The hadronic light-by-light contribution to the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon: a lattice approach

Paul Rakow for QCDSF



QCDSF

M Göckeler, M Gürtler, R Horsley, H Perlt, K Petrov, D Pleiter, PR, G Schierholz, ...

Berlin, DESY, Edinburgh, Leipzig, Liverpool, Munich, Regensburg

Introduction

- Muon anomalous magnetic moment, g-2
- Vacuum polarisation contribution to g-2
- Light-by-Light: Introduction
- Light-by-Light: method
- Light-by-Light results (intermediate).
- Conclusions

Muon Magnetic Moment

Consider a classical charged body. If it rotates it has angular momentum

 $\mathbf{J} = m \langle r_m^2 \rangle \omega$

and a magnetic moment

$${f M}=rac{1}{2}q\langle r_q^2
angle \omega$$

If the mass-radius r_m and charge-radius r_q are the same,

$$\mathbf{M} = \frac{q}{2m} \mathbf{J}$$

Muon Magnetic Moment

If you solve the Dirac equation in a magnetic field, you find that a fermion has a magnetic moment twice as big as this classical model:

$$\mathbf{M} = g \; \frac{q}{2m} \mathbf{J}$$

with g = 2 from the (tree-level) Dirac equation.

Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment

Quantum corrections change the result:

$$a_{\mu} \equiv (g-2)/2 = \frac{\alpha_e}{2\pi} + \cdots$$

 a_{μ} is called the anomalous magnetic moment.

Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment

Can be measured to great accuracy

```
a_{\mu} = 116\,592\,082\,(55) \times 10^{-11}
```

Can also be calculated: 5 loop QED 2 loop electro-weak hadronic effects

Possible mismatch, 2.7σ . Main theory uncertainty, hadronic effects.

Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment

Is this mismatch of 2.7 σ a sign of new physics? Expect



Or is it a problem on the theory side?

Hadronic Effects



Vacuum Polarisation



Related to cross-section

 $e^+ e^- \rightarrow hadrons$

via dispersion relation and electromagnetic kernel.

Vacuum Polarisation



Calculating the vacuum polarisation in lattice gauge theory.

 $\langle J_{\mu}(0)J_{\nu}(x)\rangle$

Light-by-Light



Called light-by-light because 'blob' represents photon-photon scattering.

Light-by-light contribution: Lattice could be useful. (Current uncertainty from phenomenology is 20% or more.) Lattice proposal: Hayakawa, Blum, Izubuchi, Yamada; Lattice 2005, Dublin

Light-by-Light



For light-by-light 'blob', we need QCD contribution to

 $\langle J_{\nu_1}(x_1) J_{\nu_2}(x_2) J_{\nu_3}(x_3) J_{\mu}(x_q) \rangle_{con}$

or its Fourier transform. Rest of calculation by QED perturbation theory. More complicated than $\langle JJ \rangle$, which just depends on a single momentum.

Light-by-Light



For a given q the light-by-light amplitude depends on two internal photon momenta (eg k_1, k_2). Final momentum fixed by momentum conservation.

Our plan is to measure $\langle JJJJ \rangle$ for enough values of the photon momentum to be able to calculate the light-by-light contribution to g - 2. ("Direct Method")

Calculations in Jülich.

Clover fermions, two-flavour simulation.

 $24^3 \times 48$ lattice. Currently 24 configurations measured.

 $\beta = 5.40, \quad \kappa = 0.13625$

$$a = 0.07 \text{ fm}, \quad a^{-1} = 2.75 \text{ GeV}$$

Local current $J_{\mu}(x) = \overline{\psi}(x)\gamma_{\mu}\psi(x)$ Disconnected contributions neglected.



$\langle J_{\nu_1}(k_1) J_{\nu_2}(k_2) J_{\nu_3}(k_3) J_{\mu}(q) \rangle$

Now have measurements of the 4-current tensor for all polarisations and a respectable range of momenta.



$\langle J_{\nu_1}(k_1) J_{\nu_2}(k_2) J_{\nu_3}(k_3) J_{\mu}(q) \rangle$

Picture: Fix polarisations; q and k_2 ; plot as a function of k_1 . (Have all k_1 , but just plot as function of x and t components).

Parallel polarisations: | | | |



Statistical errors, a few %.





Why the dramatic difference between crossed polarisation and parallel?





 π^0 decays to two cross-polarised photons (coupling to $F^{\mu\nu}F^{\star}_{\mu\nu}$).



Possible in crossed case, not in parallel case.

Look at same data in position space:



Parallel polarisation: Almost a δ function. Crossed polarisation: Long tail, matches known pion mass. Magenta curve: π mass (measured directly).



Not quite full: Current calculation only considers the diagrams with all 4 photons attached to the same quark line, $\sum_{f} e_{f}^{4}$



Flavour SU(3) suppresses most other diagrams, because there are quark loops with a single photon attached.

$$egin{aligned} &\left(\sum_{f'} e_{f'}^3
ight) imes \left(\sum_f e_f
ight)\ &\mathbf{e_u} + \mathbf{e_d} + \mathbf{e_s} = rac{2}{3} - rac{1}{3} - rac{1}{3} = \mathbf{0} \end{aligned}$$

 $\sum_{f} e_{f}$ argument, or V-spin.

Argument suppresses all 3-line and 4-line diagrams, some 2-line diagrams.



However there are diagrams with 2 photons on one quark line, and the other two on another quark line, which we are missing, and which aren't suppressed by interference between flavours.

$$\left(\sum_{f} e_{f}\right)^{2}$$

Some hope from large N_c . Should think about ways to include neglected diagrams.





Can write down a 'direct' method that produces all two-fermion-line diagrams at a cost-per-configuration about the same as the one-fermion-line contribution.

Extrapolations

Even after measuring $\langle JJJJ \rangle$ will be faced with extrapolations before we have a physical number.

- Lattice spacing to zero.
- Sea quark mass to m_u, m_d, m_s .
- Momentum extrapolations to $k \sim m_{\mu}$.

Conclusions

- Have interesting results for the hadronic tensor $\langle JJJJ \rangle$.
- Statistical Errors seem small (a few percent).
- π^0 contribution dramatic.
- Working on convolution of $\langle JJJJ \rangle$ tensor with QED part to give g-2.
- Currently just looking at the single quark-line connected contribution. Is this sufficient to give a useful result?
- Should try to find ways to include the other diagrams two-quark-line diagrams feasible, all others suppressed by flavour SU(3).
- Limitations in computer time still mean that lattice results need to be extrapolated to physical points.
- Making good progress.