the factorization scale and are mostly related to the different values of renormalization scale. This feature confirms our findings that the NNLO corrections to the coefficient functions are more important than the corrections of the same order to the anomalous dimensions functions.

The next wellcomed feature is that the renormalization/factorization- scale estimate of theoretical uncertainty of the final NNLO results are in agreement with the theoretical uncertainty of the NNLO result of Eq.(35), estimated by means of application of the Padé approximation technique at the N<sup>3</sup>LO. This fact gives additional theoretical support in favour of the reliability of the NNLO value of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ , given in Eq.(35), which is one of the main results of our considerations.

Let us discuss the renormalization/factorization-scale dependence of the results of the fits, performed in the case when HT terms were included as the free parameters and  $\gamma = 0$  (for simplicity). In this case we found the following scale-dependence of the central values of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$ , given in Eqs.(36),(37):

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)_{NLO} &= \begin{array}{l} +0.006 \\ -0.005 \end{array} \\ \Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)_{NNLO} &= \pm 0.003\end{aligned}\quad (47)$$






Fig.3. The  $x$ -shape of  $h(x)$  extracted from the fits of CCFR'97 data in the case of fixing the initial scale at  $Q_0^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$  and changing factorization/renormalization scales.

These errors demonstrate the same features, as in the case of the inclusion of the HT-terms through the IRR-model, namely

- 1) the reduction of theoretical errors in NNLO;
- 2) the correspondence of the theoretical error in NNLO to the one, previously estimated with the help of simulation of the effects of the N<sup>3</sup>LO corrections by means of the Padé resummation technique;
- 3) the agreement of the results of Eq.(47) with the independent estimates of factorization/renormalization scale uncertainties, recently obtained in the NS case in Ref.[65].

In Fig.3 we present the investigation of the scale-dependence of the  $x$ -shape of the model-independent twist-4 coefficient  $h(x)$ , which was obtained in Sec.3(b) in LO, NLO, NNLO and Padé-motivated N<sup>3</sup>LO in the cases of  $k_F = k_R = 1$  (see Fig.2). More definitely, Fig.3 demonstrate, how the NLO and NNLO plots of Fig.2 are changing in two cases, namely when  $k_F = k_R = 1/4$  and  $k_R = k_F = 4$ .

These plots demonstrate us the following typical features of scale-dependence of the  $x$ -shape of the twist-4 contributions:

- In the case of  $k_R = k_F = 4$  the result of the NLO analysis is closer to the LO behaviour of  $h(x)$ , obtained in Fig.2 in the case of  $k_R = k_F = 1$ , while in the case of  $k_R = k_F = 1/4$  the NLO  $x$ -shape of the twist-4 correction is almost identical

to the one, obtained in Sec.3(b) in NNLO and indicate the partial reduction of the twist-4 model-independent contributions. This means, that considering the renormalization/factorization scale ambiguities we can simulate in part the effects of the NNLO contributions. This feature confirms the findings of Ref.[66], obtained at the NLO within DGLAP approach.

- In the case of  $k_R = k_F = 1/4$  both NLO and NNLO  $x$ -shapes of  $h(x)$  are in agreement with the results of applications of the N<sup>3</sup>LO Padé approximation technique, shown in Fig.2.
- In the case of  $k_R = k_F = 4$  the NNLO  $x$ -shape of  $h(x)$  is also comparable with minimization of the contribution of the twist-4 corrections. However, for these values of renormalization/factorization scales the detailed structure of  $h(x)$  is less vivid and has large errors. This property is explained by the effective enhancement of the contributions of the NNLO corrections to the coefficient functions of the corresponding Mellin moments (see Table 2 and Eq.(44)) and large correlations of HT effects with the values of the parameter  $\Lambda_{\overline{MS}}^{(4)}$ .

### 5. The attempt of the inclusion of nuclear corrections.

The effects of nuclear corrections are the remaining important source of uncertainties of the analysis of the DIS data. This is especially important for the experiments on heavy targets and in the case of CCFR data—on iron <sup>56</sup>Fe.

The attempts to study these effects were done in Ref.[67] in the framework of the Deuteron-motivated model. A satisfactory QCD description of the CCFR data for  $xF_3$  was achieved due to the fact that in this case the nuclear effects do not exceed 5 % effect. However, a more realistic description of the nuclear effect for  $xF_3$  in the case of <sup>56</sup>Fe-target [68] revealed the appearance of new  $1/Q^2$  and  $1/M$  corrections to NS moments, which have the following form

$$\begin{aligned}
M_n^A(Q^2)/A &= \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{M}(n-1) + \frac{\langle \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle}{6M^2}n(n-1) + O\left(\frac{1}{M^3}\right)\right) M_n^{NS}(Q^2) \\
&+ \langle \Delta p^2 \rangle \partial_{p^2} M_n^{NS}(Q^2) \\
&+ \frac{2 \langle \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle}{3Q^2} n(n+1) M_{n+2}^{NS}(Q^2)
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

where  $M$  is the mass of a nucleon, and for <sup>56</sup>Fe the parameters of the nuclear model adopted in Ref.[68] are  $\langle \epsilon \rangle \approx -56 \text{ MeV}$ ,  $\langle \mathbf{p}^2 \rangle / (2M) \approx 35 \text{ MeV}$ ,  $\langle \Delta p^2 \rangle_{Fe} \approx -0.17 \text{ GeV}$  and the derivative  $\partial_{p^2} M_n(Q^2)$  takes into account that the target momentum  $p$  can be generally off-mass-shell. This effect results in the following contribution [68]

$$\partial_{p^2} M_n(Q^2) = \partial_{p^2} M_n^{as} + \frac{n}{Q^2} \left( M_n^{NS} + M^2 \partial_{p^2} M_n^{as} \right) \tag{49}$$

which is independent of the nuclear content of the target. The numerical values of  $\partial_{p^2} M_n^{as}$  were also presented in Ref.[68].

Note that the effects of nuclear corrections in DIS were also recently studied in Ref.[69] in the case of  $xF_3$  and in Refs.[70],[71] in the case of  $F_2$  (for earlier related works, see e.g., Ref.[72]). However, in our studies we concentrate ourselves on the consideration of the results of Ref.[68].

We included the corrections of Eqs.(48)-(49) into our fits and observed an unacceptable increase of  $\chi^2$  value. We think that this can be related to a possible asymptotic character of the  $1/M$ -expansion in Eq.(48), since the third term in the brackets of the r.h.s. of Eq.(48) becomes comparable with the first term (which is equal to unity) for  $n \sim 8$  used in our fits. Note that the moments with large  $n$  are important in the reconstruction of the behavior of  $xF_3$  as  $x \rightarrow 1$ . This observed feature necessitates the derivation of the explicit expression for  $M_n^A(Q^2)$  which is not expanded in powers of  $1/M$ -terms. It should be added that the problem of possible asymptotic nature of the power suppressed expansions was mentioned in the case of Ellis-Jaffe and Bjorken DIS sum rules in Ref.[73].

Another possibility to explain the non-convergence of our fits with the nuclear corrections of Eq.(48) might be related to the fact that the parton distribution model for the nuclear SF  $xF_3^{56Fe}$  can be different from the canonical model used by us[74]. In any case, we think that the study of the problem of possible influence of heavy nuclear effects on the results of fits of  $xF_3$  data is still on the agenda.

### Conclusion

In this work we presented the results of extractions of  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  and twist-4 terms from the QCD analysis of the CCFR data taking into account definite QCD corrections at the NNLO and beyond. Within experimental and theoretical errors our results for  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  are in agreement with other extractions of this fundamental parameter, including its world average value  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.118 \pm 0.005$ .

Our estimate of the NNLO theoretical uncertainties is based on application of the [0/2] Padé approach at the N<sup>3</sup>LO level and the analysis of factorization and renormalization scale ambiguities. The uncertainties of our NNLO analysis can be decreased after explicit NNLO calculations of the NS Altarelli-Parisi kernel. It should be added, however, that the NLO results, obtained by us both for the  $x$ -shape of twist-4 corrections and for the  $\alpha_s(M_Z)$  value are in good agreement with the results of the NLO DGLAP analysis of the CCFR'97  $xF_3$  and  $F_2$  SFs data [75], which gives  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1222 \pm 0.0048$  (*exp*)  $\pm 0.0040$  (*theor*)

As to the twist-4 term, we found that despite the qualitative agreement of our NLO results with the IRR model prediction, at the NNLO level its  $x$ -shape tends to decrease and is stable to the application of the [0/2] Padé motivated N<sup>3</sup>LO analysis, which is supported by the NNLO fits with fixing factorization and renormalization scales as  $k_R = k_F = 1/4$ .

This feature can be related to the fact that the analysis of the CCFR data cannot distinguish the twist-4  $1/Q^2$  terms from the NNLO perturbative QCD approximations of the Mellin moments. This possible explanation is similar to the conclusions of the LO analysis of the old less precise neutrino DIS data, made by the authors of Ref.[59]. It is worth to remind that they were unable to distinguish between LO logarithmic and  $1/Q^2$ -behavior of the QCD contributions to Mellin moments of  $xF_3$ . The experimental precision achieved in our days might move this effect to NNLO. Another possibility is that the inclusion of NNLO perturbative QCD contributions makes the extraction of the  $1/Q^2$ -corrections within IRR model approach and by the model-independent way more

problematic (for discussions of the perturbatively based alternative of the IRR language within quantum mechanics model see Ref.[76]).

Another related explanation of the decrease of the twist-4 terms in NNLO come from the partial summation of the definite terms of the asymptotic perturbative QCD series and that the increase of the order of perturbative QCD analysis effectively suppresses the remaining sum of the perturbative QCD contribution. One can hope that future experiments of the NuTeV collaboration will allow one to get new experimental data at the precision level, necessary for extracting a more detailed information about higher twist contributions.

#### **Note added**

After the technical part of this work was done, we learned about the work of Ref.[77] where the NNLO analysis of  $F_2$  SLAC, HERA and BCDMS data was performed both in the singlet and nonsinglet cases with the help of the method of Bernstein polynomials [78]. The main result of this work is the NNLO value  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1172 \pm 0.0024$ , which is in agreement with our findings. In another recent work, the first steps towards the inclusion of NNLO corrections to the NS part of  $F_2$  and modelling the NNLO corrections to the kernel in the  $x$ -space were made [65]. Our analysis of factorization-renormalization scale uncertainties confirms their findings. It should be also noted, that quite recently the NNLO results of Ref.[16] were confirmed [79] with the help of other methods. We hope that our possible future studies will allow us to generalize the Jacobi polynomial NNLO analysis presented in this work to the case of  $F_2$  SF.

#### **Acknowledgments**

Part of this work was done when one of us (AVS) was visiting Santiago de Compostela University. He is grateful to his colleagues for the hospitality in Spain.

We are grateful to A.V.Kotikov for his participation at the first stage of these studies and for discussions. The useful comments of S.I. Alekhin are gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks are due to S.A.Kulagin for sharing his points of view on the current status of studies of nuclear effects in DIS.

We would like to thank G.Altarelli, V.M. Braun, J. Blümlein, K.G. Chetyrkin, and W. van Neerven for useful comments on our previous results, given in Refs.[11, 12].

We express our special thanks to J. Chýla for careful reading the work and valuable advises.

We would also like to acknowledge S.J. Brodsky, J. Ellis, B.L. Ioffe, L.N. Lipatov, E.A. Kuraev, A.A. Pivovarov and A.V. Radyushkin for their interest in the results of our analysis.

The part of this work was done when ALK was visiting ICTP, Trieste. He is grateful to the staff of Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics for providing good working conditions.

This work is done within the scientific program of the project supported by the Russian Foundation of Basic Research, Grant N 99-01-00091. The work of G.P. was supported by CICYT (Grant N AEN96-1773) and Xunta de Galicia (Grant N XUGA-20602B98).

## **References**

- [1] CCFRR Collab., D. MacFarlane et al., *Z. Phys.* **C26** (1984) 1.
- [2] W.G. Seligman, Columbia Univ, Thesis R-1257, CU-368, Nevis- 292, 1997;  
CCFR-NuTeV Collab., W.G. Seligman et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** (1997) 1213.
- [3] G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, *Nucl. Phys.* **B126** (1977) 298; V.N. Gribov and L.N. Lipatov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **15** (1972) 438; L.N. Lipatov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **20** (1975) 94; Yu.L. Dokshitzer, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **46** (1977) 641.
- [4] S. Kuhlmann, H.L. Lai and W.K. Tung, *Phys. Lett.* **B409** (1997) 271.
- [5] A.D. Martin, R.C. Roberts, W.J. Stirling and R.S. Thorne, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C4** (1998) 463.
- [6] M. Gluck, E.Reya and A. Vogt, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C5** (1998) 461.
- [7] A.L. Kataev and A.V. Sidorov, *Phys. Lett.* **B331** (1994) 179.
- [8] J. Chýla and J. Rames, *Phys. Lett.* **B343** (1995) 351.
- [9] A.L. Kataev, A.V. Kotikov, G. Parente and A.V. Sidorov, *Phys. Lett.* **B388** (1996) 179.
- [10] A.V. Sidorov, *Phys. Lett.* **B389** (1996) 379;  
A.V. Sidorov, *JINR Rapid Commun.* **80** (1996) 11.
- [11] A.L. Kataev, A.V. Kotikov, G. Parente and A.V. Sidorov, *Phys. Lett.* **B417** (1998) 374; see also A.L. Kataev, A.V. Kotikov, G. Parente and A.V. Sidorov, Proc. QCD-97 Workshop, Montpellier, July 1997; *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl.* **64** (1998) 138 (hep-ph/9709509).
- [12] A.L. Kataev, G. Parente and A.V. Sidorov, Report INR-P089/98; JINR E2-98-265; US-FT/17-98; hep-ph/9809500; to be published in part in the Proceedings of “Quarks-98” Int. Seminar, Suzdal, May 1998.
- [13] G. Parisi and N. Surlas, *Nucl. Phys.* **B151** (1979) 421;  
I.S. Barker, C.B. Langensiepen and G. Shaw, *Mucl. Phys.* **B186** (1981) 61.
- [14] J. Chýla and J. Ramez, *Z. Phys.* **C31** (1986) 151.
- [15] V.G. Krivokhizhin, S.P. Kurlovich, V.V. Sanadze, I.A. Savin, A.V. Sidorov and N.B. Skachkov *Z. Phys.* **C36** (1987) 51;  
V.G. Krivokhizhin, S.P. Kurlovich, R. Lednicky, S. Nemecek, V.V. Sanadze, I.A. Savin, A.V. Sidorov and N.B. Skachkov, *Z. Phys.* **C48** (1990) 347.
- [16] E.B. Zijlstra and W.L. van Neerven, *Phys. Lett.* **B297** (1992) 377; *Nucl. Phys.* **B417** (1994) 61.

- [17] S.A. Larin, T. van Ritbergen and J.A.M. Vermaseren, *Nucl. Phys.* **B427** (1994) 41;  
S.A. Larin, P. Nogueira, T. van Ritbergen and J.A.M. Vermaseren, *Nucl. Phys.* **B492**  
(1997) 338.
- [18] G. Parente, A.V. Kotikov and V.G. Krivokhizhin, *Phys. Lett.* **B333** (1994) 190.
- [19] M. Dasgupta and B.R. Webber, *Phys. Lett.* **B382** (1996) 273.
- [20] M. Maul, E. Stein, A. Schäfer and L. Mankiewicz, *Phys. Lett.* **B401** (1997) 100.
- [21] M. Beneke and V.M. Braun, *Nucl. Phys.* **B454** (1995) 253;  
G.P. Korchemsky and G. Sterman, *Nucl. Phys.* **B437** (1995) 415;  
Yu.L. Dokshitzer, G. Marchesini and B.R. Webber, *Nucl. Phys.* **B469** (1996) 93;  
R. Akhouri and V.I. Zakharov, report UM-TH-97-05 (hep-ph/9701378);  
R. Akhouri and V.I. Zakharov, Proc. QCD-97 Workshop, Montpellier, July 1998,  
*Nucl. Phys. B. Proc. Suppl.* **64** (1998) 350 (hep-ph/9710257);  
M. Maul, E. Stein, L. Mankiewicz, M. Mayer-Hermann and A. Schäfer, In Proc. 2nd  
Topical Workshop of DIS of polarized Targets: Theory Meets Experiment; “Ham-  
purg/Zeuthen 1997 Deep inelastic scattering off polarized targets, physics with po-  
larized protons at HERA” p.617 (hep-ph/9710392).
- [22] M. Beneke, preprint CERN-TH-98-233 (hep-ph/9807443).
- [23] W. Bernreuther and W. Wetzel, *Nucl. Phys.* **B197** (1982) 228; Err. *Nucl. Phys.* **B513**  
(1998) 758.
- [24] W. Marciano, *Phys. Rev.* **D29** (1984) 580.
- [25] D.V. Shirkov and S.V. Mikhailov, *Z. Phys.* **C63** (1994) 463;  
D.V. Shirkov, A.V. Sidorov and S.V. Mikhailov, hep-ph/9707514.
- [26] J. Blümlein and W.L. van Neerven, *Phys. Lett.* **B450** (1999) 417.
- [27] S.A. Larin, T. van Ritbergen and J.A.M. Vermaseren, *Nucl. Phys.* **B438** (1995) 278;  
for the definite cross-checks see M. Spira, *Fortsch. Phys.* **46** (1998) 203.
- [28] T. van Ritbergen, J.A.M. Vermaseren and S.A. Larin, *Phys. Lett.* **B400** (1997) 379.
- [29] K.G. Chetyrkin, B.A. Kniehl and M. Steinhauser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** (1997) 2184.
- [30] S.K. Ghosh and S. Raha, hep-ph/9810368.
- [31] G. Shaw, Report MC-TH-99/1 ( hep-ph/9901253).
- [32] G.A. Baker, Jr. and P. Graves-Morris, Padé approximants, Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.,  
1981;  
C.M. Bender and S.A. Orszag, Advanced mathematical methods for scientists and  
engineers, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1978.
- [33] M.A. Samuel, J. Ellis and M. Karliner, *Phys. Rev.Lett.* **74** (1995) 4380.

- [34] J. Ellis, E. Gardi, M. Karliner and M.A. Samuel, *Phys. Lett.* **B366** (1996) 268.
- [35] A.V. Sidorov, Proc. Int. Conf. Hadron Structure-91, Stara Lesna, Czecho-Slovakia, 1991, Physics and Applications, Kosice, 1992, p. 230.
- [36] A.L. Kataev and V.V. Starshenko, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A10** (1995) 235.
- [37] A.L. Kataev, G. Parente and A.V. Sidorov, hep-ph/9904332; to be published in the Proceedings of DIS99 Workshop, Zeuthen, April 19-23; 1999.
- [38] J. Ellis, M. Karliner and M.A. Samuel, *Phys. Lett.* **B400** (1997) 176.
- [39] J. Ellis, I. Jack, D.R.T. Jones, M. Karliner and M.A. Samuel, *Phys. Rev.* **D57** (1998) 2665;  
V. Elias, T.G. Steele, F. Chishtie, R. Migneron and K. Sprague, *Phys. Rev.* **D58** (1998) 116007.
- [40] K.G. Chetyrkin, *Phys. Lett.* **B404** (1997) 161.
- [41] J.A. Vermaseren, S.A. Larin and T. van Ritbergen, *Phys. Lett.* **B405** (1997) 327.
- [42] C.M. Bender and S. Boettcher, *J. Math. Phys.* **35** (1994) 1914;  
C.M. Bender, S. Boettcher and L.N. Lipatov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** (1992) 3674; *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) 5557.
- [43] A.A. Penin and A.A. Pivovarov, *Phys. Lett.* **B357** (1995) 427.
- [44] L. Durand and G. Jaczko, *Phys. Rev.* **D58** (1998) 113002.
- [45] H. Georgi and H.D. Politzer, *Phys. Rev.* **D14** (1976) 1829.
- [46] V.A. Matveev, R.M. Muradyan and A.N. Tavkhelidze, *Nuov. Cim. Lett.* **7** (1973) 719;  
S.J. Brodsky and G.R. Farrar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **31** (1973) 1153.
- [47] S.J. Brodsky, J. Ellis, E. Gardi, M. Karliner and M.A. Samuel, *Phys. Rev.* **D56** (1997) 6980;  
G. Cvetič, *Nucl. Phys.* **B517** (1998) 506;  
G. Cvetič and R. Kögerler, *Nucl. Phys.* **B522** (1998) 396.
- [48] U. K. Yang and A. Bodek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999) 2467.
- [49] E.B. Zijlstra and W.L. van Neerven, *Nucl.Phys.* **B383** (1992) 525.
- [50] J.Sánchez-Guillén, J. Miramontes, M. Miramontes, G. Parente and O. Sampayo, *Nucl. Phys.* **B353** (1991) 337.
- [51] A.V. Kotikov, G. Parente and J. Sánchez Guillén, *Z. Phys.* **C58** (1993) 465.
- [52] J. Chýla and A.L.Kataev, *Phys.Lett.* **B297** (1992) 385.

- [53] J. Chýla and A.L.Kataev, in Report of Working Group on Precisions calculations for the  $Z^0$ -resonance, Eds. D.Yu. Bardin, W. Hollik and G.Passarino; CERN Yellow Report 95-03, p.313 (hep-ph/9502383).
- [54] G. Grunberg, *Phys.Rev.* **D29** (1984) 2315.
- [55] S.G. Gorishny, A.L. Kataev, S.A. Larin and L.R. Surguladze, *Phys. Rev.* **D43** (1991) 1633.
- [56] J.Chýla, A.L. Kataev and S.A. Larin, *Phys. Lett.* **B267** (1991) 269.
- [57] E.Berger and S.J. Brodsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **42** (1979) 940.
- [58] J. Gunion, P. Nason and R. Blankenbecler, *Phys. Rev.* **D29** (1984) 2491.
- [59] L.F. Abbot and R.M. Barnett, *Ann. of Phys.* **125** (1980) 276.
- [60] V.A. Bednyakov, I.S. Zlatev, Yu.P. Ivanov, P.S. Isaev and S.G. Kovalenko, *Yad. Fiz.* **40** (1984) 770 (*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **40** (1984) 494).
- [61] B.R. Martin and G. Shaw, *Z. Phys.* **C33** (1986) 99-106.
- [62] A. De Rujula, H. Georgi and H.D. Politzer, *Phys. Rev* **D10** (1974) 2141.
- [63] A. González-Arroyo, C. López and F.J. Ynduráin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B153** (1979) 161.
- [64] M. Virchaux and A. Milsztajn, *Phys. Lett.* **B274** (1992) 221.
- [65] W.L. van Neerven and A. Vogt, preprint INLO-PUB 14/99 (1999) (hep-ph/9907472).
- [66] S.I. Alekhin and A.L. Kataev, Proc. Nucleon99 Workshop (Frascati, June 7-9, 1999); *Nucl. Phys.* **A** (to be published) (hep-ph/9908349).
- [67] A.V. Sidorov and M.V. Tokarev, *Phys. Lett.* **358** (1995) 353;  
M.V. Tokarev and A.V. Sidorov, *Il Nuovo Cim.* **A110** (1997) 1401.
- [68] S.A. Kulagin, *Nucl. Phys.* **A640** (1998) 435.
- [69] E. Marco, E. Oset and S.K. Singh, preprint FTUV-98-35 (1998)( nucl-th/9804068).
- [70] K.J. Eskola, V.J. Kolhinen and C.A. Salgado, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C9** (1999) 61.
- [71] C.D. Cothran, D. B. Day and S. Liuti, *Phys. Lett.* **B421** (1998) 46.
- [72] S.V. Akulinichev, S.A. Kulagin and G.M. Vagradov, *Phys. Lett.* **B158** (1985) 485;  
S.V. Akulinichev, S. Shlomo, S.A. Kulagin and G.M. Vagradov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** (1985) 2239;  
B.I. Birbrair, E.M. Levin and A.V. Shuvaev, *Nucl. Phys.* **A491** (1989) 618.
- [73] B.L. Ioffe, Lectures at Int. School of Nucleon Structure, Erice, 1995, Preprint ITEP-62-95 (hep-ph/9511401).



- [74] S.A. Kulagin, private communication, September 1998.
- [75] S.I. Alekhin and A.L. Kataev, *Phys. Lett.* **B452** (1999) 402.
- [76] A.A. Penin and A.A. Pivovarov, *Phys. Lett.* **B401** (1997) 294.
- [77] J. Santiago and F.J. Ynduráin, preprint FTUAM 99-8; UG-FT-97/99 (hep-ph/9904344); preprint FTUAM 99-17 (hep-ph/9907383),
- [78] F.J. Ynduráin, *Phys. Lett.* **74B** (1978) 68.
- [79] S.Moch and J.A.M. Vermaseren, preprint NIKHEF 99-030 (1999), hep-ph/9912355.