

Brief Reports

Brief Reports are short papers which report on completed research which, while meeting the usual Physical Review standards of scientific quality, does not warrant a regular article. (Addenda to papers previously published in the Physical Review by the same authors are included in Brief Reports.) A Brief Report may be no longer than $3\frac{1}{2}$ printed pages and must be accompanied by an abstract. The same publication schedule as for regular articles is followed, and page proofs are sent to authors.

Perturbative QCD corrections to the ratio R for τ decay

Eric Braaten

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60208
and High Energy Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, Illinois 60439

(Received 21 November 1988)

The perturbative QCD correction to the semihadronic decay rate of a heavy lepton is expressed as an expansion in α_s . In the case of the τ lepton, the ratio of the semihadronic and electronic decay rates is $R = 3[1 + \alpha_s/\pi + 5.20(\alpha_s/\pi)^2 + 104.0(\alpha_s/\pi)^3]$. The use of R to give a precise determination of α_s is advocated.

The inclusive semihadronic decay rate of the τ lepton is conveniently expressed in terms of the ratio

$$R = \frac{\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu_\tau + \text{hadrons})}{\Gamma(\tau^- \rightarrow \nu_\tau e^- \bar{\nu}_e)} \quad (1)$$

A naive estimate of R is obtained by approximating the numerator by the decay rate into quark-antiquark pairs. Including $d\bar{u}$ and $s\bar{u}$, we obtain¹

$$R \simeq N_c(\cos^2\theta_C + \sin^2\theta_C) = 3 \quad (2)$$

The corrections to this naive prediction can be classified into three categories: (1) perturbative QCD; (2) nonperturbative QCD; and (3) electroweak corrections, and they are all reviewed in Ref. 2. The electroweak corrections are enhanced by a large logarithm³ but are still relatively small, increasing the prediction by about 2.4%. Although the decay is a timelike process, the nonperturbative QCD corrections can be treated systematically using the operator-product expansion.⁴⁻⁶ These corrections are also estimated to be small, decreasing R by a few percent. The largest corrections by far are the perturbative QCD corrections. The purpose of this paper is to express these corrections as a simple power series in the strong coupling constant α_s .

The ratio R can be expressed as an integral over the invariant mass of the hadrons:

$$R = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{M^2} \frac{ds}{M^2} \left[1 - \frac{s}{M^2} \right]^2 \left[\left[1 + 2\frac{s}{M^2} \right] \text{Im}\Pi_T(s+i\epsilon) - \text{Im}\Pi_L(s+i\epsilon) \right] \quad (3)$$

where M is the mass of the heavy lepton. The functions $\Pi_T(s)$ and $\Pi_L(s)$ are the transverse and longitudinal components of the hadronic part of the W -boson self-energy function, with an overall factor of $e^2/96\pi^2\sin^2\theta_W$ removed for convenience. Perturbative QCD can be used to approximate $\Pi_T(s)$ and $\Pi_L(s)$ for large spacelike s , but it is not applicable in (3) as it stands, because s is timelike and the integral extends down to small s . However, as shown by Lam and Yan,⁷ the analytic properties of the Π_T and Π_L allow R to be expressed as a contour integral in the complex s plane:

$$R = \frac{1}{i\pi} \int_C \frac{ds}{M^2} \left[1 - \frac{s}{M^2} \right]^2 \left[\left[1 + 2\frac{s}{M^2} \right] \Pi_T(s) - \Pi_L(s) \right] \quad (4)$$

where the contour C runs clockwise around the circle of radius $|s|=M^2$. This contour avoids the small- s region, and furthermore, as pointed out in Ref. 5, the factor $(1-s/M^2)^2$ suppresses the contribution from the timelike region. Thus, provided M^2 is sufficiently large, the functions Π_T and Π_L can be reliably approximated using perturbative QCD.

In the case of the τ lepton, the mass M is sufficiently small that one must consider the possibility of large nonperturbative QCD corrections. Because the timelike region of the s contour is suppressed, the operator-product expansion can be used to expand $\Pi_T(s)$ and $\Pi_L(s)$ in powers of $1/s$. This expansion systematically organizes all nonperturbative effects into matrix elements of local operators, and makes reliable estimates of the nonperturbative corrections to R possible. The best available esti-

mates⁶ place them between -1% and -3% . While there is a large uncertainty in the magnitude of the corrections, there is no uncertainty in the sign because all the operators of dimensions 6 or less contribute with the same negative sign.⁵

We now proceed to calculate the perturbative QCD corrections to R . Because R can be expressed as an integral along the contour $|s|=M^2$ as in (4), it is clear that the appropriate expansion parameter will be $\alpha_s(M)$. Using integration by parts, (4) can be rewritten in the form

$$\begin{aligned} R &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_c \frac{ds}{s} \left[1 - 2\frac{s}{M^2} + 2\frac{s^3}{M^6} - \frac{s^4}{M^8} \right] s \frac{d}{ds} \Pi_T(s) \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} d\theta (1 + 2e^{i\theta} - 2e^{3i\theta} - e^{4i\theta}) \\ &\quad \times s \frac{d}{ds} \Pi_T(s = -M^2 e^{i\theta}). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

We have dropped the Π_L term since the perturbative corrections do not contribute to the longitudinal self-energy function. The logarithmic derivative $s(d/ds)\Pi_T$ can be extracted from the recent calculation⁸ of the ratio R for e^+e^- annihilation to order α_s^3 . It is equal to the function $D(s)$ calculated in Ref. 8, except that $3\sum Q_f^2$ should be replaced by $3\sum |V_{ff'}|^2$ and $(\sum Q_f)^2$ should be set to 0. Here, $V_{ff'}$ is a Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix element and the sum is over pairs of quarks which couple to the W and are light enough to be produced in the decay of the heavy lepton. In the case of the τ lepton, the sum is $|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 \simeq 1$. The resulting expansion for $s(d/ds)\Pi_T$ is

$$\begin{aligned} s \frac{d}{ds} \Pi_T &= 3\sum |V_{ff'}|^2 \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_s(-s)}{\pi} + K_1 \left[\frac{\alpha_s(-s)}{\pi} \right]^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + K_2 \left[\frac{\alpha_s(-s)}{\pi} \right]^3 + \dots \right], \\ K_1 &= 1.986 - 0.115f, \\ K_2 &= 95.87 - 4.22f + 0.086f^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In the case of $f=3$ flavors, the coefficients are $K_1=1.641$ and $K_2=83.98$. The coupling constant α_s is the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ (modified minimal-subtraction scheme) coupling constant evaluated at the renormalization scale $\mu^2 = -s$.

To evaluate the integral, we expand the coupling constant $\alpha_s(-s)$ around the point $s = -M^2$ on the integration contour $s = -M^2 e^{i\theta}$, $-\pi < \theta < \pi$. The behavior of $\alpha_s(t)$ as a function of complex t is governed by the β function:

$$t \frac{d}{dt} \alpha_s(t) = \frac{1}{2} \beta(\alpha_s(t)).$$

The expansion of the β function⁹ is needed to order α_s^3 :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\pi} \beta(\alpha_s) &= -\beta_0 \left[\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right]^2 - \beta_1 \left[\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right]^3 + \dots, \\ \beta_0 &= \frac{33-2f}{6}, \quad \beta_1 = \frac{306-38f}{24}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

In the case of three flavors, these coefficients are $\beta_0 = \frac{9}{2}$ and $\beta_1 = 8$. To order α_s^3 , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha_s(M^2 e^{i\theta})}{\pi} &= \frac{\alpha_s(M^2)}{\pi} + i \frac{\theta}{2\pi} \beta(\alpha_s(M^2)) \\ &\quad - \frac{\theta^2}{8\pi} \beta(\alpha_s(M^2)) \beta'(\alpha_s(M^2)) + \dots \\ &= \frac{\alpha_s(M^2)}{\pi} - \frac{i}{2} \beta_0 \theta \left[\frac{\alpha_s(M^2)}{\pi} \right]^2 \\ &\quad + \left[-\frac{i}{2} \beta_1 \theta - \frac{1}{4} \beta_0^2 \theta^2 \right] \left[\frac{\alpha_s(M^2)}{\pi} \right]^3 + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This expansion must be inserted into (6), which in turn must be inserted into (5). The integrals over θ can be evaluated analytically. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 3 \sum |V_{ff'}|^2 \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_s(M^2)}{\pi} + (K_1 + \frac{19}{24} \beta_0) \left[\frac{\alpha_s(M^2)}{\pi} \right]^2 \right. \\ &\quad + \left[K_2 + \frac{19}{12} \beta_0 K_1 + \frac{19}{24} \beta_1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{265 - 24\pi^2}{288} \beta_0^2 \right] \left[\frac{\alpha_s(M^2)}{\pi} \right]^3 \\ &\quad \left. + \dots \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

In the case of three flavors, it reduces to

$$R = 3 \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} + 5.20 \left[\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right]^2 + 104.0 \left[\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right]^3 + \dots \right]. \quad (10)$$

This result is consistent with that of Ref. 6, where it is given in the less convenient form of an expansion in powers of $1/\ln(M^2/\Lambda^2)$.

The coefficient of α_s^3 in (10) is large, even larger than in the ratio R for e^+e^- annihilation which for five flavors is⁸

$$\begin{aligned} R(s) &= \frac{11}{3} \left[1 + \frac{\alpha_s(s)}{\pi} + 1.41 \left[\frac{\alpha_s(s)}{\pi} \right]^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 64.8 \left[\frac{\alpha_s(s)}{\pi} \right]^3 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The order- α_s^3 correction is significant, which gives us reason to worry that the uncalculated order- α_s^4 correction might also be significant. However, in the absence of any understanding of the large coefficient, it is reasonable to accept the correction at face value. In the case of e^+e^- annihilation, the global fit to R over the energy range $2.6 < \sqrt{s} < 52$ GeV is improved by including the order- α_s^3 correction.¹⁰ This fit yields a precise determination of the strong coupling constant: $\alpha_s(33 \text{ GeV}) = 0.135 \pm 0.016$. If this coupling constant is evolved down to M_τ , it becomes $\alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.33 \pm 0.08$. The prediction (10) for the ratio R for τ decay is then $R = 3.9 \pm 0.5$. The error has been

magnified by the evolution of α_s from 30 GeV down to M_τ and is significantly larger than the present experimental uncertainty in R .

It is clear that the accuracy of current measurements of α_s will not permit a precise theoretical prediction of the ratio R for τ decay. However, as pointed out in Refs. 3 and 6, this procedure can be inverted to determine α_s . In fact, τ decay is probably the lowest-energy process from which the running coupling constant can be extracted cleanly without hopeless complications from nonperturbative effects. The ratio R is determined experimentally by measuring the branching fraction B_e of the τ into electrons, and inserting it into the formula

$$R = \frac{1 - 1.973B_e}{B_e}. \quad (12)$$

The direct measurement¹¹ of B_e yields the ratio $R = 3.71 \pm 0.13$ while an indirect determination of B_e from measuring the lifetime¹¹ of the τ yields the value $R = 3.32 \pm 0.16$. Using (10) and taking into account the estimated electroweak and nonperturbative QCD correc-

tions, we obtain the values

$$\alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.30 \pm 0.03 \quad (13)$$

from the direct measurement of B_e and

$$\alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.19 \pm 0.06 \quad (14)$$

from the indirect measurement. The errors are due to the uncertainty in the experimental measurement only. A rough estimate of the uncertainty due to higher-order corrections is the size of the order- α_s^3 correction, which is 0.07 for (13) and 0.03 for (14). While this correction introduces a significant uncertainty into this determination of α_s , there is no reason to expect it to be less severe for other processes where the calculation of the order- α_s^3 correction is prohibitively difficult. Even including this uncertainty, the ratio R for τ decay remains competitive with other methods of determining α_s . If the reason for the large order- α_s^3 correction can be understood, then high-precision measurements of the τ lifetime would provide by far the most accurate determinations of α_s .

This work was supported in part by the Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-76-ER022789.

¹M. L. Perl, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **30**, 299 (1980).

²E. Braaten, Argonne Report No. ANL-HEP-88-74 (unpublished).

³W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 1815 (1988).

⁴K. Schilcher and M. D. Tran, *Phys. Rev. D* **29**, 570 (1984).

⁵E. Braaten, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1606 (1988).

⁶S. Narison and A. Pich, *Phys. Lett. B* **211**, 183 (1988).

⁷C. S. Lam and T. M. Yan, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 703 (1977).

⁸S. G. Gorishnii, A. L. Kataev, and S. A. Larin, INR Moscow Report No. E2-88-254 (unpublished).

⁹W. Caswell, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33**, 244 (1974); D. R. T. Jones, *Nucl. Phys.* **B75**, 531 (1974).

¹⁰R. Marshall, Rutherford Report No. RAL-88-049 (unpublished).

¹¹K. G. Hayes and M. L. Perl, *Phys. Rev. D* **38**, 3351 (1988).