Theory for quarkonium: from NRQCD to soft gluon factorization

Yan-Qing Ma

Peking University

References: 1703.08402: YQM, Chao 1911.05886: Li, Feng, YQM 2005.08786: Chen, YQM 2103.15121: Chen, Jin, YQM, Meng

IHEP Seminar, 2021/10/27







I. NRQCD factorization with dominant LDMEs

- II. Relativistic corrections
- III. Soft gluon factorization
- IV. Application to FF: $g \rightarrow Q\overline{Q}(\ {}^3S_1^{[8]}) + X$
- V. Summary and outlook



Heavy quarkonium

> Bound state of $Q\overline{Q}$ pair under strong interaction

eg: $J/\psi \ \psi', \chi_{cJ}, \Upsilon(nS), \chi_{bJ}(nP) \cdots$



- The simplest system in QCD: two-body problem
- "Hydrogen atom in QCD", "an ideal laboratory in QCD"
- Example: quarkonium production can be traced by heavy quark pair (vs light hadron), unique to explore hadronization mechanism



NRQCD: factorization

Factorization formula





n: quantum numbers of the pair: color, spin, orbital angular momentum, total angular momentum, spectroscopic notation ^{2S+1}L^[c]

> A glory history

- Solved IR divergences in P-wave quarkonium decay
- Explained ψ' surplus
- Explained χ_{c2}/χ_{c1} production ratio

Thanks to coloroctet mechanism



Achievement: χ_{cJ} production

 $\succ \chi_{cI} \text{ production: } d\sigma_{\chi_{cJ}}/(2J+1) \approx d\hat{\sigma}_{{}^{3}P_{J}^{[1]}} \langle O\left({}^{3}P_{0}^{[1]}\right) \rangle + d\hat{\sigma}_{{}^{3}S_{1}^{[8]}} \langle O\left({}^{3}S_{1}^{[8]}\right) \rangle$

YQM, Wang, Chao, 1002.3987



Predictions agree with new data





Achievement: explain $\psi(nS)$ surplus

$\gg \psi(nS)$ production in NRQCD

States	Power in v	p _T behavior at LO	p _⊤ behavior at NLO
${}^{3}S_{1}^{[1]}$	V ⁰	p _T ⁻ ⁸	p _T ⁻6
³ S ₁ ^[8]	V ⁴	p _T ⁻⁴	p _T ⁻⁴
¹ S ₀ ^[8]	V ³	p _T ⁻ ⁶	p _T ⁻⁴
³ P _J [8]	V ⁴	р _т -6	р _т -4





Kramer, 0106120

YQM, Wang, Chao, 1012.1030

Butenschoen, Kniehl, 1105.0820

 $d\sigma/dP_t \times Br(\mu\mu) (nb/GeV)$

40

Gong, Wan, Wang, Zhang, 1205.6682



> LO NRQCD

• Dominated by ${}^{3}S_{1}^{[8]}$, LO NRQCD predicts transversely polarized

 $\psi(\mathrm{nS})$ at high p_T , contradicts with Tevatron and LHC data



CDF, 0704.0638

FIG. 4 (color online). Prompt polarizations as functions of p_T : (a) J/ψ and (b) $\psi(2S)$. The band (line) is the prediction from NRQCD [4] (the k_T -factorization model [9]).



Shao, Han, YQM, Meng, Zhang, Chao, 1411.3300

Gong, Wan, Wang, Zhang, 1205.6682



NLO fit by PKU group

> Fit J/ψ yield data at Tevatron with $p_T > 7$ GeV

- Due to p_T^{-4} and p_T^{-6} behaviors, constrain two combinations
- $M_0 = \langle O({}^{1}S_0^{[8]}) \rangle + 3.9 \langle O({}^{3}P_0^{[8]}) \rangle / m_c^2 \approx (7.4 \pm 1.9) \times 10^{-2} \text{GeV}^3$
- $M_1 = \langle O\left({}^3S_1^{[8]} \right) \rangle 0.56 \langle O\left({}^3\boldsymbol{P}_0^{[8]} \right) \rangle / m_c^2 \approx (0.05 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{-2} \, \mathrm{GeV}^3$

> Two orders difference: hierarchy problem

• Velocity scaling rule of NRQCD

 $\langle O\left({}^{1}S_{0}^{[8]} \right) \rangle \sim \langle O\left({}^{3}S_{1}^{[8]} \right) \rangle \sim \langle O\left({}^{3}\boldsymbol{P}_{0}^{[8]} \right) \rangle / m_{c}^{2}$

• Thus natural expectation: $M_0 \sim M_1$

Upper bound from Belle total cross section

 $M_0 < 0.02 {\rm GeV}^3$

Zhang, YQM, Wang, Chao, 0911.2166

• No universality of NRQCD LDMEs!



NLO fit by Hamburg group

> NLO NRQCD V.S. Global data

Butenschoen, Kniehl, 1105.0820

- Including Belle, LEP, HERA, RHIC, Tevatron, LHC
- Total of 194 data points from 26 data sets
- Exclude $p_T < 3 \text{ GeV}$ pp data and $p_T < 1 \text{ GeV}$ ep data

 $\langle \mathcal{O}^{J/\psi}({}^{3}S_{1}^{[1]}) \rangle = 1.32 \text{ GeV}^{3} \qquad \chi^{2}_{\text{d.o.f.}} = 725/194 = 3.74$

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle \mathcal{O}^{J/\psi}({}^{1}S_{0}^{[8]}) \rangle & (4.97 \pm 0.44) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^{3} \\ \langle \mathcal{O}^{J/\psi}({}^{3}S_{1}^{[8]}) \rangle & (2.24 \pm 0.59) \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^{3} \\ \langle \mathcal{O}^{J/\psi}({}^{3}P_{0}^{[8]}) \rangle & (-1.61 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^{5} \end{array}$$

Data are not well described by NLO NRQCD, especially Belle data



Fit by IHEP group

> Fit J/ψ yield data at Tevatron and LHC

Gong, Wan, Wang, Zhang, 1205.6682

• **Exclude** $p_T < 7 \ GeV$ pp data

 $(\langle \mathcal{O}({}^{1}S_{0}^{[8]})\rangle, \langle \mathcal{O}({}^{3}S_{1}^{[8]})\rangle, \frac{\langle \mathcal{O}({}^{3}P_{0}^{[8]})\rangle}{m_{c}^{2}}) \equiv \frac{\mathcal{O}}{100} \text{ GeV}^{3}$ $\mathcal{O} = (9.7 \pm 0.9, -0.46 \pm 0.13, -0.95 \pm 0.25)$

Results of the three groups: no universality

$$\succ \gamma + \gamma^* \rightarrow \eta_c$$
: NNLO fails to describe data

Feng, Jia, Sang, 1505.02665



> Phenomenological: difficulties

NLO NRQCD theory has difficulty to describe global data: polarization puzzle, hierarchy problem, universality problem
 (Warning: Problems with η_c and Y(nS) production not discussed)

> Theoretical: rigorousness

- Based on EFT of QCD: NRQCD
- Factorization has been tested to NNLO

Nayak, Qiu, Sterman, 0509021 Bodwin, Chung, Ee, Kim, Lee, 1910.05497 Zhang, Meng, YQM, Chao, 2011.04905

> What is missing?

- Remember: summation over all possible *n* in NRQCD formula
- Corrections at high powers in v (relativistic corrections)!





I. NRQCD factorization with dominant LDMEs

II. Relativistic corrections

- III. Soft gluon factorization
- IV. Application to FF: $g \rightarrow Q\overline{Q}(\ {}^3S_1^{[8]}) + X$

V. Summary and outlook



Relativistic corrections in NRQCD

Relativistic (power) corrections

- Equations of motion of NRQCD EFT: $\left(iD_0 \frac{D^2}{2m} + \cdots\right)\psi = 0$
- NRQCD factorization: use EOM to remove V_0 , leaving operators like:

(Warning: here D replaced by ∇ , needs proper gluon fields to make them gauge invariant)



Corrections in type 3 widely studied, for charmonium production in pp collision, about 30%-50% corrections

CS-channel: Fan, YQM, Chao, 0904.4025 CO-channel: Xu, Li, Liu, Zhang,1203.0207 S-D mixing-channel: He, Kniehl, 1507.03882 LP in p_T , all order in v: Li, Chen, Huang, YQM, 1909.03554

However, more relativisticcorrection terms may be needed!



Soft gluon emission

Soft gluon emission in color-bleaching process

- P_{ψ} is different from P, $P = P_{\psi}[1 + O(\lambda)]$
- **NRQCD** expand *P* around P_{ψ}
- Bad convergence of NRQCD expansion



YQM, Vogt, 1609.06042

• Cross section approximately $\propto P^{-4} = P_{\psi}^{-4} [1 + O(\lambda)]^{-4}$

$$\int_{-1}^{1} \frac{d\cos\theta}{2(1+\lambda+\lambda\cos\theta)^4} = 0.42$$

= 1 - 4\lambda + 40/3\lambda^2 - 40\lambda^3 + ...
= 1 - 1 2 + 1 2 - 1 08 + 0 91 - 0 73 + ... Mangano, Petrelli, 9610364

 Solution: soft gluon momentum should be kept but not expanded, which means to resum relativistic corrections (due to kinematic effects) to all powers in v!



Over subtraction



- Soft gluon in P-wave: factorized to S-wave matrix element
- Subtraction scheme: at <u>zero momentum</u>, which contributes the largest production rate. Over subtracted! P-wave negative!
- Big cancellation between S-wave and P-wave! Perturbation unstable
- Solution: soft gluon momentum should be kept during subtraction process, or resum kinematic effects to all powers in v.



Threshold region

At threshold region

• Large logarithms appear: can be resummed by introducing shape

functions Beneke, Rothstein, Wise, 9705286 Fleming, Leibovich, Mehen, 0306139 Leibovich, Liu, 0705.3230

 Soft gluon momentum: has leading contribution for quarkonium momentum distribution, cannot be ignored

Combination of logs resummation and powers resummation is needed

• Keep soft gluon momentum unexpanded is the first step.



\succ Relativistic corrections with fixed power in v

- Bad convergence, too many terms are needed
- Involves too many LDMEs, very hard to fix them
- Solution: resum all LDMEs to obtain a function! (Like resum twist-2 local operators to obtain PDFs)

> What do we need to resum?

- Type 0 ($\chi^{\dagger}\psi, \chi^{\dagger}\sigma^{i}\psi, \chi^{\dagger}T^{a}\psi, \chi^{\dagger}\sigma^{i}T^{a}\psi$): finite number, can be studied exclusively
- Type 1-2 insertion ($\chi^{\dagger}gE^{i}\psi$, $\chi^{\dagger}\overleftrightarrow^{i}\psi$): usually not enhanced, less important, do not need to resum
- Type 3 and 4 insertion $(\chi^{\dagger} \overleftrightarrow^2 \psi, \nabla^i (\chi^{\dagger} \psi))$: kinematic effects, enhanced if the observable has a steep distribution. E.g., p_T distribution in pp collision, momentum distribution in endpoint region. Need to resum





I. NRQCD factorization with dominant LDMEs

II. Relativistic corrections

III. Soft gluon factorization

IV. Application to FF: $g \rightarrow Q\overline{Q}({}^{3}S_{1}^{[8]}) + X$

V. Summary and outlook

Derivation of SGF: exclusive processes

> A different way to use EOM

Li, Feng, YQM, 1911.05886 Chen, YQM, 2005.08786

- NRQCD factorization: use EOM to remove V_0
- SGF: remove relative derivatives $\overleftrightarrow_0, \overleftrightarrow^2$, leaving only total derivatives:

$$\langle R_{nn_1n_2}^H \rangle = \langle 0 | \nabla_0^{n_1} \nabla^{n_2} (\chi^{\dagger} \mathbf{K}_n \psi) | H \rangle$$

 K_n denotes operators for type 0-2 insertions

• Assume: factorization (similar to NRQCD factorization) is valid to all orders:

$$A^{H} = \sum_{n,n_1,n_2} \hat{A}_{nn_1n_2}(P_H) \langle R_{nn_1n_2}^{H} \rangle$$

Using integration by parts

- Remove operators unless $n_1 = n_2 = 0$
- H rest frame: matching coefficients are functions of quarkonium mass

Factorization

 $\mathcal{A}^{Q} = \sum_{n} \hat{\mathcal{A}}^{n} \overline{R}_{Q}^{n*} \qquad \overline{R}_{Q}^{n*} = \langle 0 | [\overline{\Psi} \mathcal{K}_{n} \Psi](0) | Q \rangle_{S}$ "S": field operators are in small momentum regions

Derivation of SGF: inclusive processes

➢ Use EOM to remove relative derivatives ^{Chen, YQM, 2005.08786}

Resulting: $\langle O_{nn_1n_2n_3n_4}^{H+X} \rangle = \langle 0 \left| \nabla_0^{n_1} \nabla^{n_2} (\chi^{\dagger} \widetilde{K}_n \psi)^{\dagger} (a_{H+X}^{\dagger} a_{H+X}) \nabla_0^{n_3} \nabla^{n_4} (\chi^{\dagger} K_n \psi) \right| 0 \rangle$

where
$$a_{H+X}^{\dagger}a_{H+X} \equiv \sum_{J_Z^H} |H+X\rangle\langle H+X|$$

• Assume: factorization is valid at this level $(2\pi)^3 2P_H^0 \frac{d\sigma_H}{d^3 P_H} = \sum_{n.n_1.n_2.n_3.n_4} d\hat{\sigma}_{nn_1n_2n_3n_4}(P_H) \sum_{X,P_X} \langle O_{nn_1n_2n_3n_4}^{H+X} \rangle$

Use integration by parts

- Remove operators unless $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = n_4 = 0$
- Matching coefficients are functions of (H rest frame): m_H , E_X , \vec{P}_X^2 (Warning: $\vec{P}_X \cdot \langle O_{n0000}^{H+X} \rangle$ is also possible if polarization is concerned)
- In a general frame: P_H^2 , $P_H \cdot P_X$, P_X^2

YQM, Chao, 1703.08402



- \mathcal{H}_n : perturbatively calculable hard parts
- $F_{n \rightarrow H}$: nonperturbative soft gluon distributions (SGDs)
- UV renormalization scale is suppressed

$$F_{n \to H}(P, P_H) = \int d^4 b e^{-iP \cdot b} \langle 0 | [\overline{\Psi} \mathcal{K}_n \Psi]^{\dagger}(0) (a_H^{\dagger} a_H) [\overline{\Psi} \mathcal{K}_n \Psi](b) | 0 \rangle_{\mathrm{S}}$$



Soft gluon distributions (SGDs)

Operator definition

• Expectation values of bilocal operators in QCD vacuum

$$F_{n \to H}(P, P_H) = \int d^4 b e^{-iP \cdot b} \langle 0 | [\overline{\Psi} \mathcal{K}_n \Psi]^{\dagger}(0) (a_H^{\dagger} a_H) [\overline{\Psi} \mathcal{K}_n \Psi](b) | 0 \rangle_{\mathrm{S}}$$

with

$$a_{H}^{\dagger}a_{H} = \sum_{X} \sum_{J_{z}^{H}} |H + X\rangle \langle H + X|$$
$$\mathcal{K}_{n}(rb) = \frac{\sqrt{M_{H}}}{M_{H} + 2m} \frac{M_{H} + \mathcal{P}_{H}}{2M_{H}} \Gamma_{n} \frac{M_{H} - \mathcal{P}_{H}}{2M_{H}} \mathcal{C}^{[c]}$$

Spin project operators: $\Gamma_n = \sum_{L_z, S_z} \langle L, L_z; S, S_z | J, J_z \rangle \Gamma_{LL_z}^o \Gamma_{SS_z}^s$

Color project operators:

$$\mathcal{C}^{[1]} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_c}{\sqrt{N_c}} \qquad \qquad \mathcal{C}^{[8]} = \sqrt{2}t^{\bar{a}} \Phi^{(A)}_{a\bar{a}}(rb)$$



Gauge link

$$\begin{split} \Phi^{(A)}(rb) &= \mathcal{P} \exp\left\{-ig_s \int_0^\infty d\lambda \, b_\ell \cdot A^{(A)}(r\,b+\lambda \, b_\ell)\right\} \\ b_\ell^\mu &= b^\mu + \varepsilon \ell^\mu \qquad \qquad 0 < \varepsilon \ll 1 \end{split}$$

- When *b* is finite, gauge link along *b* direction (avoid gauge-link-collinear divergence)
- When b → 0, gauge link unambiguously along l direction
 (agree with gauge-completed NRQCD matrix elements)
 Nayak, Qiu, Sterman, 0509021
 Nayak, Qiu, Sterman, 0509021

Evaluated in <u>small</u> region

• Subscript "S": evaluate the matrix element in the region where offshellness of all particles is much smaller than heavy quark mass



RGEs for SGDs

> RGEs

Chen, Jin, YQM, Meng, 2103.15121

$$\frac{d}{d\ln\mu_f} F_{[L'\tilde{L}',\lambda']\to H}(z, M_H, m_Q, \mu_f) = \sum_{L,\tilde{L},\lambda} \int_z^1 \frac{dx}{x} \boldsymbol{K}^{[L\tilde{L},\lambda]}_{[L'\tilde{L}',\lambda']}(\hat{z}, M_H/x, m_Q, \mu_f)$$
$$\times F_{[L\tilde{L},\lambda]\to H}(x, M_H, m_Q, \mu_f),$$

Evolution kernels

$$\boldsymbol{K}_{[L'\tilde{L}',\lambda']}^{[L\tilde{L},\lambda],LO}(\hat{z},M_H/x,m_Q,\mu_f) = \frac{d}{d\ln\mu_f} F_{[L'\tilde{L}',\lambda']\to Q\bar{Q}[L\tilde{L},\lambda]}^{NLO}(\hat{z},M_H/x,m_Q,\mu_f).$$

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{K}_{[SS],LO}^{[SS],LO}(z, M_H, m_Q, \mu_f) = & \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \bigg\{ N_c \bigg[\frac{2z}{(1-z)_+} - \ln \frac{\mu^2 e^{-1}}{M_H^2} \delta(1-z) \\ & - 2\delta(1-z) \bigg(\frac{1}{2\Delta} \ln \frac{1+\Delta}{1-\Delta} - 1 \bigg) \bigg] + \frac{1}{N_c} \bigg(\frac{1+\Delta^2}{2\Delta} \ln \frac{1+\Delta}{1-\Delta} - 1 \bigg) \delta(1-z) \bigg\}. \end{aligned}$$

$$\Delta = \frac{\sqrt{M_H^2 - 4m_Q^2}}{M_H}$$





I. NRQCD factorization with dominant LDMEs

II. Relativistic corrections

III. Soft gluon factorization

IV. Application to FF: $g \rightarrow Q\overline{Q}({}^{3}S_{1}^{[8]}) + X$

V. Summary and outlook



Feynman diagrams

Chen, Jin, YQM, Meng, 2103.15121







> NRQCD

 $\hat{d}^{(}$

$${}^{2)}_{\rightarrow^{3}S_{1}^{[8]}} = \frac{1}{12C_{F}} \Big[A(\mu_{0})\delta(1-z) + \frac{1}{N_{c}} P_{gg}(z) \Big(\ln(\frac{\mu_{0}^{2}}{4m_{Q}^{2}}) - 1 \Big) \\ + \frac{2(1-z)}{z} - \frac{4(1-z+z^{2})^{2}}{z} \Big(\frac{\ln(1-z)}{1-z} \Big),$$

Braaten, Lee, 0004228 YQM, Qiu, Zhang, 1311.7078

Chen Jin YOM Mena 2103 15121

• Double logs as $z \to 1$ (threshold logs)

> SGF

$$\hat{D}_{[SS]}^{LO,(0)}(\hat{z}, M_H/x, \mu, \mu_f) = \frac{\pi \alpha_s}{(N_c^2 - 1)} \frac{8x^3}{M_H^3} \delta(1 - \hat{z}),$$
(5.28a)
$$\hat{D}_{[SS]}^{NLO,(0)}(\hat{z}, M_H/x, \mu, \mu_f) = \frac{4\alpha_s^2 N_c x^3}{(N_c^2 - 1)M_H^3} \left[\frac{1}{2} \delta(1 - \hat{z}) \left(2A(\mu, M_H/x) + \frac{2\beta_0}{N_c} \ln\left(\frac{x^2 \mu_f^2 e^{-1}}{M_H^2}\right) + \ln^2\left(\frac{x^2 \mu_f^2 e^{-1}}{M_H^2}\right) + \frac{\pi^2}{6} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{N_c} P_{gg}^{(0)}(\hat{z}) \ln\left(\frac{\mu^2}{\mu_f^2}\right) + \left(\frac{2(1 - \hat{z})}{\hat{z}} + \hat{z}(4 + 2\hat{z}^2) + \frac{2\hat{z}^4}{9}(5 + \hat{z})\right) \\
\times \left(\ln\left(\frac{x^2 \mu_f^2 e^{-1}}{M_H^2}\right) - 2\ln(1 - \hat{z}) \right) + \frac{2(1 - \hat{z})}{\hat{z}} - \left(\frac{4\hat{z}^4}{1 - \hat{z}} - \frac{4\hat{z}^4}{9}(5 + \hat{z})\right) \ln \hat{z} \right].$$
(5.28a)

- No threshold logs in hard part
- Logs are factorized to SGDs and then resummed by using REGs



Nonperturbative models

The first class of models

 $F^{\text{mod}}(\omega') = M_H N_H \frac{b^b}{\Gamma(b)} \frac{\omega'^{b-1}}{\bar{\Lambda}^b} e^{-b\omega'/\bar{\Lambda}}, \quad \omega' = M_H (1/x - 1), \quad \text{Fleming, Leibovich, Mehen, 0306139}$

Model-1: $F^{\text{mod}}(\omega')|_{\bar{\Lambda}=0.6\text{GeV},b=2}$, Model-2: $F^{\text{mod}}(\omega')|_{\bar{\Lambda}=0.6\text{GeV},b=1}$, Model-3: $F^{\text{mod}}(\omega')|_{\bar{\Lambda}=0.6\text{GeV},b=3}$, Model-4: $F^{\text{mod}}(\omega')|_{\bar{\Lambda}=0.5\text{GeV},b=2}$, Model-5: $F^{\text{mod}}(\omega')|_{\bar{\Lambda}=0.7\text{GeV},b=2}$,

the zeroth, first and second moments are $M_H N_H$, $M_H N_H \overline{\Lambda}$ and $M_H N_H \overline{\Lambda}^2(\frac{1}{b}+1)$

> The other models

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Model-6:} & 4M_H N_H [\theta(w' \ge \frac{19}{40}) - \theta(w' > \frac{29}{40})], & \text{Model-8:} & \begin{cases} M_H N_H (-\frac{50}{81}w' + \frac{10}{9}), & 0 \le w' \le \frac{9}{5}, \\ 0, & w' > \frac{9}{5}, \end{cases} \\ \text{Model-7:} & \frac{5}{6} M_H N_H [\theta(w' \ge 0) - \theta(w' > \frac{6}{5})], & \text{Model-9:} & \begin{cases} \frac{200}{81} M_H N_H w', & 0 \le w' \le \frac{9}{10}, \\ 0, & w' > \frac{9}{10}. \end{cases} \\ \end{array}$$



RGEs effects

Model dependence is significantly reduced after using RGEs





figure: $\overline{\Lambda}$ dependence of gluon FF at NLO.

$$R^X(n) \equiv \frac{\int_0^1 dz z^n D_{g \to H}^X(z, M_H, m_Q, \mu)}{\int_0^1 dz z^n D_{g \to H}(z, M_H, m_Q, \mu)}, \qquad \qquad \mathbf{R}^{NRQCD} \approx 6$$

31/33



J/ψ production at B factories

Chen, Jin, YQM, Meng, in preparation



- Similar to SCET+NRQCD at large z, different at small z
- Has smaller total cross section, easier to reconcile with pp data



- NRQCD factorization: polarization puzzle, hierarchy problem, universality problem
 - Possible reason: convergence of v^2 expansion is bad because of soft gluon emission

Soft gluon factorization (SGF)

- Soft gluons effects considered; better convergence in v^2 expansion
- Equivalent to NRQCD, but with power corrections originated from kinematic effects resummed (kinematical factorization), (partial) large logs resummed
- Phenomenological difficulties encountered in NRQCD: to be studied in SGF
- Soft gluons effects in other processes, like B production.

Global fit by Butenschoen and Kniehl

> NLO NRQCD V.S. RHIC, Tevatro, LHC data

10 [nb/GeV] 10 10 [nb/GeV] [hb/GeV] PHENIX data CDF data: Run 1 [nb/GeV] CDF data: Run 2 ATLAS data 10 CS, LO CS, LO CS, LO CS, LO 10 10 10 CS, NLO CS, NLO CS. NLO - CS, NLO 10 8 (intro Ĵ. Î ---- CS+CO, LO ---- CS+CO, LO - CS+CO, LO ---- CS+CO, LO 10 CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO B(J/w -ψ/C)8 1 B(J/ψ B(J/γ 10 10 10 × (X+h/)7 10 × × (X+M/P ×(X+\// (X+/)/ 10 10 10 -dd)^Ldp,op 10 10 -dd)-dp/သူ 10 dơ/dp₁(pp̃da/dp/dp 10 √s = 1.8 TeV √s = 7 TeV √s = 200 GeV √s = 1.96 TeV 10 |y| < 0.6 |y| < 0.75 |y| < 0.35 |v| < 0.610 5 8 9 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 p_T [GeV] p_T [GeV] p_T [GeV] p_T [GeV] 10 10 [nb/GeV] [hb/GeV] [nb/GeV] 10 10 [nb/GeV] ATLAS data ATLAS data CMS data CMS data CS, LO CS, LO CS, LO CS, LO 10 10 10 10 CS, NLO CS, NLO - CS, NLO CS, NLO (IIII Î) IIII (internet ----- CS+CO, LO ---- CS+CO, LO --- CS+CO, LO ---- CS+CO, LO 10 10 10 10 CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO B(J/w η/L X $X = B(J/\eta$ B(J/v ψ/L)8×(X+ψ/L 1 1 1 × (X+h/l <(X+ψ/Γ€ 10 10 10 10 10 dd)¹db/ db/ 10 10 -dd)¹dp da/dp₁(pp da/dp₁(pp 10 √s = 7 TeV √s = 7 TeV √s = 7 TeV √s = 7 TeV 10 10 10 0.75 < |y| < 1.51.5 < |y| < 2.25|y| < 1.21.2 < |y| < 1.610 10 12 14 16 18 10 12 14 16 18 12 14 16 14 16 6 8 20 10 20 10 18 20 8 10 12 18 20 4 6 8 6 8 6 p_T [GeV] p_T [GeV] p_T [GeV] p_T [GeV] 10 [hb/GeV] LHCb data [hb/GeV] CMS data ALICE data [hb/GeV] LHCb data [hb/GeV] 10 10 10 CS, LO CS, LO CS, LO ··· CS, LO 10 CS, NLO CS, NLO CS, NLO CS, NLO) III Î. ļi li Ē 10 10 ----- CS+CO, LO 10 -- CS+CO, LO ---- CS+CO, LO -- CS+CO, LO 10 CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO CS+CO, NLO × B(J/ψ--ψ/L)B × (X+ψ/Le $\sqrt{N} \times B(J/\psi$ γ/L/ψ×(X+γ/L 10 1 (X+/// 10 10 10 10 -dd)¹dp/op 10 ا -dd)¹dp/op 10 -dd)¹dp/op 10 ġ √s = 7 TeV √s = 7 TeV 10 √s = 7 TeV √s = 7 TeV 10 1.6 < |v| < 2.42.5 < v < 42 < y < 2.52.5 < y < 310 4 6 8 10 12 14 16 18 20 3 4 5 6 8 9 10 4 6 8 10 12 14 4 6 10 12 14 p_T [GeV] p_T [GeV] р_т [GeV] р_т [GeV]

Butenschoen, Kniehl, 1105.0820

Global fit by Butenschoen and Kniehl

> NLO NRQCD V.S. LHC, HERA, LEP data

Butenschoen, Kniehl, 1105.0820





NLO fit by ANL-Korea group

> Fit J/ψ yield data at Tevatron and LHC

Bodwin, Chung, Kim, Lee, 1403.3612

- **Exclude** $p_T < 10 \text{ GeV}$ data
- Large logs at LP in $1/p_T^2$ expansion are resumed

 $\frac{d\sigma^{\rm LP+NLO}}{dp_T} = \frac{d\sigma^{\rm LP}}{dp_T} - \frac{d\sigma^{\rm LP}_{\rm NLO}}{dp_T} + \frac{d\sigma_{\rm NLO}}{dp_T}$ $\langle \mathcal{O}^{J/\psi}({}^1S_0^{[8]})\rangle = -0.030 \pm 0.381 \text{ GeV}^3$ $\langle \mathcal{O}^{J/\psi}({}^3S_1^{[8]})\rangle = 0.023 \pm 0.057 \text{ GeV}^3$ $\langle \mathcal{O}^{J/\psi}({}^3P_0^{[8]})\rangle = 0.043 \pm 0.106 \text{ GeV}^5.$



Good fit, yet another different set of LDMEs



Fit J/ψ yield data at Tevatron and LHC

• Similar shape as functions of p_T/M



Faccioli, Knunz, Lourenco, Seixas, Wohri, 1403.3970

• Ignoring ${}^{3}P_{I}^{[8]}$ contributions, ${}^{1}S_{0}^{[8]}$ dominance