Pseudoscalar pole contributions to the muon g-2 from lattice QCD

Sebastian Burri, Gurtej Kanwar, Marcus Petschlies, Urs Wenger + ETMC





Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Bern

Muon g-2

- ► 4.2 σ tension, hadronic contributions dominate 43 × 10⁻¹¹ theory uncertainty.
- ▷ HVP at $O(\alpha^2)$: 40 × 10⁻¹¹ err ▷ HLbL at $O(\alpha^3)$: 17 × 10⁻¹¹ err
- Fermilab E989 expects 15×10^{-11} err
- Need to reduce theory uncertainties on hadronic contributions



Systematic errors

- Several analysis choices (e.g., fit window, fit model, z-expansion order).
 AIC-weighted model averaging, with CDF trick to separate syst./stat. errors, per lattice ensemble used.
- Continuum extrapolation yields additional systematic error.

Results: π^0





Pseudoscalar-pole contribution

HVP-LO

6931(40)

► HLbL decomposes into several contributions, $a_{\mu}^{\text{HLbL}} = a_{\mu}^{P-\text{pole}} + \dots$

$$a_{\mu}^{P-\text{pole},(1)} = \int_{0}^{\infty} dQ_{1}dQ_{2}\int_{-1}^{1} d\cos\theta \ w_{1}(Q_{1}, Q_{2}, \cos\theta) \\ \times F_{P\gamma\gamma}(-Q_{1}^{2}, -(Q_{1}+Q_{2})^{2}) \ F_{P\gamma\gamma}(-Q_{2}^{2}, 0) \\ a_{\mu}^{P-\text{pole},(2)} = \int_{0}^{\infty} dQ_{1}dQ_{2}\int_{-1}^{1} d\cos\theta \ w_{2}(Q_{1}, Q_{2}, \cos\theta) \\ \times F_{P\gamma\gamma}(-Q_{1}^{2}, -Q_{2}^{2}) \ F_{P\gamma\gamma}(-(Q_{1}+Q_{2})^{2}, 0)$$

- Analytically known weight functions.
- Non-perturbative transition form factors $F_{P\gamma\gamma}(q_1^2, q_2^2)$ required.
- ► Leading contributions from π^0 , η , η' .

Pseudoscalar transition form factors

Figure 5: Form factor results from ONE analysis choice.





Figure 7: Comparison with known theoretical results.

Figure 6: Continuum extrapolation.

Currently analyzing additional statistics on cB64 (rightmost point, Fig. 6).

Results: η







Figure 2: Transition form fac-

tor from $P \in \{\pi^0, \eta, \eta'\}$ to

two photons.

- ► Data from CELLO [2], CLEO [3], BaBar [4, 5], Belle [6] for singly-virtual $F_{P\gamma\gamma}(-Q^2, 0)$ at $Q^2 \gtrsim 1.0 \text{GeV}^2$.
- Doubly virtual and low-Q² essentially unconstrained from experiment. However, upcoming BES-III results are promising.
- Complementarity: doubly virtual, low-Q² easier than singly virtual, large-Q² on the lattice.

TFFs from lattice QCD

Euclidean time current-current vacuum transition amplitude

 $\epsilon^{\mu\nu
ho\sigma} q_{1
ho} q_{2\sigma} F_{P\gamma\gamma}(q_1^2, q_2^2)$

- $ilde{A}_{\mu
 u}(au) = \left\langle 0 \Big| j_{\mu}(au; \mathbf{q}_1) \, j_{
 u}(0; \mathbf{0}) \Big| P(\mathbf{p})
 ight
 angle$
- Laplace transform



 $= -i^{n_0} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\tau \ e^{\omega_1 \tau} \ \tilde{A}_{\mu\nu}(\tau)$ Figure 3: Three-point function for $F_{P\gamma\gamma}$. Extrapolation from finite-volume "orbits" in (q_1^2, q_2^2) plane by conformal *z*-expansion. Figure 9: Comparison with known theoretical results.

- Figure 8: Singly virtual form factor results.
- Preliminary results do not include lattice discretization uncertainties.

Conclusions & Outlook

- Our results for the doubly virtual and low-Q² pseudoscalar TFF are complementary to experimental values.
 - ▷ Future combined fits may be of interest.
- ► This is the first lattice calculation with physical quark masses.
 - \triangleright We validate π^0 lattice results extrapolating from unphysical masses [7].
 - \triangleright Results for the η are a first lattice calculation.
- ► Future directions:
 - ▷ Vary lattice setup for better kinematic coverage.
 - \triangleright Address noise problems with measurements of the $\eta'?$

References

Lattice QCD setup

	$N_f =$	2 + 1 + 1	l twisted	clover,	lwasaki	gauge	action,	physical	quark	masses
--	---------	-----------	-----------	---------	---------	-------	---------	----------	-------	--------

ensemble	$L^3 \cdot T/a^4$	m_{π} [MeV]	<i>a</i> [fm]	$a \cdot L_x$ [fm]	$m_{\pi} \cdot L_x$
cB072.64	$64^{3} \cdot 128$	140.2	0.080	5.09	3.62
cC060.80	$80^{3} \cdot 160$	136.7	0.068	5.46	3.78
cD054.96	$96^{3} \cdot 192$	140.8	0.057	5.46	3.90

Figure 4: ETMC ensembles used in this calculation.

Analysis for π⁰: several lattice spacings, continuum limit in progress.
 Analysis for η: preliminary results on cB64, finer lattices in progress.
 η' currently too noisy to extract reliable data on these ensembles.

[1] T. Aoyama et al. *Phys. Rept.*, 887:1–166, 2020. H. J. Behrend et al. Z. Phys. C, 49:401–410, 1991. [2] J. Gronberg et al. Phys. Rev. D, 57:33-54, 1998. [3] Bernard Aubert et al. Phys. Rev. D, 80:052002, 2009. P. del Amo Sanchez et al. Phys. Rev. D, 84:052001, 2011. [5] S. Uehara et al. *Phys. Rev. D*, 86:092007, 2012. [6] Antoine Gérardin, Harvey B. Meyer, and Andreas Nyffeler. *Phys. Rev. D*, 100(3):034520, 2019. |7| Andreas Nyffeler. *Phys. Rev. D*, 94(5):053006, 2016. [8] G. W. Bennett et al. *Phys. Rev. D*, 73:072003, 2006. [9] [10] B. Abi et al. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 126(14):141801, 2021. Gernot Eichmann, Christian S. Fischer, Esther Weil, and Richard Williams. Phys. Lett. B, 797:134855, 2019. [11] [12] Khépani Raya, Adnan Bashir, and Pablo Roig. Phys. Rev. D, 101(7):074021, 2020. [13] Pere Masjuan and Pablo Sanchez-Puertas. *Phys. Rev. D*, 95(5):054026, 2017.

