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## Muon g-2

- $4.2 \sigma$ tension, hadronic contributions dominate $43 \times 10^{-11}$ theory uncertainty.
$\triangleright \mathrm{HVP}$ at $O\left(\alpha^{2}\right): 40 \times 10^{-11} \mathrm{err}$
$\triangleright$ HLbL at $O\left(\alpha^{3}\right): 17 \times 10^{-11} \mathrm{err}$
- Fermilab E989 expects $15 \times 10^{-11} \mathrm{err}$
- Need to reduce theory uncertainties on hadronic contributions


Figure 1: Tension between theory and experimental estimates of the muon $\mathrm{g}-2$ [1].


## Pseudoscalar-pole contribution

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


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



Analytically known weight functions.

- Non-perturbative transition form factors $F_{P_{\gamma \gamma}}\left(q_{1}^{2}, q_{2}^{2}\right)$ required.
- Leading contributions from $\pi^{0}, \eta, \eta^{\prime}$.


## Pseudoscalar transition form factors



Figure 2: Transition form factor from $P \in\left\{\pi^{0}, \eta, \eta^{\prime}\right\}$ to two photons.

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


## TFFs from lattice QCD

- Euclidean time current-current vacuum transition amplitude

$$
\tilde{A}_{\mu \nu}(\tau)=\langle 0| j_{\mu}\left(\tau ; \mathbf{q}_{1}\right) j_{\nu}(0 ; \mathbf{0})|P(\mathbf{p})\rangle
$$

- Laplace transform

$$
\epsilon^{\mu \nu \rho \sigma} q_{1 \rho} q_{2 \sigma} F_{P \gamma \gamma}\left(q_{1}^{2}, q_{2}^{2}\right)
$$



$$
=-i^{n_{0}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d \tau e^{\omega_{1} \tau} \tilde{A}_{\mu \nu}(\tau)
$$

Figure 3: Three-point function for $F_{P_{\gamma \gamma}}$

- Extrapolation from finite-volume "orbits" in $\left(q_{1}^{2}, q_{2}^{2}\right)$ plane by conformal z-expansion.


## Lattice QCD setup

- $N_{f}=2+1+1$ twisted clover, Iwasaki gauge action, physical quark masses.

| ensemble | $L^{3} \cdot T / a^{4}$ | $m_{\pi}[\mathrm{MeV}]$ | $a[\mathrm{fm}]$ | $a \cdot L_{x}[\mathrm{fm}]$ | $m_{\pi} \cdot L_{x}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 $\pi^{0}$ : several lattice spacings, continuum limit in progress.
- Analysis for $\eta$ : preliminary results on cB64, finer lattices in progress.
- $\eta^{\prime}$ currently too noisy to extract reliable data on these ensembles.


## 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: $\pi^{0}$



Figure 5: Form factor results from ONE analysis choice.


Figure 6: Continuum extrapolation.

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


## Results: $\eta$



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- $Q^{2}$ pseudoscalar TFF are complementary to experimental values.
$\triangleright$ Future combined fits may be of interest.
- This is the first lattice calculation with physical quark masses.
$\triangleright$ We validate $\pi^{0}$ lattice results extrapolating from unphysical masses [7].
$\triangleright$ Results for the $\eta$ are a first lattice calculation.
- Future directions:
$\triangleright$ Vary lattice setup for better kinematic coverage.
$\triangleright$ Address noise problems with measurements of the $\eta^{\prime}$ ?
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