arXiv:2312.11049v1 [hep-ph] 18 Dec 2023

Brodsky *et al*'s defence does not work

P. M. Stevenson

T.W. Bonner Laboratory, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Rice University, Houston, TX 77251, USA

Abstract:

In their defence of "maximum conformality" methods, Brodsky *et al* make the astonishing claim that any RG transformation $a' = a(1 + V_1 a + \ldots)$ in QCD must have V_1 proportional to $b = (33 - 2n_f)/6$. It is well known that this is not true. I emphasize again the correctness and central importance of the Celmaster-Gonsalves relation for the prescription dependence of the Λ parameter.

I recently made a direct attack [1] upon the BLM [2] or PMC ("principle of maximum conformality") methods (see [3] and references therein). The key point arises already at next-to-leading order (NLO) for a physical quantity

$$\mathcal{R} = a(1 + r_1 a + \ldots). \tag{1}$$

The result given by BLM/PMC for the r_1 coefficient is just *different* when one starts, not from $\overline{\rm MS}$, but from another scheme related to it by

$$a' = a(1 + V_1 a + \ldots). \tag{2}$$

Thus BLM/PMC does not resolve the scheme ambiguity [1, 4]. None of the variants or generalizations of BLM cures this fundamental defect.

Brodsky *et al*'s defence [5] goes off in many directions. I disagree with almost every statement they make, but it would be of little wider interest to rebut each one. The key point of their defence, though, is astonishing: They claim in their seventh paragraph that V_1 must be proportional to $b = (33 - 2n_f)/6$ and that anything else would somehow spoil the "colour structure."

It is easily seen that this is untrue. Ever since the classic work of Celmaster and Gonsalves (CG) [6] it has been clear that *scheme* dependence involves both *scale* and *prescription* dependence, so that a general *scheme* transformation has the form

$$V_1 = -b \ln(\mu'/\mu) + v_1. \tag{3}$$

While the *scale*-change part is proportional to b, the *prescription*-change part, v_1, can be any finite number and in QCD could depend arbitrarily upon n_f (though for most prescriptions in the literature v_1 is linear in n_f). CG introduced a class of "momentum subtraction" (MOM) prescriptions and calculated how they relate to minimal subtraction (MS) in NLO. Their results, in Eqs. (17, 18), are of the form of Eq. (2) with v_1's that are clearly not proportional to $33 - 2n_f$. (CG also explicitly checked that their calculations satisfied the Ward identities.) Do Brodsky *et al* really believe that all MOM prescriptions are illegitimate?

Further, if the "$V_1 \propto b$" contention were true, it would need to be explained why MS and $\overline{\rm MS}$ are correct, while a similar prescription [6] that defined the trace of the unit Dirac matrix in d dimensions to be d or $2^{d/2}$ (rather than 4) would somehow be flat wrong.

The point can also be made as follows. One way to define a renormalization prescription (as noted by many authors) is through the "effective charge" associated with a physical quantity. For example, from the e^+e^- cross-section ratio one could define a prescription

whose couplant is related to the $\overline{\rm MS}$ one by a V_1 equal to the r_1 coefficient for $\mathcal{R}^{e^+e^-}$ calculated in $\overline{\rm MS}$:

$$r_1^{e^+e^-\ (\overline{\rm MS})} = b\ln(\mu/Q) + \left(\frac{365}{24} - 11\zeta_3\right) - n_f\left(\frac{11-8\zeta_3}{12}\right), \tag{4}$$

which again, is *not* proportional to b. Does the e^+e^- effective-charge prescription "violate the colour structure"? (Or does $\overline{\rm MS}$?) Of course not.

The scale/prescription issue is one that still seems to confuse many researchers. The key to understanding it is the CG relation [6]:

$$\ln(\tilde{\Lambda}'/\tilde{\Lambda}) = v_1/b, \tag{5}$$

which the relates the $\tilde{\Lambda}$ parameters of two prescriptions.

One must first define $\tilde{\Lambda}$ within a given renormalization prescription. The β-function equation

$$\mu\frac{da}{d\mu} \equiv \beta(a) = -ba^2(1 + ca + c_2a^2 + \ldots) \tag{6}$$

is integrable and (since we naturally want the range of integration to involve only 0 to a) the constant of integration can be conveniently specified [8] by[1]

$$\ln(\mu/\tilde{\Lambda}) = \lim_{\delta\to 0}\left(\int_\delta^a \frac{dx}{\beta(x)} + \mathcal{C}(\delta)\right), \tag{7}$$

with

$$\mathcal{C}(\delta) = \int_\delta^\infty \frac{dx}{bx^2(1+cx)}. \tag{8}$$

The $\tilde{\Lambda}$ parameter depends upon the renormalization prescription, but in the simple and definite way given by Eq. (5) above. That equation is *exact* and does not involve any $v_2, v_3, \ldots$ coefficients. CG's proof, in my notation, is the following. In the primed prescription the counterpart to Eq. (7) will need primes on $\tilde{\Lambda}$, on a, and (beyond NLO) on $\beta(x)$. (The μ remains the same since, by definition, a change of *prescription* is a change of *scheme* that keeps the value of μ unchanged.) One therefore has

$$\ln(\mu/\tilde{\Lambda}') = \lim_{\delta\to 0}\left(\int_\delta^{a'} \frac{dx}{\beta'(x)} + \mathcal{C}(\delta)\right). \tag{9}$$

[1] For a full discussion see Sect. 6.3 of [9]. CG did not quite arrive at this way of defining a Λ parameter, but their discussion in subsection II.F of [6] is completely consistent with it. This definition of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is not unique, but any satisfactory definition will be equivalent to it up to the addition of a finite constant to $\mathcal{C}(\delta)$; for example, the conventional definition of Λ corresponds to subtracting $(c/b)\ln|2c/b|$.

When taking the difference of Eqs. (7) and (9) the $\mathcal{C}(\delta)$ terms cancel leaving

$$\ln(\mu/\tilde{\Lambda}) - \ln(\mu/\tilde{\Lambda}') = \lim_{\delta\to 0}\left(\int_\delta^a \frac{dx}{\beta(x)} - \int_\delta^{a'} \frac{dx}{\beta'(x)}\right), \tag{10}$$

On the left-hand side the μ dependence cancels to leave $\ln(\tilde{\Lambda}'/\tilde{\Lambda})$. The right-hand side must therefore be *independent* of μ, so we may *choose* to take $\mu \to \infty$, making both a and a' tend to zero, by asymptotic freedom. One may then evaluate the difference of integrals for arbitrarily small a values, which leads to the result in Eq. (5) above.

CG's proof is sound, but it does leave a bit of a mystery as to how the right-hand side of Eq. (10) reduces to v_1/b at *any* μ. An alternative proof, due to Hugh Osborn, can be found in Sect. 6.5 of [9]. It splits the two integrations at ϵ and $\epsilon' = \epsilon(1 + v_1\epsilon + \ldots)$, respectively. Two terms cancel exactly, leaving only terms with $x < \epsilon$ or $x < \epsilon'$. Thus it is clear that the non-zero result, v_1/b, arises solely from the $\frac{1}{x^2}$ singularity and the behaviour of $\beta(x)$ away from the infinitesimal neighbourhood of $x = 0$ plays no role.[2] [3]

The CG relation is the key to the observation [8] that

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_1(Q) \equiv b\ln(\mu/\tilde{\Lambda}) - r_1 \tag{11}$$

is an invariant – independent of both μ and the prescription. That means that the NLO coefficient r_1 of a physical quantity $\mathcal{R}$ depends on scheme *only* through the ratio $\mu/\tilde{\Lambda}$ (which makes sense, since the a obtained from Eq. (7) at NLO depends only on $\mu/\tilde{\Lambda}$.)

There is no meaningful answer to the questions "What is the right μ?" and "What is the right prescription?" The only RS variable that matters at NLO is the *ratio* of μ to the $\tilde{\Lambda}$ parameter, so the real question, for any given quantity $\mathcal{R}$, is "What is a good choice of $\mu/\tilde{\Lambda}$?" Methods that "work" supply an answer to that question.

I stress again that here and in [1] I am not concerned with defending my own "Principle of Minimal Sensitivity" method [8]: That is a separate argument. I have explained that method in detail in Ref. [9] and anyone who applies it carefully will find, I am sure, that the method defends itself.

[2] Ref. [7], cited by [5] in support of their claim, has tacitly assumed that Λ is invariant, so the right-hand side of their equation (18) is missing a $\ln(\Lambda^*/\Lambda)$ term.

[3] In ref. [1] I said that "$\mathcal{C}(\delta)$ involves only b and c and so is RS invariant." The second part of that statement is problematic because in different prescriptions one may *choose* whether or not to use the same δ. My proof of the CG relation in Appendix A of [1] used a $\delta' = \delta(1 + v_1\delta + \ldots)$ and the v_1/b result then arose from $\mathcal{C}(\delta) - \mathcal{C}(\delta')$. Brodsky it et al seize upon this semantic conundrum, but it has no bearing on the correctness of the CG result.

References

[1] P. M. Stevenson, Phys, Lett. B **847** (2023) 138288.

[2] S. J. Brodsky, G. P. Lepage, and P. B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D **28** (1983) 228.

[3] L. Di Giustino, S. J. Brodsky, P. G. Ratcliffe, X-G Wu, and S-Q Wang, *High precision tests of QCD without scale or scheme ambiguities*, preprint submitted to *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics*, July 7, 2023. arXiv:2307.03951.

[4] W. Celmaster and P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Lett. B **125** (1983) 493 ; J. Chýla, Phys. Rev. D **31** (1985) 2690.

[5] S. J. Brodsky, L. Di Giustino, P. G. Ratcliffe, S-Q Wang, and X-G Wu, arXiv:2311.17360.

[6] W. Celmaster and R. Gonsalves, Phys. Rev. D **20** (1979) 1420.

[7] F. A. Chishtie and D. G. C. McKeon, Phys. Rev. D **95** (2017) 116013.

[8] P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Lett. B **100** (1981) 61; Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 2916.

[9] P. M. Stevenson, *Renormalized Perturbation Theory and its Optimization by the Principle of Minimal Sensitivity*, World Scientific, 2022. The text is available "open access" from the publisher's website:
https://www.worldscientific.com/worldscibooks/10.1142/12817#t=aboutBook

Addendum: Numerical Example

This addendum demonstrates explicitly that the BLM procedure gives different results in different schemes. The specific example here is for $\mathcal{R}_{e^+e^-}$ with $n_f = 2$ at $Q = 1$ GeV with $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\overline{\rm MS}} = 0.2$ GeV, corresponding to Example 3 ($Q/\tilde{\Lambda}_{\overline{\rm MS}} = 5$) in Chap. 10 of Ref. [9].

The NLO β function is

$$\beta^{\rm NLO}(a) = -ba^2(1 + ca), \tag{A.1}$$

with

$$b = 29/6, \qquad c = 115/58. \tag{A.2}$$

The r_1 coefficient ($r_1 = An_f + B$), calculated in the $\overline{\rm MS}(\mu = Q)$ scheme, has

$$\begin{aligned} A &= -\frac{11}{12} + \frac{2}{3}\zeta_3 = -0.115295, \\ B &= \frac{365}{24} - 11\zeta_3 = 1.98571, \end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

so that for $n_f = 2$ one has

$$r_1^{\overline{\rm MS}(\mu=Q)} = 2A + B = 1.75512. \tag{A.4}$$

The NLO result in the $\overline{\rm MS}(\mu = Q)$ scheme uses an "a" that is the solution to the integrated β-function equation at NLO for $\ln(\mu/\tilde{\Lambda})$ equal to $\ln 5$; i.e., it is the root of

$$\frac{1}{a}\left(1 + ca\ln\left|\frac{ca}{1+ca}\right|\right) - b\ln 5 = 0, \tag{A.5}$$

which is

$$a_{\overline{\rm MS}}(Q) = 0.0862557. \tag{A.6}$$

The NLO result in the $\overline{\rm MS}(\mu = Q)$ scheme is then

$$\mathcal{R}_{\overline{\rm MS}(\mu=Q)} = a_{\overline{\rm MS}}(Q)\left(1 + r_1^{\overline{\rm MS}(\mu=Q)} a_{\overline{\rm MS}}(Q)\right) = 0.0993138. \tag{A.7}$$

To obtain the BLM/PMC result I follow Eqs. (3.4), (3.5) in Ref. [3][4] These give

$$C_1^* = \frac{33}{2}A + B = 0.0833333, \tag{A.8}$$

and

$$\mu_r^* = Q\exp 3A = 0.707593\ {\rm GeV}. \tag{A.9}$$

[4]Though Eq. (3.4) is *not* "the NLO α_s-running formula" but the *leading-order* one; it corresponds to the LO β function $-ba^2$. The NLO running involves c, of course, and requires solving equations such as Eq. (A.5) above. This error makes matters worse, in that the BLM result is not even the same as using the $\overline{\rm MS}(\mu = \mu_r^*)$ scheme, but correcting it would not affect my main point.

Then

$$a_{BLM} = \frac{a_{\overline{\rm MS}}(Q)}{1 + b\, a_{\overline{\rm MS}}(Q) \ln(\mu_r^*/Q)} = 0.10079, \tag{A.10}$$

so that the NLO BLM result is

$$\mathcal{R}_{BLM} = a_{BLM}(1 + C_1^* a_{BLM}) = 0.101636. \tag{A.11}$$

But suppose we had originally calculated r_1 in some other renormalization prescription. That is equivalent to taking the $\overline{\rm MS}$ result and making a change of renormalization prescription $a' = a(1 + v_1 a + ...)$. (Let us choose to keep the scale choice as $\mu = Q$ in both prescriptions.) By the exact CG relation we have

$$\tilde{\Lambda}' = \tilde{\Lambda}_{\overline{\rm MS}} e^{v_1/b}, \tag{A.12}$$

so that a', the NLO couplant of the new scheme, is given by the root of

$$\frac{1}{a'}\left(1 + c a' \ln\left|\frac{c a'}{1 + c a'}\right|\right) - b \ln(Q/\tilde{\Lambda}') = 0, \tag{A.13}$$

and the NLO coefficient in the new scheme is

$$r_1{}' = r_1 - v_1. \tag{A.14}$$

Let v_1 be of the form

$$v_1 = v_{10}\, n_f + v_{11}. \tag{A.15}$$

Example (i): $v_{10} = 0$, $v_{11} = 2$.

First, find the NLO result in this new scheme:

$$A' = A = -0.115295, \quad B' = B - 2 = -0.0142926, \tag{A.16}$$

$$r_1{}' = r_1 - 2 = -0.244883, \tag{A.17}$$

$$\tilde{\Lambda}' = (0.2\ {\rm GeV}) e^{v_1/b} = 0.302509\ {\rm GeV}. \tag{A.18}$$

Solving for $a' = a_{\rm new}(Q)$ from Eq. (A.13) above gives

$$a' = 0.108568, \tag{A.19}$$

so that the NLO result in the new scheme is

$$\mathcal{R}' = a'(1 + r_1{}' a') = 0.105682. \tag{A.20}$$

Now apply the BLM procedure but starting from the new prescription:

$$C_1^{*\prime} = \frac{33}{2} A' + B' = -1.91667, \tag{A.21}$$

$$\mu_r^{*\prime} = Q \exp 3A' = \mu_r^* = 0.707593\,\mathrm{GeV}. \tag{A.22}$$

Then

$$a_{BLM}{}' = \frac{a'}{1 + b\,a' \ln(\mu_r^{*\prime}/Q)} = 0.132643, \tag{A.23}$$

so that the NLO BLM result is

$$\mathcal{R}_{BLM}{}' = a_{BLM}{}'(1 + C_1{}^{*\prime} a_{BLM}{}') = 0.0989209. \tag{A.24}$$

This is *different* from the BLM result of Eq. (A.11) above.

Example (ii): $v_{10} = 1$, $v_{11} = 0$.

Since, with $n_f = 2$, the net v_1 is the same as in Example (i), the results of Eqs. (A.17) to (A.20) are unchanged. Applying the BLM procedure, however, gives

$$A' = A - 1 = -1.115295, \quad B' = B = 1.98571, \tag{A.25}$$

so that

$$C_1^{*\prime} = \frac{33}{2} A' + B' = -16.4167, \tag{A.26}$$

$$\mu_r^{*\prime} = Q \exp 3A' = \mu_r^*\, e^{-3} = 0.035229\,\mathrm{GeV}. \tag{A.27}$$

Then

$$a_{BLM}{}' = \frac{a'}{1 + b\,a' \ln(\mu_r^{*\prime}/Q)} = -0.143658, \tag{A.28}$$

so that the NLO BLM result is now

$$\mathcal{R}_{BLM}{}' = a_{BLM}{}'(1 + C_1{}^{*\prime} a_{BLM}{}') = -0.482459. \tag{A.29}$$

This result is different again – and is clearly nonsensical, since we are the wrong side of a Landau pole and the couplant is negative.