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## $(g-2)$ of the muon: current status

Current $4.2 \sigma$ tension between the direct measurement (BNL + FNAL) and Standard Model prediction:


Standard Model prediction: White Paper 2006.04822 (Phys.Rept).

Figure from Muon (g-2) collaboration, 2104.03281 (PRL).

## Outline

Reducing the hadronic uncertainties using lattice QCD:

- the hadronic vacuum polarisation ( $\mathrm{O}\left(\alpha^{2}\right), 0.2 \%$ precision desirable)
- the 'hadronic light-by-light' contribution ( $\mathrm{O}\left(\alpha^{3}\right), 10 \%$ precision desirable)

Useful resources:

- online workshop "Muon g-2 theory initiative workshop in memoriam Simon Eidelman", KEK, Japan, 28 June - 3 July 2021.
- (online) Lattice conference 2021, MIT, July 26-30, 2021.
- (online) TAU2021 conference, Indiana University, Sep. 27 to Oct. 1, 2021.


## Computing $a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{hvp}}$ from lattice-QCD current-current correlators $G(t)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G(t) \equiv \int d^{3} x\left\langle j_{3}(t, \vec{x}) j_{3}^{\dagger}(0)\right\rangle=\int_{0}^{\infty} d \omega \omega^{2} \frac{R_{e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow \text { hadrons }}\left(\omega^{2}\right)}{12 \pi^{2}} e^{-\omega t} . \\
& a=0.064 \mathrm{fm}: \quad m_{\pi}=200 \mathrm{MeV} \\
& m_{\pi}=130 \mathrm{MeV} \text { Mainz/CLS 1904.03120. } \\
& a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{hvp}}=\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} d t \widetilde{K}(t) G(t), \quad \text { where } \quad \widetilde{K}(t) \sim \begin{cases}\frac{\pi^{2}}{9} m_{\mu}^{2} t^{4} & t \ll m_{\mu}^{-1} \\
2 \pi^{2} t^{2} & t \gg m_{\mu}^{-1} .\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

- The tail of the integrand is affected by statistical fluctuations, by finite-size effects and depends strongly on the pion mass due to the $\pi \pi$ channel.


## Leading hadronic contribution to $(g-2)_{\mu}$ from lattice QCD



Summary plot from White Paper 2006.04822 (Phys.Rept).
Lattice average: $a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{HVP}, \mathrm{LO}}=(711.6 \pm 18.4) \times 10^{-10}$
To be compared with $a_{\mu}^{\text {hvp,pheno }}=(693.1 \pm 4.0) \times 10^{-10}$.

## The Budapest-Marseille-Wuppertal lattice calculation

BMW result: $a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{hvp}, \mathrm{BMW}}=707.5(2.3)_{\text {stat }}(5.0)_{\text {syst }}(5.5)_{\mathrm{tot}} \times 10^{-10}$.

[BMW, 2002.12347 (Nature vol 593, 51 (2021))].
Figure from HM, Thrill of the Magnetic Moment, Nature Vol 593, 44 (2021).

## Aspects of the dispersive approach: $a_{\mu}=\left(\frac{\alpha m_{\mu}}{3 \pi}\right)^{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{d s}{s^{2}} \hat{K}(s) R(s)$

Selected exclusive channels contributing to $a_{\mu}^{\text {hvp }}$ : From White Paper 2006.04822

|  | DHMZ19 | KNT19 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\pi^{+} \pi^{-}$ | $507.85(0.83)(3.23)(0.55)$ | $504.23(1.90)$ |
| $\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$ | $46.21(0.40)(1.10)(0.86)$ | $46.63(94)$ |
| $\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$ | $13.68(0.03)(0.27)(0.14)$ | $13.99(19)$ |
| $\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0} \pi^{0}$ | $18.03(0.06)(0.48)(0.26)$ | $18.15(74)$ |
| $K^{+} K^{-}$ | $23.08(0.20)(0.33)(0.21)$ | $23.00(22)$ |
| $K_{S} K_{L}$ | $12.82(0.06)(0.18)(0.15)$ | $13.04(19)$ |
| $\pi^{0} \gamma$ | $4.41(0.06)(0.04)(0.07)$ | -0.42 |
| Sum of the above | $626.08(0.95)(3.48)(1.47)$ | -0.31 |
| $[1.8,3.7] \mathrm{GeV}($ without $c \bar{c})$ | $33.45(71)$ | 0.12 |
| $J / \psi, \psi(2 S)$ | $7.76(12)$ | -08 |
| $[3.7, \infty) \mathrm{GeV}$ | $17.15(31)$ | -0.22 |
| Total $a_{\mu}^{\text {HVP, LO }}$ | $694.0(1.0)(3.5)(1.6)(0.1)_{\psi}(0.7)_{\mathrm{DV}+\mathrm{QCD}}$ | -0.17 |

Tension in $\pi^{+} \pi^{-}$channel data: Fig from BES III, 2009.05011 (PLB).


## BMW calculation: continuum extrapolation of light-quark (connected) contribution

In this calculation using stout-smeared staggered fermions, pion taste-splittings are the source of the dominant cutoff effects:


Error estimated from the distribution of results obtained in the continuum, applying different $a^{2}$ correction schemes to the data.
[BMW, 2002.12347 (Nature vol 593, 51 (2021))].

## Recent progress on understanding cutoff effects from short distances

At short distances in massless lattice QCD:

$$
G(t, a)=G_{\text {cont }}(t)\left(1+\mathrm{O}\left((a / t)^{2}\right)\right)
$$

Therefore, since $G_{\text {cont }}(t) \sim 1 / t^{3}$,

$$
\int_{0}^{t} d t^{\prime} t^{\prime 4} G\left(t^{\prime}, a\right)=\int_{0}^{t} d t^{\prime} t^{4} G_{\mathrm{cont}}\left(t^{\prime}\right)+\mathrm{const} \times a^{2} \int_{a}^{t} d t^{\prime} t^{4} \frac{1}{t^{\prime 5}}+\mathrm{O}\left(a^{2}\right)
$$

one obtains a logarithmically enhanced cutoff effect from short distances.
In leading order of Wilson lattice perturbation theory, one finds

$$
\int_{0}^{t} d t^{\prime} t^{\prime 4} G\left(t^{\prime}, a\right)=\int_{0}^{t} d t^{\prime} t^{\prime 4} G_{\text {cont }}\left(t^{\prime}\right)+\frac{7 N_{c} \sum_{f} \mathcal{Q}_{f}^{2}}{60 \pi^{2}} a^{2} \log (1 / a)+\mathrm{O}\left(a^{2}\right)
$$

Cè, Harris, HM, Toniato, Török [2106.15293].
See Husung, Marquard, Sommer 1912.08498 (EPJC) for recent results on logarithmic effects to be expect in on-shell quantities.

## Possible strategies to improve control over the long-distance tail

1. Auxiliary calculation of the (discrete, finite-volume) spectrum of $\pi \pi$ states and their coupling to the e.m. current.
The low-lying states saturate the correlator at long distances.


D200:
$a=0.064 \mathrm{fm}$
$m_{\pi}=200 \mathrm{MeV}$
Fig. from 1904.03120.
See also RBC/UKQCD 2019;
Fermilab-HPQCD-MILC 2021.
2. 'all-to-all' propagators using the low eigenmodes of the Dirac operator RBC collaboration 1801.07224 (PRL); BMW collaboration 2002.12347 (Nature).
3. approximate factorization of the QCD path integral with bias correction. Dalla Brida et al., 2007.02973.

## Other aspects of lattice calculations of $a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{hvp}}$

Beyond controlling the lattice-spacing dependence and the statistical precision of the tail, there are many aspects to the calculation:

- "scale setting": the lattice spacing must be calibrated to a precision of a few permille
- finite-size effects
- disconnected diagrams
- strange and charm contributions (contribute about 54 and $15 \times 10^{-10}$ )
- isospin-breaking effects: expanding around $m_{\pi}=m_{\pi^{0}}^{\text {phys }}$, appear to be very small due to large cancellations between different contributions (BMW, 2002.12347). Several formalisms are available to handle QED in lattice QCD.


## Contribution of an intermediate window of Euclidean time

- A full lattice calculation of $a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{hvp}}$ at the subpercent level requires control over a vast number of contributions and effects.
- $\Rightarrow$ community strategy: perform comparisons of particularly precisely determined subcontributions or closely related quantities.
$a_{\mu}^{W}=\left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right)^{2} \int_{0}^{\infty} d t \widetilde{K}(t) \cdot \operatorname{window}_{\left[t_{0}, t_{1}\right]}(t) \cdot G(t), \quad t_{0}=0.4 \mathrm{fm}, t_{1}=1.0 \mathrm{fm}$.


Expect updates in coming few months.

Figure from BMW, 2002.12347 (Nature).

Hadronic light-by-light contribution to $(g-2)_{\mu}$ from lattice QCD

## Direct lattice calculation of HLbL in $(g-2)_{\mu}$

At first, this was thought of as a QED+QCD calculation
[pioneered in Hayakawa et al., hep-lat/0509016].
Today's viewpoint: the calculation is considered a QCD four-point Green's function, to be integrated over with a weighting kernel which contains all the QED parts.

RBC-UKQCD: calculation of $a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{HLbL}}$ using coordinate-space method in muon rest-frame; photon+muon propagators:

- either on the $L \times L \times L$ torus (QED ${ }_{L}$ ) (1510.07100-present)
- or in infinite volume $\left(\right.$ QED $\left._{\infty}\right)$ (1705.01067-present).


## Mainz:

- manifestly covariant QED $\infty_{\infty}$ coordinate-space approach, averaging over muon momentum using the Gegenbauer polynomial technique (1510.08384-present).


## Coordinate-space approach to $a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{HLbL}}$, Mainz version

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { QED kernel } \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{[\rho, \sigma] ; \mu \nu \lambda}(x, y) \\
& a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{HLbL}}=\frac{m e^{6}}{3} \underbrace{\int d^{4} y}_{=2 \pi^{2}|y|^{3} d|y|}[\int d^{4} x \underbrace{\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{[\rho, \sigma] ; \mu \nu \lambda}(x, y)}_{\text {QED }} \underbrace{i \widehat{\Pi}_{\rho ; \mu \nu \lambda \sigma}(x, y)}_{=\text {QCD blob }}] .
\end{aligned}
$$

- $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{[\rho, \sigma] ; \mu \nu \lambda}(x, y)$ computed in the continuum \& infinite-volume
- no power-law finite-volume effects \& only a 1 d integral to sample the integrand in $|y|$.
[Asmussen, Gérardin, Green, HM, Nyffeler 1510.08384, 1609.08454]


## Tests of the framework and adjustments to the kernel



Integrands (Lepton loop, method 2)


Correspondings integrals

- The QED kernel $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{[\rho, \sigma] ; \mu \nu \lambda}(x, y)$ is parametrized by six 'weight' functions of the variables $\left(x^{2}, x \cdot y, y^{2}\right)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\overline{\mathcal{L}}_{[\rho, \sigma] ; \mu \nu \lambda}^{(\Lambda)}(x, y)= & \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{[\rho, \sigma] ; \mu \nu \lambda}(x, y)-\partial_{\mu}^{(x)}\left(x_{\alpha} e^{-\Lambda m_{\mu}^{2} x^{2} / 2}\right) \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{[\rho, \sigma] ; \alpha \nu \lambda}(0, y) \\
& -\partial_{\nu}^{(y)}\left(y_{\alpha} e^{-\Lambda m_{\mu}^{2} y^{2} / 2}\right) \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{[\rho, \sigma] ; \mu \alpha \lambda}(x, 0),
\end{aligned}
$$

- Using this kernel, we have reproduced (at the $1 \%$ level) known results for a range of masses for:

1. the lepton loop (spinor QED, shown in the two plots);
2. the charged pion loop (scalar QED);
3. the $\pi^{0}$ exchange with a VMD-parametrized transition form factor.

## Wick-contraction topologies in HLbL amplitude $\langle 0| T\left\{j_{x}^{\mu} j_{y}^{\nu} j_{z}^{\lambda} j_{0}^{\sigma}\right\}|0\rangle$


(4)

$(2,2)$

$(3,1)$

$(2,1,1)$

(1,1,1,1)

First two classes of diagrams turn out to be dominant, with a cancellation between them.

Example: $\Pi=\left\langle\left(j_{u}-j_{d}\right)\left(j_{u}-j_{d}\right)\left(j_{u}-j_{d}\right)\left(j_{u}-j_{d}\right)\right\rangle$ does not contain the $\pi^{0}$ pole ( $\pi^{0}$ only couples to one isovector, one isoscalar current).
Write out the Wick contractions: $\Pi=2 \cdot \Pi^{(4)}+4 \cdot \Pi^{(2,2)}$
In kinematic regime where $\pi^{0}$ dominates: $|\Pi| \ll \Pi^{(4)} \Rightarrow \Pi^{(2,2)} \approx-\frac{1}{2} \Pi^{(4)}$. Including charge factors: $\left[\left(Q_{u}^{2}+Q_{d}^{2}\right)^{2} \Pi^{(2,2)}\right]=-\frac{25}{34}\left[\left(Q_{u}^{4}+Q_{d}^{4}\right) \Pi^{(4)}\right]$.

Large- $N_{c}$ argument by J. Bijnens, 1608.01454; see also 1712.00421 .

## The connected and leading disconnected contribution

$$
\text { Cumulated } a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{HLbL}}=\int_{0}^{|y|_{\max }} d|y| f(|y|)
$$

Connected


Leading disconnected


## Chiral, continuum, volume extrapolation

Connected contribution

disconnected contribution


| Contribution | Value $\times 10^{11}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Light-quark fully-connected and $(2+2)$ | $107.4(11.3)(9.2)(6.0)$ |
| Strange-quark fully-connected and $(2+2)$ | $-0.6(2.0)$ |
| $(3+1)$ | $0.0(0.6)$ |
| $(2+1+1)$ | $0.0(0.3)$ |
| $(1+1+1+1)$ | $0.0(0.1)$ |
| Total | $106.8(15.9)$ |

[Chao et al, 2104.02632 (EPJC)]

## RBC/UKQCD $\left(\mathbf{Q E D}_{L}\right)$ : cumulative contributions to $a_{\mu}^{\mathrm{HLbL}}$

Connected $\longrightarrow$

Disconnected $\longrightarrow$



48I discon $\longmapsto \bigcirc$
64I discon $\longmapsto$
24D discon $\longmapsto \square$
32D discon $\longmapsto \times$
32Dfine discon $\longmapsto \Delta \hookrightarrow$
[Blum et al. 1911.08123 (PRL)]

## Compilation of $a_{\mu}^{\text {HLbL }}$ determinations



Good consistency of different determinations.
Fig from Chao et al, 2104.02632 (EPJC).

## Conclusion

- $(g-2)_{\mu}$ remains a hot topic in precision tests of the SM!
- HVP: consistency checks expected soon between different lattice collaborations
- the HLbL contribution shows good agreement between the dispersive approach and two independent lattice calculations.

