Total HVP: lattice

Laurent Lellouch

CPT Marseille CNRS & Aix-Marseille U.



Present situation



- a^{LO-HVP}_μ situation unchanged since WP'20: no new result!
- During same period, Fermilab divided uncertainty on a_μ measurement by 2.9!
- Nevertheless much learned (and "unlearned"):
 - 9 lattice calculations agree on intermediate window [Ruth's talk]
 - 3 lattice calculations agree on short-distance window
 - Still missing lattice confirmation of BMWc'20 0.8% computation of total a^{LO-HVP}_µ or similarly precise computation of long-distance window
 - Data-driven determination more uncertain since:
 - CMD-3 2023 measurement of $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)!$
 - limitations of PHOKHARA radiative corrections uncovered [BaBar'23] ...
 - But limitations better understood and implications studied [BaBar'23, Davier et al '23]

Main points in section at present

- Original WP averaged results published before March 2020
- Average done flavor by flavor w/ added common FV, SIB and QED corrections → broad agreement among collaborations
- Total final uncertainty was 2.6% dominated by: FV, stats and $a \rightarrow 0$ \rightarrow consistent w/ data-driven, BNL and now Fermilab
- Situation changed w/ BMWc'20's 0.8% determination of $a_{\mu}^{\text{LO-HVP}}$:
 - Competitive w/ 0.6% WP'20 data-driven determination whose uncertainty is underestimated due to possibly underestimated systematics in some σ(e⁺e[−] → π⁺π[−]) measurements
 - WP'20 vs BNL'06 is $3.6\sigma \rightarrow 1.6\sigma$ w/ BMWc'20
 - vs BNL'06 + FNAL'21, $4.2\sigma \rightarrow 1.5\sigma$ w/ BMWc'20
 - vs BNL'06 + FNAL'21 & '23, $5.1\sigma \rightarrow 1.7\sigma$ w/ BMWc'20
- Also not included in lattice WA of WP'20: LM'20 & ABGP'22 which agree w/ BMWc'20 but w/ larger uncertainties

Main points in section at present

٠



Obtaining a WA lattice result for $a_{\mu}^{\text{LO-HVP}}$

- Catastrophic scenario: no new results \rightarrow lattice WA $a_{\mu}^{\text{LO-HVP}}$ = BMWc'20 result?
- Expected scenario: new results for total a^{LO-HVP}_µ or all 3 windows
 - \rightarrow study individual contribs/windows, correlations, QED schemes, ...
 - A. All agree w/ p-value ≥ 0.05
- 1. Avg available total $a_{\mu}^{\text{LO-HVP}}$ results
 - \rightarrow w/ correlations à la FLAG
 - → individual contribs/windows in each calculation already combined consistently
 - → eliminates issues w/ correlations among contribs/windows and QED scheme used in each calculation
- Do same as B
- Take most precise avg as lattice WA

- B. Some disagree w/ p-value < 0.05
- FLAG avg contribs/windows which agree among all calculations (e.g. a^{LO-HVP}_μ)
- Combine other contribs/windows, w/ appropriately enlarged systematics
- Combine all avg/combinations into a total $a_{\mu}^{\text{LO-HVP}}$
 - → account for correlations among contribs/windows and for QED schemes w/in and among given calculations
- Much more work than A.1, but can use results from other lattice HVP sections (e.g. those on different windows)

Final words

- Challenging to make progress w/out knowing if new results will be available
- Only results accepted for publication will be included (cf. 23/04/2024 plenary)
- Will need time to make appropriate combinations
 - \rightarrow very helpful to get a heads up asap
- Close collaboration necessary w/ authors of other lattice HVP sections: "Intermediate window", "Isospin symmetric HVP", "Isospin breaking corrections", "Methodology", "SD window"?, "LD window"?
- Important that all groups account for stat and syst error correlations between all of their contribs/windows when combining them
- Credibility of lattice on the line
 - → important to provide a competitive result for $a_{\mu}^{\text{LO-HVP}}$ in time for Fermilab's final measurement of a_{μ}
- Comments, suggestions, questions are welcome