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- Enter the Gluon
- If $\phi_{q / H^{( }}(x)=$ probability to find $q$ with momentum $x p$,
- then,

$$
M_{q}=\sum_{q} \int_{0}^{1} d x x \phi_{q / H}(x)=\begin{gathered}
\text { total fraction of momentum } \\
\text { carried by quarks. }
\end{gathered}
$$

- Experiment gave

$$
M_{q} \sim 1 / 2
$$

- What else? Quanta of force field that holds $H$ together?
- 'Gluons' - but what are they?
- Where color comes from.
- Quark model problem:
$-s_{q}=1 / 2 \Rightarrow$ fermion $\Rightarrow$ antisymmetric wave function, but
- (uud) state symmetric in spin/isospin combination for nucleons and
- Expect the lowest-lying $\psi\left(\vec{x}_{m}, \vec{x}_{u}^{\prime}, \vec{x}_{d}\right)$ to be symmetric
- So where is the antisymmetry?
- Solution: Han Nambu, Greenberg, 1968: Color
- $b, g, r$, a new quantum number.
- Here's the antisymmetry: $\epsilon_{i j k} \psi\left(\vec{x}_{u}, \vec{x}_{u}^{\prime}, \vec{x}_{d}\right),(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k})=(\mathrm{b}, \mathrm{g}, \mathrm{r})$
- Quantum Chromodynamics: Dynamics of Color
- A globe with no north pole

- Position on 'hyperglobe’ $\leftrightarrow$ phase of wave function (Yang \& Mills, 1954)
- We can change the globe's axes at different points in spacetime, and 'local rotation' $\leftrightarrow$ emission of a gluon.
- QCD: gluons coupled to the color of quarks
(Gross \& Wilczek; Weinberg; Fritzsch, Gell-Mann, Leutwyler, 1973)


## 2. Field Theory Essentials

- Fields and Lagrange Density for QCD
- $q_{f}(x), f=u, d, c, s, t, b$ : Dirac fermions (like electron) but extra $(i, j, k)=(b, g, r)$ quantum number.
- $A_{a}^{\mu}(x)$ Vector field (like photon) but with extra $a \sim(g \bar{b} \ldots)$ quantum no. (octet).
- $\mathcal{L}$ specifies quark-gluon, gluon-gluon propagators and interactions.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}=\sum_{f} & \bar{q}_{f}\left(\left[\boldsymbol{i} \partial_{\mu}-\boldsymbol{g} A_{\mu a} \boldsymbol{T}_{a}\right] \gamma^{\mu}-\boldsymbol{m}_{\boldsymbol{f}}\right) \boldsymbol{q}_{f}-\frac{1}{4}\left(\partial_{\mu} A_{\nu a}-\partial_{\nu} A_{\mu a}\right)^{2} \\
& -\frac{g}{2}\left(\partial_{\mu} A_{\nu a}-\partial_{\nu} A_{\mu a}\right) C_{a b c} A_{b}^{\mu} A_{c}^{\nu} \\
& -\frac{g^{2}}{4} C_{a b c} A_{b}^{\mu} A_{c}^{\nu} C_{a d e} A_{\mu d} A_{\nu e}
\end{aligned}
$$

From a Lagrange density to observables, the pattern:


- UV Divergences (toward renormalization \& the renormalization group)
- Use as an example

$$
\left.\mathcal{L}_{\phi^{4}}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\partial_{\mu} \phi\right)^{2}-m^{2} \phi^{2}\right)-\frac{\lambda}{4!} \phi^{4}
$$

- The "four-point Green function":

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M(\mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{t})={ }_{2}^{1} X_{4}^{3}+{\underset{2}{2}}_{2}^{3}+\bigcup_{2}^{1} X_{4}^{3}+\bigcup_{2}^{1}{ }_{3}^{4} \\
& \int^{\infty} \frac{d^{4} k}{\left(k^{2}-m^{2}\right)\left(\left(p_{1}+p_{2}-k\right)^{2}-m^{2}\right)} \sim \rho^{\infty} \frac{d^{4} k}{\left(k^{2}\right)^{2}} \Rightarrow \infty
\end{aligned}
$$

Interpretation: The UV divergence is due entirely states of high 'energy deficit',

$$
E_{\text {in }}-E_{\text {state S }}=p_{1}^{0}+p_{2}^{0}-\underset{i}{\sum} \sqrt{\sum_{S}} \sqrt{\vec{k}_{i}^{2}-m^{2}}
$$

Made explicit in Time-ordered Perturbation Theory:


Analogy to uncertainty principle $\Delta E \rightarrow \infty \Leftrightarrow \Delta t \rightarrow 0$.

- This suggests: UV divergences are 'local’ and can be absorbed into the local Lagrange density. Renormalization.
- For our full 4-point Green function, two new "counterterms":
The renormalized 4-point function:


- The combination is supposed to be finite.
- How to choose them? This is the renormalization "scheme"

Renormalization:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{X}+\dot{\chi m}=0 \text { (only natural choice) } \\
& { }_{2}^{1} \alpha_{4}^{3}+\gamma+\dot{Y}+\lambda \delta \lambda=\text { finite }
\end{aligned}
$$

But what should we choose for these?

$$
\begin{array}{cccc}
A & B & C & D
\end{array}
$$

- For example: define $\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{B}+\mathrm{C}$ b cutting off $d^{4} k$ at $k^{2}=\Lambda^{2}$ (regularization). Then

$$
A+B+C=a \ln \frac{\Lambda^{2}}{s}+b\left(s, t, u, m^{2}\right)
$$

- Now choose:

$$
D=-a \ln \frac{\Lambda^{2}}{\mu^{2}}
$$

so that

$$
A+B+C+D=a \ln \frac{\mu^{2}}{s}+b\left(s, t, u, m^{2}\right)
$$

independent of $\Lambda$.

- Criterion for choosing $\mu$ is a "renormalization scheme": MOM scheme: $\mu=s_{0}$, some point in momentum space. MS scheme: same $\mu$ for all diagrams, momenta
- But the value of $\mu$ is still arbitrary. $\mu=$ renormalization scale.
- Modern view (Wilson) We hide our ignorance of the true high- $E$ behavior.
- All current theories are "effective" theories with the same low-energy behavior as the true theory.
- $\mu$-dependence is the price we pay for working with an effective theory: The Renormalization Group
- As $\mu$ changes, mass $m$ and coupling $g$ have to change: $m=m(\mu) g=g(\mu) \quad$ "renormalized" but...
- Physical quantities can't depend on $\mu$ :

$$
\mu \frac{d}{d \mu} \sigma\left(\frac{s_{i j}}{\mu^{2}}, \frac{m^{2}}{\mu^{2}}, g(\mu), \mu\right)=0
$$

- The 'group' is just the set of all changes in $\mu$.
- 'RG' equation (Mass dimension $[\sigma]=d_{\sigma}$ ):

$$
\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu}+\mu \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial g}+\mu \frac{\partial m}{\partial \mu} \frac{\partial}{\partial m}+d_{\sigma}\right) \sigma\left(\frac{s_{i j}}{\mu^{2}}, \frac{m^{2}}{\mu^{2}}, g(\mu), \mu\right)=0
$$

The beta function : $\quad \beta(g) \equiv \mu \frac{\partial g(\mu)}{\partial \mu}$

- The Running coupling
- Consider any $\sigma\left(m=0, d_{\sigma}=0\right)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu \frac{d \sigma}{d \mu}=0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \mu \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial \mu}=-\beta(g) \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial g} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

- in PT:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma=g^{2}(\mu) \sigma^{(1)}+g^{4}(\mu)\left[\sigma^{(2)}\left(\frac{s_{i j}}{s_{k l}}\right)+\tau^{(2)} \ln \frac{s_{12}}{\mu^{2}}\right]+\ldots \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

- (2) in (1) $\rightarrow$

$$
\begin{aligned}
g^{4} \tau^{(2)} & =2 g \sigma^{(1)} \beta(g)+\ldots \\
\beta(g) & =\frac{g^{3} \tau^{(2)}}{2} \frac{\sigma^{(1)}}{\sigma^{(1)}}+\mathcal{O}\left(g^{5}\right) \equiv-\frac{g^{3}}{16 \pi^{2}} \beta_{0}+\mathcal{O}\left(g^{5}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- In QCD:

$$
\beta_{0}=11-\frac{2 n_{f}}{3}
$$

- $-\beta_{0}<0 \rightarrow g$ decreases as $\mu$ increases.
- Asymptotic Freedom: Solution for the QCD coupling

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mu} & =-g^{3} \frac{\beta_{0}}{16 \pi^{2}} \\
\frac{d g}{g^{3}} & =-\frac{\beta_{0}}{16 \pi^{2}} \frac{d \mu}{\mu} \\
\frac{1}{g^{2}\left(\mu_{2}\right)}-\frac{1}{g^{2}\left(\mu_{1}\right)} & =-\frac{\beta_{0}}{16 \pi^{2}} \ln \frac{\mu_{2}}{\mu_{1}} \\
g^{2}\left(\mu_{2}\right) & =\frac{g^{2}\left(\mu_{1}\right)}{1+\frac{\beta_{0}}{16 \pi^{2}} g^{2}\left(\mu_{1}\right) \ln \frac{\mu_{2}}{\mu_{1}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Vanishes for $\mu_{2} \rightarrow \infty$. Equivalently,

$$
\alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{2}^{2}\right) \equiv \frac{g^{2}\left(\mu_{2}^{2}\right)}{4 \pi}=\frac{\alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{1}\right)}{1+\frac{\beta_{0}}{4 \pi} \alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{1}\right) \ln \frac{\mu_{2}}{\mu_{1}}}
$$

- Dimensional transmutation: $\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}$
- Two mass scales appear in

$$
\alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{2}^{2}\right)=\frac{\alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{1}\right)}{1+\frac{\beta_{0}}{4 \pi} \alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{1}\right) \ln { }_{\mu_{1}}^{\mu_{2}}}
$$

but the value of $\alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{2}\right)$ can't depend on choice of $\mu_{1}$.

- Reduce it to one by defining $\Lambda \equiv \mu_{1} e^{-\beta_{0} / \alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{1}\right)}$, independent of $\mu_{1}$. Then

$$
\alpha_{s}\left(\mu_{2}^{2}\right)=\frac{4 \pi}{\beta_{0} \ln \frac{\mu_{2}}{\mu^{2}}}
$$

- Asymptotic freedom strongly suggests a relationship to the parton model, in which partons act as if free at short distances. But how to quantify this observation?

3. Infrared Safety

- To use perturbation theory, would like to choose $\mu$ 'as large as possible to make $\alpha_{s}(\mu)$ as small as possible.
- But how small is possible?
- A "typical" cross section, , define $Q^{2}=s_{12}$ and $x_{i j}=$ $s_{i j} / Q^{2}$,

$$
\sigma\left(\frac{Q^{2}}{\mu^{2}}, x_{i j}, \frac{m_{i}^{2}}{\mu^{2}}, \alpha_{s}(\mu), \mu\right)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{n}\left(\frac{Q^{2}}{\mu^{2}}, x_{i j}, \frac{m_{i}^{2}}{\mu^{2}}\right) \alpha_{s}^{n}(\mu)
$$

with $m_{i}^{2}$ all fixed masses - external, quark, gluon $(=0$ !)

- Generically, the $a_{n}$ depend logarithmically on their arguments, so a choice of large $\mu$ results in large logs of $m_{i}^{2} / \mu^{2}$.
- But if we could find quantities that depend on $m_{i}^{\prime} s$ only through powers, $\left(m_{i} / \mu\right)^{p}, p>0$, the large- $\mu$ limit would exist.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma\left(\frac{Q^{2}}{\mu^{2}}, x_{i j}, \frac{m_{i}^{2}}{\mu^{2}}, \alpha_{s}(Q), \mu\right) & =\sigma\left(\frac{Q}{\mu}, x_{i j}, \frac{m_{i}^{2}}{\mu^{2}}, \alpha_{s}(\mu), \mu\right) \\
& =\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_{n}\left(\frac{Q}{\mu}, x_{i j}\right) \alpha_{s}^{n}(\mu)+\mathcal{O}\left(\left[\frac{m_{i}^{2}}{\mu^{2}}\right]^{p}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Such quantities are called infrared (IR) safe.
- Measure $\sigma \rightarrow$ solve for $\alpha_{s}$. Allows observation of the running coupling.
- Most pQCD is the computation of IR safe quantities.
- Consistency of $\alpha_{s}(\mu)$ found as above at various momentum scales
(Particle Data Group)


- To find IR safe quantities, need to understand where the lowmass logs come from.
- To analyze diagrams, we generally think of $m \rightarrow 0$ limit in $m / Q$.
- Generic source of IR (soft and collinear) logarithms:

- IR logs come from degenerate states: Uncertainty principle $\Delta E \rightarrow 0 \Leftrightarrow \Delta t \rightarrow \infty$.
- For soft emission and collinear splitting it's "never too late". But these processes don't change the flow of energy ... The problem is asking for particle content.
- For IR safety, sum over degenerate final states in perturbation theory, and see what the sum is. This requires us to introduce another regularization, this time for IR behavior.
- The IR regulated theory is like QCD at short distances, but is better-behaved at long distances.
IR-regulated QCD not the same as QCD except for IR safe quantities.
- See how it works for the total $\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$annihilation cross section to order $\alpha_{s}$. Lowest order is $2 \rightarrow 2, \sigma_{2}^{(0)} \equiv \sigma_{0}, \sigma_{3}$ starts at order $\alpha_{s}$.
- Gluon mass regularization: $1 / k^{2} \rightarrow 1 /\left(k^{2}-m_{G}\right)^{2}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{3}^{\left(m_{G}\right)} & =\sigma_{0} \frac{4 \alpha_{s}}{3}\left(2 \ln ^{2} \frac{Q}{m_{g}}-3 \ln Q m_{g}-\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}+\frac{5}{2}\right) \\
\sigma_{2}^{\left(m_{G}\right)} & =\sigma_{0}\left[1-\frac{4 \alpha_{s}}{3} \pi\left(2 \ln ^{2} \frac{Q}{m_{g}}-3 \ln \frac{Q}{m_{g}}-\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}+\frac{7}{4}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

which gives

$$
\sigma_{\mathrm{tot}}=\sigma_{2}^{\left(m_{G}\right)}+\sigma_{3}^{\left(m_{G}\right)}=\sigma_{0}\left[1+\frac{\alpha_{s}}{\pi}\right]
$$

- Pretty simple! (Cancellation of virtual ( $\sigma_{2}$ ) and real ( $\sigma_{3}$ ) gluon diagrams.)
- Dimensional regularization: change the area of the sphere from $4 \pi R^{2}$ to $(4 \pi)^{(1-\varepsilon)} \frac{\Gamma(1-\varepsilon)}{\Gamma(2(1-\varepsilon))} R^{2-2 \varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon=2-D / 2$ in $D$ dimensions.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{3}^{(\varepsilon)}= & \sigma_{0} \frac{4 \alpha_{s}}{3}\left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^{2}}{(3-2 \varepsilon) \Gamma(2-2 \varepsilon)}\right)\left(\frac{4 \pi \mu^{2}}{Q^{2}}\right)^{\varepsilon} \\
& \times\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}}-\frac{3}{2 \varepsilon}-\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}+\frac{19}{4}\right) \\
\sigma_{2}^{(\varepsilon)}= & \sigma_{0}\left[1-\frac{4}{3} \frac{\alpha_{s}}{\pi}\left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon)^{2}}{(3-2 \varepsilon) \Gamma(2-2 \varepsilon)}\right)\left(\frac{4 \pi \mu^{2}}{Q^{2}}\right)^{\varepsilon}\right. \\
& \left.\times\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^{2}}-\frac{3}{2 \varepsilon}-\frac{\pi^{2}}{2}+4\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

which gives again

$$
\sigma_{\mathrm{tot}}=\sigma_{2}^{\left(m_{G}\right)}+\sigma_{3}^{\left(m_{G}\right)}=\sigma_{0}\left[1+\frac{\alpha_{s}}{\pi}\right]
$$

- This illustrates IR Safety: $\sigma_{2}$ and $\sigma_{3}$ depend on regulator, but their sum does not.
- Generalized IR safety: sum over all states with the same flow of energy into the final state. Introduce $I R$ safe weight "e(\{ $\left.\left.p_{i}\right\}\right)$ "

$$
\frac{d \sigma}{d e}=\sum_{n} \int_{P S(n)}\left|M\left(\left\{p_{i}\right\}\right)\right|^{2} \delta\left(e\left(\left\{p_{i}\right\}\right)-w\right)
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& e\left(\ldots p_{i} \ldots p_{j-1}, \alpha p_{i}, p_{j+1} \ldots\right)= \\
& \quad e\left(\ldots(1+\alpha) p_{i} \ldots p_{j-1}, p_{j+1} \ldots\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Neglect long times in the initial state for the moment and see how this works in $\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$annihilation: event shapes and jet cross sections.
- "Seeing" Quarks and Gluons With Jet Cross Sections
- Simplest example: cone jets in $\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$annihilation

- Intuition: eliminating long-time behavior $\Leftrightarrow$ recognize the impossibility of resolving collinear splitting/recombination of massless particles
- No factors $Q / m$ or $\ln (Q / m)$ Infrared Safety.
- In this case,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{2 J}(Q, \delta, \epsilon)= & \frac{3}{8} \sigma_{0}\left(1+\cos ^{2} \theta\right) \\
& \times\left(1-\frac{4 \alpha_{s}}{\pi}\left[4 \ln \delta \ln \epsilon+3 \ln \delta+\frac{\pi^{2}}{3}+\frac{5}{2}\right]\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

- Perfect for QCD: asymptotic freedom $\rightarrow d \alpha_{s}(Q) / d Q<0$.
- No unique jet definition. $\leftrightarrow$ Each event a sum of possible histories.
- Relation to quarks and gluons always approximate but corrections to the approximation computable.
- The general form of a jet cross section:

$$
\sigma_{\mathrm{jet}}=\sigma_{0} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{n}\left(y_{i}, N, C_{F}\right) \alpha_{s}^{n}(Q)
$$

- Choices for $y_{i}: \delta, \Omega_{\mathrm{jet}}, T, y_{\mathrm{cut}}, \ldots$
- $\delta$, cone size; $\Omega$, jet direction
- Shape Variable, e.g. thrust ( $T=1$ for "back-to-back" jets

$$
T=\frac{1}{s} \max _{\hat{n}} \sum_{i}\left|\hat{n} \cdot \vec{p}_{i}\right|
$$

- $y_{\text {cut }}$ Cluster Algorithm: $y_{i j}>y_{\text {cut }}$,

$$
y_{i j}=2 \min \left(E_{i}^{2}, E_{j}^{2}\right)\left(1-\cos \theta_{i j}\right)
$$

Summarize: what makes a cross section infrared safe?

- Independence of long-time interactions:


More specifically: should depend on only the flow of energy into the final state. This implies independence of collinear re-arrangements and soft parton emisssion.
But if we prepare one or two particles in the initial state (as in DIS or proton-proton scattering), we will always be sensitive to long time behavior inside these particles. The parton model suggests what to do: factorize. This is the subject of Part III.

