

# MATCHING PERTURBATIVE AND NON-PERTURBATIVE PHYSICS WITH POWER ACCURACY IN HEAVY-QUARK EFFECTIVE THEORY\*

Xiangdong Ji

*Center for Theoretical Physics  
Laboratory for Nuclear Science  
and Department of Physics  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139*

(MIT-CTP-2453

hep-ph/9507322

July 1995)

## Abstract

I discuss a scheme to match perturbative and non-perturbative physics with power accuracy in the heavy-quark effective theory. I elaborate on two important aspects of the scheme: 1) a multi-loop subtraction of soft contributions from the perturbation series in the pole mass, 2) a perturbative regularization of the linearly-divergent heavy-quark self-energy in the lattice formulation of the heavy-quark effective theory.

Typeset using REVTeX

---

\*This work was supported in part by funds provided by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) under cooperative agreement No. DF-FC02-94ER40818.

In the last few years, the heavy-quark effective theory, HQET, has been widely used to study hadron physics involving heavy flavors. The HQET is essentially based on the concept of scale separation—the large-momentum-scale physics associated with the heavy-quark mass can be factorized and calculated in perturbation theory, and the remaining low-momentum-scale, non-perturbative physics can be summarized in the heavy-quark effective lagrangian. Since the number of papers on the subject is enormous, I refer the reader to review articles for relevant references [1].

It was generally accepted that the heavy-quark mass used in the heavy-quark expansion should be the pole mass, defined according to the single-particle pole in the perturbative heavy-quark propagator [2]. Recently, however, Bigi, Shifman, Uraltsev, and Vainshtein (BSUV) [3] and Beneke and Brown [4] pointed out that the pole mass is intrinsically ambiguous at the order of  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$  and thus, to this degree, the heavy-quark expansion is not unique. The discovery is consistent with an earlier observation by Falk, Neubert and Luke [5] that a residual mass term  $-\delta m_0 \bar{h}_v h_v$  is generally present in the heavy-quark effective lagrangian. It is also consistent with the finding by Maiani, Martinelli and Sachrajda [6] that the lattice formulation of the HQET at order  $1/m_Q$  is plagued by the divergences in inverse powers of the lattice spacing  $a$ .

Given the freedom of constructing the HQET, it is important to find a scheme to match perturbative and non-perturbative calculations with power accuracy. Recently, two approaches have appeared in the literature to tackle this issue. After arguing that a perturbative subtraction of power divergences is not viable, Martinelli and Sachrajda [7] proposed to use non-perturbative renormalization conditions to define power-divergent operators [8]. They provided examples to show how it works in the lattice simulations of the HQET. In their approach, the cancellation of the infrared renormalons in perturbation series involves non-perturbative physics. On the other hand, BSUV [3] took Novikov et al.'s approach to Wilson's operator-product expansion (OPE) [9]. According to that, the OPE provides a separation of physics above and below a certain momentum scale  $\mu$ . The low-momentum physics is taken into account by the non-perturbative matrix elements and the high-momentum physics is included in the coefficient functions. In their paper, BSUV showed explicitly how this can be done at one-loop level.

In this paper I follow the proposal by BSUV and aim to complete the scheme in two important aspects: 1). Outline a procedure for the multi-loop subtraction of the soft contributions present in the perturbation series in the pole mass. The subtraction can be calculated perturbatively using the heavy-quark effective lagrangian in the dimensional regularization and minimal subtraction scheme ( $\overline{\text{MS}}$ ). The approach works also for other perturbation series in the HQET. 2). Show how the non-perturbative corrections may be computed, consistently with the above perturbative calculation, in the lattice formulation of the HQET. This involves matching the non-perturbative quantities in the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  and lattice schemes and formulating the renormalization conditions for power-divergence quantities in perturbative theory. The discussion follows closely a recent paper on Wilson's expansion with power accuracy by the present author [10].

I start with the heavy-quark expansion for the projected inverse heavy-quark propagator in the full theory, as studied by Beneke and Braun [4],

$$S_P^{-1}(k, m_Q) = m_Q - m_{\text{pole}}(m(\mu), \alpha_s(\mu)) + C\left(\frac{m_Q}{\mu}, \alpha_s(\mu)\right) S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k, \mu) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(v \cdot k)^2}{m_Q^2}, \frac{k_{\perp}^2}{m_Q^2}\right), \quad (1)$$

where  $m_Q$ , to be specified shortly, is the heavy-quark mass defining the expansion,  $v$  is the velocity of the heavy quark, and  $k$  is the residual momentum. Their relation with the total momentum of the heavy quark,  $P$ , is

$$P = m_Q v + k. \quad (2)$$

The pole mass  $m_{\text{pole}}$  is a function of the renormalized  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass  $m(\mu)$ . It is also a perturbation series in  $\alpha_s$ , plagued by the infrared renormalon at  $b = 2\pi/\beta_0$  in the Borel plane [3,4], where  $\beta_0 = 11 - 2N_f/3$ .  $S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}$  is a propagator defined in the effective theory with the effective lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \bar{h}_v i v \cdot D h_v + \mathcal{L}_{\text{light}}, \quad (3)$$

in the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme, where  $h_v$  is the heavy-quark effective field and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{light}}$  is the lagrangian for light quarks and gluons.  $S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}$  is a non-perturbative quantity with the ultraviolet renormalon at  $b = 2\pi/\beta_0$  in the Borel plane [4].

It was suggested in Refs. [3,4] that to cancel the infrared renormalon, one may subtract a residual mass  $\delta m(\Lambda)$  of order  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$  from the pole mass  $m_{\text{pole}}$  and choose,

$$m_Q(\Lambda) = m_{\text{pole}} - \delta m(\Lambda) + \dots, \quad (4)$$

as the expansion parameter, where the ellipsis represents higher-order terms in the heavy-quark mass. Apart from the role of cancelling the renormalon,  $\delta m(\Lambda)$  is otherwise arbitrary. In Ref. [3],  $\delta m(\Lambda)$  is identified as the Coulomb energy of the heavy quark below the momentum scale  $\Lambda$ . If so, the expansion parameter  $m_Q(\Lambda)$  contains only the physics above the scale  $\Lambda$  and is entirely perturbative if  $\Lambda \gg \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ . The  $\Lambda$  dependence in  $m_Q(\Lambda)$  shows explicitly that the construction of the heavy-quark expansion is not unique. The scale  $\Lambda$  needs not to be the same as the renormalization scale  $\mu$  introduced in the full theory.

To determine the subtraction to all orders, I consider the heavy-quark propagator  $S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k)$  in perturbation theory. [I will neglect the generic renormalization scale  $\mu$  below.] In dimensional regularization, the propagator satisfies the renormalization condition,

$$S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k = 0, \overline{\text{MS}})|_{\text{pert}} = 0, \quad (5)$$

i.e., the mass shift vanishes. The argument for this is simple: The effective lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$  contains no mass scale in the chiral limit. Because  $S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k = 0)|_{\text{pert}}$  has the dimension of a mass, it must diverge linearly. All power divergent integrals are taken to be zero in dimensional regularization.

However, the conclusion is deceptive. The self-energy of the heavy quark contains both soft and hard contributions, and they cannot cancel each other on the physical ground. For definiteness, let us define the hard and soft contributions as follows. Denote a generic light-quark or gluon propagator by  $D(k)$ . Split the propagator into two parts according to virtuality  $k^2$  of the particle,

$$D(k) = D(k)\theta(k^2 > \Lambda^2) + D(k)\theta(k^2 < \Lambda^2) . \quad (6)$$

Then the contribution to the heavy-quark self-energy from a Feynman diagram with all propagators replaced by  $D(k)\theta(k^2 > \Lambda^2)$  is defined as hard. The complementary part, denoted as  $\Delta\Sigma$ , is soft,

$$\Delta\Sigma(\Lambda) = S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k = 0)|_{\text{pert}} - S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k = 0)|_{\text{pert}}(\text{all } k^2 > \Lambda^2) . \quad (7)$$

It is easy to see that  $\Delta\Sigma$  does not have any linear divergences. All logarithmic divergences in it can be regulated dimensionally and subtracted minimally. Therefore we define the residual mass,

$$\delta m(\Lambda) = C(\alpha_s)\Delta\Sigma(\Lambda) , \quad (8)$$

which is a perturbation series in  $\alpha_s$ ,  $\Lambda \sum_{n=1} b_n \alpha_s^n$ . The one-loop calculation in Ref. [3] gives  $c_1 = 2/3$ . Multi-loop subtraction can now be routinely calculated according to Eqs. (7) and (8). Since  $\delta m(\Lambda)$  contains all the soft contribution, it has the infrared renormalon at  $b = 2\pi/\beta_0$ .

Following Refs. [3,4], I reorganize Eq. (1) as follows,

$$S_P^{-1}(k, m_Q) = m_Q - [m_{\text{pole}} - \delta m(\Lambda)] + C(\alpha_s) \left[ S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k, \overline{\text{MS}}) - \Delta\Sigma(\Lambda) \right] + \dots . \quad (9)$$

The infrared renormalon in  $\delta m(\Lambda)$  cancels both the infrared renormalon in  $m_{\text{pole}}$  and the ultraviolet renormalon in  $S_{\text{eff}}$ , rendering  $m_{\text{pole}} - \delta m(\Lambda)$  and  $S_{\text{eff}}^{-1} - \Delta\Sigma(\Lambda)$  well-defined. However, both quantities now depend on the separation scale  $\Lambda$ .

I now turn to the non-perturbative part of the expansion in the lattice formulation of QCD, because at present the lattice provides the only formalism to calculate non-perturbative physics from the fundamental lagrangian. In a lattice, the discretized version of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$  produces a linearly-divergent quark self-energy. To calculate  $S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}$  in the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -scheme, we first match it with the lattice propagator,

$$S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k, \overline{\text{MS}}) = Z(\mu a, \alpha_s) \left[ S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k, \text{latt}) - S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(0, \text{latt})_{\text{pert}} \right] , \quad (10)$$

where the second term, calculated in the lattice perturbation theory, diverges like  $1/a$  and serves to cancel the linear divergence in the first term.  $Z$  is a renormalization constant, calculable in perturbation theory [11]. Alternatively, one can add a residual mass term  $-\delta m_0 \bar{h}_v h_v$  to the original lagrangian in Eq. (3), where  $\delta m_0$  is fixed by the perturbative renormalization condition,

$$S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(0, \text{latt})|_{\text{pert.}} = 0 . \quad (11)$$

The propagator calculated in the new effective theory has no linear divergences. The new propagator replaces the two terms in the right-hand side of Eq. (10). However, the residual mass thus determined,  $\delta m_0 = 1/a \sum_n c_n \alpha_s^n$ , has the infrared renormalon at  $b = 2\pi/\beta_0$ .

There is yet another way to define the effective theory on the lattice, which is free of both the linear divergence and the infrared renormalon. Define a new  $\delta m_0$  with a subtraction of another series,

$$\delta m_0 = 1/a \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n \alpha_s^n - \Lambda \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d_n \alpha_s^n , \quad (12)$$

where  $d_n$  is adjusted so that the following renormalization condition is satisfied,

$$S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(0, \text{latt})|_{\text{pert}} = -Z^{-1} \Delta \Sigma(\Lambda) . \quad (13)$$

Then  $\delta m_0$  is free of the infrared renormalon, although it now depends on the separation scale  $\Lambda$ . The modified effective lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}'_{\text{eff}}(\Lambda) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} - \delta m_0(a, \Lambda) \bar{h}_v h_v , \quad (14)$$

is also  $\Lambda$  dependent, as discussed in Refs. [4,5]. The non-perturbative heavy-quark propagators  $S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k, \Lambda)$  in this theory, apart from the renormalization factor  $Z$ , gives directly  $S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k, \overline{\text{MS}}) - \Delta \Sigma(\Lambda)$  in Eq. (9). Let me emphasize again that the residual  $\delta m_0$  is an entirely perturbative quantity.

Using the expansion parameter defined in Eq. (4), I have,

$$S_P^{-1}(k, m_Q) = C(\alpha_s) Z S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(v \cdot k, \Lambda) + \dots . \quad (15)$$

It is possible to find a special value of  $\Lambda = \Lambda_0$  such that,

$$S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(0, \Lambda_0) = 0 . \quad (16)$$

The expansion parameter  $m_Q^S$  define at this  $\Lambda_0$  coincides with the subtracted pole mass introduced by Martinelli and Sachrajda. In some sense, this special mass is the physical pole mass because the propagator in the full theory has a pole at  $\not{p} = m_Q^S$ , as is clear from Eq. (15).  $m_Q^S$  is independent of the details of the effective theory. It would be nice to check that the two formulations of the lattice renormalization conditions give the same  $m_Q^S$ .

Both the subtracted pole mass and the physical mass of a pseudo-scalar meson with the heavy quark can be expanded in the  $m_Q(\Lambda)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} m_Q^S &= m_Q(\Lambda) + C(\alpha_s) S_{\text{eff}}^{-1}(0, \Lambda) + \dots , \\ m_H &= m_Q(\Lambda) + C'(\alpha_s) \bar{\Lambda}(\Lambda) + \dots . \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$\bar{\Lambda}$  is the mass of the pseudo-scalar meson calculated in the lattice effective theory with the renormalization condition in Eq. (13).  $C$  and  $C'$  are the coefficient functions calculable in perturbation theory.  $\Lambda$  dependence is explicit in different orders of  $m_Q$  in the above equations, however, it cancels in the physical quantities.

In conclusion, I have discussed in this paper the heavy-quark effective theory in the approach of BSUV. I gave a multi-loop subtraction formula for calculating the scale-dependent heavy-quark mass  $m_Q(\Lambda)$ . I outlined a perturbative regularization of the linear divergences in the heavy-quark self-energy in the lattice QCD. With these crucial ingredients, power corrections to the results of the leading-order HQET can be practically calculated.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank M. Beneke for discussions about renormalons in the HQET.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Neubert, Phys. Rep. 245 (1994) 259; T. Mannel, in *QCD: 20 years later*, ed. by P. M. Zerwas and H. A. Kastrup, World Scientific, Singapore, 1993.
- [2] V. Novikov, L. Okun, M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, M. Voloshin, and V. Zakharov, Phys. Rep. 41 (1987) 1.
- [3] I. I. Bigi, M. A. Shifman, N. G. Uraltsev, and A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D50 (1994) 2234; Phys. Rev. D52 (1995) 196.
- [4] M. Beneke and V. M. Braun, Nucl. Phys. B426 (1994) 301.
- [5] A. F. Falk, M. Neubert and M. Luke, Nucl. Phys. B388 (1992) 363.
- [6] L. Maiani, G. Martinelli and C. T. Sachrajda, Nucl. Phys. B368 (1992) 281.
- [7] G. Martinelli and C. T. Sachrajda, CERN-TH.7517/94, SHEP 94/95-13, 1995; hep-ph/9502352.
- [8] G. Martinelli, C. Pittori, C. T. Sachrajda, M. Testa, A. Vladikas, Nucl. Phys. B445 (1995) 81.
- [9] V. Novikov, M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, and V. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B249 (1985) 445.
- [10] X. Ji, MIT CTP-preprint No. 2437, June, 1995; hep-ph/9506216.
- [11] X. Ji, MIT CTP-preprint No. 2447, June, 1995; hep-lat/9506034.