Determination of α_s from τ's

Matthias Jamin

α_s measurements



S. Bethke

For 0.6 % precision at M_Z need "only" ≈ 2 % at M_τ.

Hadronic τ decay rate

Consider the physical quantity R_τ: (Braaten, Narison, Pich 1992)

$$R_\tau \equiv \frac{\Gamma(\tau^- \to \text{hadrons}\,\nu_\tau(\gamma))}{\Gamma(\tau^- \to e^- \bar{\nu}_e \nu_\tau(\gamma))} = 3.6280(94)\,. \quad \text{(HFAG 2012)}$$

R_τ is related to the QCD correlators $\Pi^{(1,0)}(z)$: $(z \equiv s/M_\tau^2)$

$$R_\tau = 12\pi \int\limits_0^1 dz (1-z)^2 \Big[(1+2z)\,\mathrm{Im}\Pi^{(1)}(z) + \mathrm{Im}\Pi^{(0)}(z)\Big]\,,$$

with the appropriate combinations

$$\Pi^{(J)}(z) = |V_{ud}|^2 \Big[\Pi_{ud}^{V,J} + \Pi_{ud}^{A,J}\Big] + |V_{us}|^2 \Big[\Pi_{us}^{V,J} + \Pi_{us}^{A,J}\Big]\,.$$

Hadronic τ decay moments

Additional exp information can be inferred from the moments

$$R_\tau^w \equiv \int_0^1 dz\, w(z)\, \frac{dR_\tau}{dz} = R_{\tau,V}^w + R_{\tau,A}^w + R_{\tau,S}^w\,.$$

Theoretically, R_τ^w can be expressed as:

$$R_\tau^w = N_c\, S_{\rm EW} \Big\{ (|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2) \Big[1 + \delta^{w(0)} \Big] + \sum_{D\geq 2} \Big[|V_{ud}|^2 \delta_{ud}^{w(D)} + |V_{us}|^2 \delta_{us}^{w(D)} \Big] \Big\}\,.$$

$\delta_{ud}^{w(D)}$ and $\delta_{us}^{w(D)}$ are corrections in the Operator Product Expansion, the most important ones being $\sim m_s^2$ and $m_s \langle \bar{q} q \rangle$.

OPAL 1998 V&A spectra



OPAL data can be updated with new branching fractions.

ALEPH data currently miss correlations from unfolding.

FOPT vs CIPT problem

The purely perturbative contribution $\delta^{(0)}$ is plagued by differences for different RG-resummations. (FOPT vs CIPT.)

Using $\alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.3186$, the numerical analysis results in:

$$\begin{array}{lccccc} & a^1 & a^2 & a^3 & a^4 & a^5 \\ \delta^{(0)}_{\rm FO} = & 0.101 & +0.054 & +0.027 & +0.013 & (+0.006) = 0.196\,(0.202) \\ \delta^{(0)}_{\rm CI} = & 0.137 & +0.026 & +0.010 & +0.007 & (+0.003) = 0.181\,(0.185) \end{array}$$

Contour improved PT appears to be better convergent.

The difference between both approaches is $0.015\,(0.017)$!

This problematic entails a ≈ 6 % difference for $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$.

Borel model

To proceed, realistic model $B[\widehat{D}](u)$: (Beneke, MJ 2008)

$$B[\widehat{D}](u) = B[\widehat{D}_1^{\rm UV}](u) + B[\widehat{D}_2^{\rm IR}](u) + B[\widehat{D}_3^{\rm IR}](u) + d_0^{\rm PO} + d_1^{\rm PO}\, u \,,$$

where

$$B[\widehat{D}_p](u) = \frac{d_p}{(p\pm u)^{1+\gamma}} \left[\, 1 + b_1(p\pm u) + b_2(p\pm u)^2 \,\right].$$

- Our main model incoporates the leading UV pole ($u=-1$), as well as the two leading IR renormalons ($u=2,3$).
- It should reproduce the exactly known $c_{n,1}$, $n\leq 4$.
- For both UV and IR, the residues d_p are free while γ, $b_{1,2}$ depend on anomalous dimensions and β-coefficients.

Central Borel model



$c_{5,1} = 283\,, \quad \alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.3186\,.$ (Beneke, MJ 2008)

Model for DV's

In the OPE, close to the Minkowskian axis ($s > 0$), so-called Duality Violations (DV's) can appear.

They can be studied on the basis of a toy-model:

(Shifman et al. 1995-2000)

(Catà, Golterman, Peris 2005/2008)

$$\Pi_V(s) = -\,\psi\left(\frac{M_V^2 + u(s)}{\Lambda^2}\right) + \text{const.}\,.$$

where

$$u(s) = \Lambda^2 \left(\frac{-s}{\Lambda^2}\right)^{\zeta} \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta = 1 - \frac{a}{\pi N_c}\,.$$

The model is based on large-N_c QCD and Regge-theory.

$$M_V = 770\,\mathrm{MeV}, \quad \Lambda = 1.2\,\mathrm{GeV}, \quad a = 0.4\,.$$

Model for DV's

The OPE corresponds to the asymptotic expansion of the ψ-function for large s (large u).

$$\psi(z) \sim \ln z - \frac{1}{2z} - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{B_{2n}}{2nz^{2n}} \,, \quad \mathrm{Re}\, z > 0 \,.$$

In the Minkowskian region, an additional term arises:

$$-\,\pi \left[\cot(\pi z) \pm i \right], \quad \mathrm{Re}\, z < 0 \,, \;\; \mathrm{Im}\, z \gtrless 0 \,.$$

Formally, this term is exponentially suppressed, but it is enhanced by the poles of the ψ-function.



$$z = 1.5 \cdot \exp\left(i\varphi\right)$$ (MJ 2011)

ψ-function moments



ψ-function moment for $w(z) = 1$. (MJ 2011)

ψ-function moments



ψ-function moment for $w(z) = (1 - z)^2$.

Fits to OPAL data

In fits to experimental data, a model for DV's should be included.

The ψ-function model suggests an oscillating, decaying exponential, which can be chosen of the form:

$$\rho^{\rm DV}_{V/A}(s) = \kappa_{V/A}\, {\rm e}^{-\gamma_{V/A} s} \sin\left(\alpha_{V/A} + \beta_{V/A} s\right).$$

The fit quantities are the w-moments of the exp spectra.

$$R^w_{\tau,V/A}(s_0) \equiv \int\limits_0^{s_0} ds\, w(s)\, \rho_{V/A}(s)\,.$$

The cleanest moment turns out to be $w(s) = 1$.

Fitting combinations of several moments is complicated by very strong correlations.

OPAL V-moment



(Boito, Golterman, MJ, Mahdavi, Maltman, Osborne, Peris 2012)

OPAL V-spectrum



(Boito, Golterman, MJ, Mahdavi, Maltman, Osborne, Peris 2012)

Conclusions

- Presently, the most reliable value of α_s from τ's including DV's comes from the trivial moment $w(s) = 1$.

$$\Rightarrow \quad \boxed{\alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.325 \pm 0.016 \pm 0.007} \quad \text{(FOPT)}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \boxed{\alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.347 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.005} \quad \text{(CIPT)}$$

- These values should be compared to the World Average (Bethke 2009): $\alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.3186 \pm 0.0058$.

- Better data on exclusive and inclusive τ decay spectra would be helpful to resolve theoretical issues.

Conclusions

- Presently, the most reliable value of α_s from τ's including DV's comes from the trivial moment $w(s) = 1$.

$$\Rightarrow \quad \alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.325 \pm 0.016 \pm 0.007 \quad \text{(FOPT)}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.347 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.005 \quad \text{(CIPT)}$$

- These values should be compared to the World Average (Bethke 2009): $\alpha_s(M_\tau) = 0.3186 \pm 0.0058$.

- Better data on exclusive and inclusive τ decay spectra would be helpful to resolve theoretical issues.

Thank You for Your attention !