# **Overview of large momentum** effective theory

Jianhui Zhang University of Regensburg

July 15, 2017, PKU

#### Contents

- Introduction
- Large momentum effective theory
- Results on parton distributions
- Summary and outlook

#### 3

- Hadrons are complicated bound systems of quarks and gluons described by the QCD Lagrangian
- A great simplification for the structure of hadron at high energy is provided by parton model
  - Approximation by taking hadron momentum  $P_h \rightarrow \infty$
  - Hadrons can be viewed as constituted by free, non-interacting partons
  - DIS cross section can be written as an incoherent sum of virtual photon-quark partonic cross sections, weighted by the probability of finding each quark in the proton with a given longitudinal momentum fraction

$$\frac{d^2\sigma}{dxdQ^2} \sim \sum_{q,\bar{q}} \int_x^1 \frac{dz}{z} f_q(z) \hat{\sigma}_{q\gamma^* \to X}(x/z)$$



- Physics at infinite momentum limit can be formulated in terms of light-cone quantization
  - Light-cone coordinates  $\xi^{\pm} = (t \pm z)/\sqrt{2}$
  - Quantization at equal light-cone time  $\xi^+ = 0$
  - Probability interpretation of parton densities, e.g.

$$q(x,\mu^2) = \int \frac{d\xi^-}{4\pi} e^{-ix\xi^- P^+} \langle P | \overline{\psi}(\xi^-) \gamma^+ \exp\left(-ig \int_0^{\xi^-} d\eta^- A^+(\eta^-)\right) \psi(0) | P \rangle$$

- Non-local correlator, gauge invariance ensured by the insertion of a gauge link
- Expectation of quark number operator in light-cone gauge  $A^+ = 0$
- Invariant under boost in z direction, valid in rest frame

- Precise knowledge of parton observables such as the PDFs are important to
  - Reduce uncertainties in theory prediction of hadronic cross sections
  - Disentangle new physics effects from the standard model
- On the other hand, they are non-perturbative quantities defined in terms of light-cone correlators, and difficult to compute

- Precise knowledge of parton observables such as the PDFs are important to
  - Reduce uncertainties in theory prediction of hadronic cross sections
  - Disentangle new physics effects from the standard model
- On the other hand, they are non-perturbative quantities defined in terms of light-cone correlators, and difficult to compute
  - PDF collaborations (CTEQ, MSTW, NNPDF.....)



FIG. 4: The CT14 parton distribution functions at Q = 2 GeV and Q = 100 GeV for  $u, \overline{u}, d, \overline{d}, s = \overline{s}$ , and g.

- Precise knowledge of parton observables such as the PDFs are important to
  - Reduce uncertainties in theory prediction of hadronic cross sections
  - Disentangle new physics effects from the standard model
- On the other hand, they are non-perturbative quantities defined in terms of light-cone correlators, and difficult to compute
  - Lattice QCD (main obstacle: light-cone dependence)
    - Can compute moments which are local operator matrix elements
    - Plagued by operator mixing



Fig. 5. Reconstructed isovector valence quark distribution  $x(u_v - d_v)$  in the proton at  $Q^2 = 4 \text{ GeV}^2$ . The central fit curve (solid line) and error band (lightly shaded) are compared with the envelope of the phenomenological distributions<sup>20</sup> (darkly shaded).

- Precise knowledge of parton observables such as the PDFs are important to
  - Reduce uncertainties in theory prediction of hadronic cross sections
  - Disentangle new physics effects from the standard model
- On the other hand, they are non-perturbative quantities defined in terms of light-cone correlators, and difficult to compute
  - Lattice QCD (main obstacle: light-cone dependence)
    - Can compute moments which are local operator matrix elements
    - Plagued by operator mixing
    - For pion DA, only the 2<sup>nd</sup> moment is computed

- To study parton physics from lattice QCD, we need to move away from the light-cone
- Observations:
- QFT has UV divergences, which can be characterized by a UV cutoff  $\Lambda$ 
  - Parton physics corresponds to taking  $P_h \rightarrow \infty$  before  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ 
    - Leads to light-cone correlations
  - If  $\Lambda \to \infty$  is taken prior to  $P_h \to \infty$ 
    - Parton physics will depend on *P*<sub>h</sub>
    - Also parton momentum fraction is not necessarily constrained to 0<x<1
    - Not light-cone correlations, but practically calculable

- To study parton physics from lattice QCD, we need to move away from the light-cone
- Observations:
- The two different orders of limit are similar to the difference between an effective field theory/full theory
  - Heavy quark effective theory is obtained by taking  $m_q \rightarrow \infty$  before  $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$
  - A finite  $m_q$  is maintained in full theory
  - They can be connected by a perturbative matching



• An effective theory framework that allows to compute light-cone or parton observables from Euclidean quantities [Ji 14']

- An effective theory framework that allows to compute light-cone or parton observables from Euclidean quantities [ji 14']
- For a light-cone observable, e.g. the PDF or the pion DA, construct a (framedependent) Euclidean quasi observable

$$ilde{O}(P,\mu) \stackrel{P o \infty}{\longrightarrow} O(\mu)$$

- An effective theory framework that allows to compute light-cone or parton observables from Euclidean quantities [ji 14']
- For a light-cone observable, e.g. the PDF or the pion DA, construct a (framedependent) Euclidean quasi observable

$$\tilde{O}(P,\mu) \stackrel{P \to \infty}{\longrightarrow} O(\mu)$$

- The choice of  $\tilde{O}(P,\mu)$  is not necessarily unique
- Instead of computing the light-cone observable directly, one can compute the quasi observable at a finite hadron momentum *P*
- The difference between quasi and light-cone observables is in finite (but large) or infinite momentum, hence they shall have the same IR physics

- In general, both quasi and light-cone observables suffer from UV divergences.
- They have different UV behavior because of different order of limits (the infinite momentum limit and the UV regularization are not exchangeable)
  - Taking inf. mom. limit first  $\rightarrow$  physical case, light-cone
  - Taking UV regularization first  $\rightarrow$  frame dependent, but practically calculable
- The difference can be perturbatively computed and captured in a matching factor Z

$$\tilde{O}(P,\mu) = Z(\frac{P}{\mu})O(\mu) + \mathcal{O}(\frac{M^2}{P^2})$$

• *M* is a typical hadronic mass scale, like hadron mass or  $\Lambda_{QCD}$ 

$$\tilde{O}(P,\mu) = Z(\frac{P}{\mu})O(\mu) + \mathcal{O}(\frac{M^2}{P^2})$$

- Analogous to e.g. the HQET. The role of heavy quark mass is now played by the large hadron momentum
- Parton model is an effective theory for the nucleon moving at large momentum
- The Z factor contains logarithm of  $\ln \frac{P}{\mu}$  when *P* becomes large, which reflects the non-smooth light-cone limit. It can be resummed by RGE

$$\tilde{O}(P,\mu) = Z(\frac{P}{\mu})O(\mu) + \mathcal{O}(\frac{M^2}{P^2})$$

- Analogous to e.g. the HQET. The role of heavy quark mass is now played by the large hadron momentum
- Parton model is an effective theory for the nucleon moving at large momentum
- The Z factor contains logarithm of  $\ln \frac{P}{\mu}$  when *P* becomes large, which reflects the non-smooth light-cone limit. It can be resummed by RGE
- Summary:
  - Euclidean quasi observable is practically computable on the lattice
  - Perturbative matching allows to extract light-cone observable from the quasi observable
  - A good approximation of the light-cone observable can be achieved at a moderately large momentum

# An example: unpol. quark PDF

• Light-cone PDF

$$q(x,\mu^2) = \int \frac{d\xi^-}{4\pi} e^{-ix\xi^- P^+} \langle P | \overline{\psi}(\xi^-) \gamma^+ \exp\left(-ig \int_0^{\xi^-} d\eta^- A^+(\eta^-)\right) \psi(0) | P \rangle$$

• The quasi-PDF can be constructed as

$$\tilde{q}(x,\Lambda,P^z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{izk^z} \langle P | \overline{\psi}(0,0_{\perp},z) \gamma^z \exp\left(-ig \int_0^z dz' A^z(0,0_{\perp},z')\right) \psi(0) | P \rangle$$

- *z* is a spatial direction
- It approaches q(x) in the limit  $P_z \to \infty$
- An alternative choice is to replace  $\gamma^z \rightarrow \gamma^0$
- Matching relation

$$\tilde{q}(x,\Lambda,P^z) = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{dy}{|y|} Z\left(\frac{x}{y},\frac{\Lambda}{P^z},\frac{\mu}{P^z}\right) q(y,\mu) + \mathcal{O}\left(\Lambda_{\rm QCD}^2/(P^z)^2,M^2/(P^z)^2\right)$$

• This factorized form holds to all-orders [Ma and Qiu 14']

# From quasi-PDF to PDF

- The matching factor Z can be computed order by order in perturbation theory
  - At one-loop [Xiong et al. 13']



- The quasi distribution does not vanish outside [-1,1]
- Both distributions have soft and coll. div., soft div. cancels in themselves, coll. div. identical

$$Z^{(1)}(\xi)/C_F = \left(\frac{1+\xi^2}{1-\xi}\right)\ln\frac{\xi}{\xi-1} + 1 + \frac{1}{(1-\xi)^2}\frac{\Lambda}{P^z}, \qquad \xi > 1$$

$$Z^{(1)}(\xi)/C_F = \left(\frac{1+\xi^2}{1-\xi}\right)\ln\frac{(P^z)^2}{\mu^2} + \left(\frac{1+\xi^2}{1-\xi}\right)\ln\left[4\xi(1-\xi)\right] - \frac{2\xi}{1-\xi} + 1 + \frac{\Lambda}{(1-\xi)^2P^z}, \quad \xi < 1$$

$$Z^{(1)}(\xi)/C_F = \left(\frac{1+\xi^2}{1-\xi}\right)\ln\frac{\xi-1}{\xi} - 1 + \frac{\Lambda}{(1-\xi)^2P^z}. \qquad \xi < 0$$

# From quasi-PDF to PDF

- The matching factor Z can be computed order by order in perturbation theory
  - At one-loop [Xiong et al. 13']



- The quasi distribution does not vanish outside [-1,1]
- Both distributions have soft and coll. div., soft div. cancels in themselves, coll. div. identical

$$Z^{(1)}(\xi)/C_F = \left(\frac{1+\xi^2}{1-\xi}\right)\ln\frac{\xi}{\xi-1} + 1 + \left(\frac{1-\chi}{(1-\xi)^2P^z}\right) \qquad \xi > 1$$

$$Z^{(1)}(\xi)/C_F = \left(\frac{1+\xi^2}{1-\xi}\right)\ln\frac{(P^z)^2}{\mu^2} + \left(\frac{1+\xi^2}{1-\xi}\right)\ln\left[4\xi(1-\xi)\right] - \frac{2\xi}{1-\xi} + 1 + \frac{\Lambda}{(1-\xi)^2P^z} \quad 0 < \xi < 1$$

$$Z^{(1)}(\xi)/C_F = \left(\frac{1+\xi^2}{1-\xi}\right)\ln\frac{\xi-1}{\xi} - 1 + \frac{\Lambda}{(1-\xi)^2P^z} \qquad \xi < 0$$

# Results from lattice simulations

- Unpolarized, helicity and transversity distributions
  - HYP smearing to smoothen Wilson line gauge links
  - One-loop matching + mass corrections + higher-twist corrections



# Results from lattice simulations

- Helicity and transversity distributions
  - One-loop matching + mass corrections + higher-twist corrections



• Renormalization effects not yet taken into account

# Renormalization of quasi-PDF

- Studies on its renormalization property:
  - Ji and Zhang, 1505.07699,
    - Multiplicative renormalization up to two-loop in DR
  - Ishikawa, Ma, Qiu, Yoshida, 1609.02018,
  - Chen, Ji and Zhang, 1608.08102,
  - Constantinou and Panagopoulos, 1705.11193,
    - Renormalization of power divergence and factorization of renormalization factors
  - Alexandrou, Cichy, Constantinou, Hadjiyiannakou, Jansen, Panagopoulos and Steffens, 1706.00265,
  - Chen, Ishikawa, Jin, Lin, Yang, Zhang and Zhao, 1706.01295,
    - Regularization-independent Momentum subtraction
  - Ji, Zhang and Zhao, 1706.08962,
  - Ishikawa, Ma, Qiu and Yoshida, 1707.03107,
    - Multiplicative renormalization proof to all-orders

# Renormalization of power divergence

- Power divergence comes from Wilson line self energy [Ishikawa et al. 16', Chen et al. 16']
  - At one-loop, a linear div. is associated with



- It is well-known that linear divergence associated with Wilson line can be removed by a mass renormalization (e.g. in auxiliary z-field formalism)
- In a sense, the auxiliary field can be understood as a Wilson line extending between
   [z,∞]

$$Z(z) = L(z, \infty), \qquad [\partial_z - igA_z(z)] Z(z) = 0$$

- Analogous to a heavy quark field
- Non-local Wilson line can be interpreted as a two-point function of z-field

$$L(z,0) = Z(z)Z^{\dagger}(0)$$

• Renormalizes analogously to a heavy quark two-point function [Dotsenko and Vergeles 80', Dorn 86']

$$L^{\mathrm{ren}}(z,0) = \mathcal{Z}_Z^{-1} e^{-\delta m|z|} L(z,0)$$

## Renormalization of power divergence

#### One-loop illustration

• The Wilson line self energy diagram gives ( $\bar{x}$ =1-x)

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int dk_z \frac{\alpha_s C_F \Lambda}{2\pi} \frac{[\delta(k_z - \bar{x}p_z) - \delta(\bar{x}p_z)]p_z}{k_z^2 + \epsilon^2}$$

• Mass counterterm contributes

$$-\int \frac{dz}{2\pi} p_z e^{i(x-1)p_z z} |z| \,\delta m = -\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int \frac{dz}{2\pi} p_z e^{-i\bar{x}p_z z} \frac{1-e^{-\epsilon|z|}}{\epsilon} \delta m$$
$$= -\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \int \frac{dk_z}{\pi} p_z \frac{\delta(\bar{x}p_z) - \delta(k_z - \bar{x}p_z)}{k_z^2 + \epsilon^2} \delta m.$$

• Therefore

$$\delta m = -\frac{\alpha_s C_F}{2\pi} (\pi \Lambda)$$

• It is gauge-independent

# Improved quasi-PDF

• We can define an improved quasi-PDF without power divergence [Chen et al. 16']

$$\tilde{q}_{\rm imp}(x,\Lambda,p^z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{izk^z - \delta m|z|} \langle p|\overline{\psi}(0,0_{\perp},z)\gamma^z L(z,0)\psi(0)|p\rangle$$

• Similarly for the pion quasi-DA [Zhang et al. 17']

$$\tilde{\phi}_{imp}(x,P_z) = \frac{i}{f_\pi} \int \frac{dz}{2\pi} e^{-i(x-1)P_z z - \delta m|z|} \langle \pi(P)|\bar{\psi}(0)\gamma^z\gamma_5\Gamma(0,z)\psi(z)|0\rangle$$

- Apart from the exponential mass renormalization to remove power divergence, there supposed to be other renormalization factors at the endpoint, which are local
- Normalization condition roughly means an implementation of renormalization

# Improved quasi-PDF

• We can define an improved quasi-PDF without power divergence [Chen et al. 16']

$$\tilde{q}_{\rm imp}(x,\Lambda,p^z) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{dz}{4\pi} e^{izk^z - \delta m|z|} \langle p|\overline{\psi}(0,0_{\perp},z)\gamma^z L(z,0)\psi(0)|p\rangle$$

• Similarly for the pion quasi-DA [Zhang et al. 17']

$$\tilde{\phi}_{imp}(x,P_z) = \frac{i}{f_\pi} \int \frac{dz}{2\pi} e^{-i(x-1)P_z z - \delta m|z|} \langle \pi(P)|\bar{\psi}(0)\gamma^z\gamma_5\Gamma(0,z)\psi(z)|0\rangle$$

- The matching factor for the improved quasi-PDF is obtained from the previous result by removing linear divergence (similarly for pion DA)
- Intuitively, the exponential renormalization factor  $e^{-\delta m|z|}$  will increase the weight of matrix elements with relatively large *z*, and therefore will increase the contribution at relatively small momentum when Fourier transformed to momentum space

# Determination of $\delta m$

- Can be done following the method in [Musch et al. 11']
  - Static heavy quark-antiquark potential can be obtained from asymptotic behavior of a rectangular Wilson loop

 $W(R, T) = c(R)e^{-V(R)T}$  + higher excitations,

- Choose a Wilson loop long in t-direction such that higher excitations are sufficiently suppressed
- Fit the quark potential [Zhang et al. 17']

$$V(r) = -\frac{1}{a} \lim_{t \to \infty} \ln \frac{\langle \operatorname{Tr}[W(t,r)] \rangle}{\langle \operatorname{Tr}[W(t-a,r)] \rangle}$$

• to

$$V(r) = \frac{c_1}{r} + c_2 + c_3 r$$

- $c_1$  is the Coulomb potential
- $c_3$  is the confinement linear potential
- $c_2$  twice the rest mass of heavy quark, expected to be  $c_2 = \tilde{c}/a + O(\Lambda_{QCD})$ ,





- One-loop correction, and also mass correction included,  $P_z = \{2, 3\} \times 2\pi/L$
- Extrapolation to infinite momentum using a simple form  $\alpha(x) + \beta(x)/P_z^2$ , but has residual contribution outside [0,1]
- Left: using the unrenormalized quasi correlation, linear divergence contained in the matching factor, unphysical oscillatory behavior near x = 0, 1
- Right: improved, there are still small kinks in the unphysical region, expected to vanish when higher-order matching is included/higher momentum is reached

# Results on pion DA

Improved pion DA result



- Param 1:  $\phi_{\pi}(x) = 6x(1-x)[1+a_2C_2^{3/2}(2x-1)]$
- Param 2:  $\phi_{\pi}(x) = A[x(1-x)]^{B}$
- Consistent with previous studies, favors a single-hump shape
- Error dominated by uncertainty in  $\delta m$ , can be improved by computing at different lattice spacing

- Non-perturbative renormalization in RI/MOM scheme
  - For a local operator

 $O_{\Gamma} = \bar{\psi} \Gamma \psi$ 

• The renormalization factor is defined as

$$Z_O \langle p | O_\Gamma | p \rangle_{p^2 = \mu^2} = \langle p | O_\Gamma | p \rangle_{\text{free}}$$

Generalization to non-local operator [Zhao and Stewart]

$$\begin{split} \tilde{Z}^{\text{OM}}(z, p^z, \Lambda, \mu_R)^{-1} \sum_{s} \langle ps | \bar{\psi}(z) \gamma^z W(z, 0) \psi(0) | ps \rangle \Big|_{p^2 = -\mu_R^2} \\ &= \sum_{s} \langle ps | \bar{\psi}(z) \gamma^z W(z, 0) \psi(0) | ps \rangle \Big|_{\text{tree}} \end{split}$$

• The renormalization factor and bare matrix element depend on the choice of regulator, the renormalized matrix element does not

- Non-perturbative renormalization in RI/MOM scheme
  - Vector quasi-PDF can mix with scalar one due to breaking of chiral symmetry

$$\begin{pmatrix} O_{\gamma_z}(z) \\ O_{\mathcal{I}}(z) \end{pmatrix} = \tilde{Z} \times \begin{pmatrix} O_{\gamma_z}^R(z) \\ O_{\mathcal{I}}^R(z) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} Z_{11}(z) & Z_{12}(z) \\ Z_{21}(z) & Z_{22}(z) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} O_{\gamma_z}^R(z) \\ O_{\mathcal{I}}^R(z) \end{pmatrix}$$

Renormalization conditions

$$\frac{\operatorname{Tr}[\not{p}\Lambda(p, z, \gamma_z)]^R}{\operatorname{Tr}[\not{p}\Lambda(p, z, \gamma_z)_{\text{tree}}]}|_{p^2 = \mu_R^2, \ p_z = P_z} = 1,$$

$$\frac{\operatorname{Tr}[\Lambda(p, z, \mathcal{I})]^R}{\operatorname{Tr}[\Lambda(p, z, \mathcal{I})_{\text{tree}}]}|_{p^2 = \mu_R^2, \ p_z = P_z} = 1,$$

$$\operatorname{Tr}[[\not{p}\Lambda(p, z, \mathcal{I})]_{p^2 = \mu_R^2, \ p_z = P_z}^R = 0,$$

$$\operatorname{Tr}[\Lambda(p, z, \gamma_z)]_{p^2 = \mu_R^2, \ p_z = P_z}^R = 0,$$

- Non-perturbative renormalization in RI/MOM scheme
  - Renormalization factors





• Non-perturbative renormalization in RI/MOM scheme



- Renormalization effects induce large uncertainties
- See Huey-Wen's talk

• To study the renormalization property of the non-local operator

 $O(x,y) = \overline{\psi}(x)\Gamma L(x,y)\psi(y)$ 

• We are motivated to introduce the following auxiliary heavy quark Lagrangian [Ji et al. 17']

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}} + \overline{Q}(x)in \cdot DQ(x)$$

- For a real heavy quark, n is timelike, and Q is a dynamical field
- For an auxiliary heavy quark, *n* is spacelike, no dynamical evolution
- After integrating out the heavy quark field, we have

$$\int \mathcal{D}\overline{Q}\mathcal{D}Q\,Q(x)\overline{Q}(y)e^{i\int d^4x\mathcal{L}} = S_Q(x,y)e^{i\int d^4x\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}}$$

up to a constant that can be absorbed into the overall normalization

•  $S_Q(x, y)$  satisfies

$$n \cdot D S_Q(x, y) = \delta^{(4)}(x - y),$$

with the solution

$$S_Q(x,y) = \theta(x^z - y^z)\delta(x^0 - y^0)\delta^{(2)}(\vec{x}_{\perp} - \vec{y}_{\perp})L(x,y)$$
  
=  $\theta(x^z - y^z)\delta(x^0 - y^0)\delta^{(2)}(\vec{x}_{\perp} - \vec{y}_{\perp})L(x^z, y^z)$ 

•  $\delta$ -function ensures that the time and transverse components are equal, and thereby generates a spacelike Wilson line

• We can do the replacement (restrict to  $x^z > y^z$  for the moment)

$$O(x,y) = \overline{\psi}(x)\Gamma Q(x)\overline{Q}(y)\psi(y)$$

• The non-local operator can be replaced by a product of two heavy-light currents

- Renormalization in HQET [Bagan et al. 94']
  - Green's functions can be renormalized to all-orders in perturbation theory
  - So is the local composite operator
  - The arguments are valid independent of whether the heavy quark field in the Lagrangian is defined by a timelike or spacelike vector
- In DR, our non-local operator renormalization can be done as (for a spacelike separation)

 $O(z_2, z_1) = Z_{\bar{j}} Z_j O_R(z_2, z_1)$ 

• After integrating over the heavy quark field, we have

$$O_R = Z_{\overline{j}}^{-1} Z_j^{-1} \overline{\psi}(z_2) \Gamma L(z_2, z_1) \psi(z_1)$$

- The above renormalization is consistent with explicit computations [Ji and Zhang, 15']
  - For example

$$Z_O = 1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi\epsilon} \qquad \qquad Z_j = 1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi\epsilon}$$

- Renormalization in HQET [Maiani et al. 92']
  - The HQET Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}} + \overline{Q}(x)in \cdot DQ(x)$$

- Takes infinite heavy quark mass limit, and does not contain any mass term
- Mass correction can receive power divergent contributions, which are absent in DR
- In cutoff regularization like lattice regularization, heavy quark self-energy does introduce a linear divergence, which has to be absorbed into an effective mass counterterm

$$\delta \mathcal{L}_m = -\delta m \overline{Q} Q$$

with  $\delta m \sim 1/a$ 

- Renormalization in HQET [Maiani et al. 92']
  - The appearance of linear divergence can be understood as following:
    - Infinitely heavy quark behaves like a static color source, its energy will have a Coulomblike form 1/r, and will diverge linearly if the source is a pointlike particle
  - This physical picture is lost for a auxiliary heavy quark defined by a spacelike vector, but the linear divergence can be removed in the same way
  - The mass counterterm shall not be understood as a physical mass, but as a parameter with mass dimension
  - The total heavy quark Lagrangian now becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_Q = \bar{Q}(in \cdot D - \delta m)Q.$$

• Integrating over the auxiliary heavy quark field, our non-local operator renormalization becomes

$$O_R = Z_{\bar{j}}^{-1} Z_j^{-1} e^{\delta \bar{m} |z_2 - z_1|} \overline{\psi}(z_2) \Gamma L(z_2, z_1) \psi(z_1)$$

• See Xiangdong's and Yanqing's talk

# Summary and outlook

- Parton observables like PDFs or hadron DAs are difficult to compute due to their non-perturbative and intrinsically Minkowskian nature
- Large momentum effective theory offers a practical possibility to directly compute them from Euclidean lattice
  - Perturbative matching
  - Non-perturbative renormalization
- A lot more effort needed for lattice results to reach an accuracy comparable with phenomenological studies
  - Finer lattice spacing
  - Larger hadron momentum
  - .....