

# $m_b(m_Z)$ from jet production at the $Z$ peak in the Cambridge algorithm

Mikhail Bilenky\*

*Institute of Physics, AS CR, 18040 Prague 8, and Nuclear Physics Institute, AS CR, 25068  
Řež(Prague), Czech Republic*

Susana Cabrera and Joan Fuster

*IFIC, CSIC-Universitat de València, 46100 Burjassot, València, Spain*

Salvador Martí

*CERN, European Laboratory for Particle Physics, CH-1211 Genève, Switzerland*

Germán Rodrigo

*INFN - Sezione di Firenze, Largo E. Fermi 2, 50125 Firenze, Italy*

Arcadi Santamaria

*Departament de Física Teòrica, IFIC, CSIC-Univ. de València, 46100 Burjassot, València, Spain*

## Abstract

We consider the production of heavy quark jets at the  $Z$ -pole at the next-to-leading order (NLO) using the *Cambridge jet-algorithm*. We study the effects of the quark mass in two- and three-jet observables and the uncertainty due to unknown higher order corrections as well as due to fragmentation. We found that the three-jet observable has remarkably small NLO corrections, which are stable with respect to the change of the renormalization scale, when expressed in terms of the *running quark mass* at the  $m_Z$ -scale. The size of the hadronization uncertainty for this observable remains reasonably small and is very stable with respect to changes in the jet resolution parameter  $y_c$ .

Typeset using REVTeX

---

\*On leave from JINR, 141980 Dubna, Russian Federation

## I. INTRODUCTION

During last few years a significant progress has been done in the understanding of the heavy quark jet-production in  $e^+e^-$ -annihilation both experimentally <sup>1</sup> and theoretically.

The DELPHI collaboration has measured the bottom-quark mass [2,3] analyzing the  $e^+e^-$ -annihilation into the three-jet final state with heavy quarks using recent next-to-leading order theoretical predictions for this process [4–10]. The DELPHI result <sup>2</sup> for the Durham [11] jet clustering algorithm

$$m_b(m_Z) = 2.67 \pm 0.25(stat.) \pm 0.34(had.) \pm 0.27(theo.)GeV , \quad (1)$$

was the first measurement of the  $b$ -quark mass far above the production threshold and it is the first experimental evidence (at the 2-3 sigma level) of the running of a fermion mass, as predicted by the Standard Model. Recently, the SLD collaboration has also analyzed its three- and four-jet data using Durham and several Jade-like jet algorithms [12]. The value of the  $b$ -quark mass [13] obtained from these data is compatible with the above DELPHI result.

The heavy quark mass measurement was done under the assumption of the flavor independence of the strong interactions with the value of the strong coupling constant,  $\alpha_s$ , fixed to its world average measured in other experiments. On the other hand, assuming a given  $b$ -quark mass value obtained from low-energy measurements, and comparing the value of  $\alpha_s$  measured from the heavy quark three-jet final state with the one measured from the production of light quarks, one can perform a test of the flavor universality of the strong interaction. Such a test was performed recently [3,12,14] and no deviation from the QCD prediction was found. The next-to-leading order QCD predictions with heavy quark mass corrections from references [4–10] were used in these studies.

There are three main sources of uncertainties in the DELPHI analysis. The first one has statistical nature. The second error is due to the uncertainty in the hadronization corrections. It was evaluated [3] using different Monte-Carlo models simulating the hadronization process. The third one is due to our ignorance of higher order perturbative corrections in the theoretical predictions at the partonic level. The last uncertainty was estimated by varying the renormalization scale in the calculations and by using different renormalization schemes, i.e. expressing intermediate results in terms of either the perturbative pole quark mass or the running quark mass.

The value of the  $b$ -quark mass measured at the  $Z$  peak (1) is found to be in good agreement with the determinations of the  $b$ -quark mass at low-energy from  $\Upsilon$ - and  $B$ -mesons spectroscopy [15], when compared at the same scale. However, the uncertainties in  $m_b(m_Z)$  are larger. Thus, it would be desirable to reduce this error by finding new observables which may show a better theoretical and hadronization properties.

---

<sup>1</sup>See [1] for a review of recent experimental results.

<sup>2</sup>The  $\overline{MS}$  definition for the running mass at the  $m_Z$ -scale was used.

In this paper we study quark mass effects in heavy quark jet production by using the Cambridge jet clustering algorithm [16,17]. We also study the possibility to reduce the uncertainties in the measurement of the  $b$ -quark mass at the  $Z$ -pole. We consider two jet observables and estimate the errors in their theoretical predictions due to the unknown higher orders by varying the renormalization scale and considering different renormalization schemes. We discuss also the size of the uncertainty due to the hadronization process. Some preliminary results of this study were reported in [18,19].

## II. THE CAMBRIDGE ALGORITHM AND THE DECAY $Z \rightarrow 3JETS$ AT THE NEXT-TO-LEADING ORDER

The Cambridge [16] jet clustering algorithm is a modified version of the popular Durham [11] algorithm that has been introduced recently in order to reduce at low  $y_c$  the formation of spurious jets with low transverse momentum particles. Consequently, compared to Durham, it allows to explore regions of smaller  $y_c$  while still keeping higher order corrections relatively small. It is important to note that at low  $y_c$  the statistical experimental error for three-jet and four-jet production is expected to be smaller, and the sensitivity to the quark mass increases.

In the Durham algorithm one finds the minimal test variable  $y_{ij}$  defined as

$$y_{ij} = 2 \frac{\min(E_i^2, E_j^2)}{s} (1 - \cos \theta_{ij}) , \quad (2)$$

for all possible pair-combinations of the particles and compare it with the jet-resolution parameter,  $y_c$ . In eq. (2)  $E_i$  and  $E_j$  denote the energies of particles <sup>3</sup>  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $\theta_{ij}$  is the angle between their three-momenta and  $s$  is the center-of-mass energy squared. If  $y_{ij} < y_c$ , the two particles  $i$  and  $j$  are combined into a new pseudoparticle with momentum

$$p_k = p_i + p_j . \quad (3)$$

The procedure is repeated again and again until  $y_{ij} > y_c$  for all pairs of (pseudo)particles. The number of (pseudo)particles at the end defines the number of jets.

The Cambridge algorithm is defined by the same test variable, eq. (2), and the same recombination rule, eq. (3), as Durham. The new ingredient of the Cambridge algorithm is the so-called *ordering variable*

$$v_{ij} = 2(1 - \cos \theta_{ij}) . \quad (4)$$

In this algorithm, first, the pair of particles, which has minimal ordering variable  $v_{ij}$ , is selected. Then one computes  $y_{ij}$  for this pair of particles, and, if  $y_{ij} < y_c$ , the two particles are recombined into a pseudoparticle according to eq. (3). But if  $y_{ij} > y_c$ , the softer particle from this pair is assigned to a resolved jet. This last step is called "soft-freezing".

---

<sup>3</sup>By the word "particles" we mean here both the real hadrons detected at experiment and the partons entering the theoretical calculation.

Because of the additional step in the jet finding iterative procedure, the Cambridge scheme turns out to be more complex and has a number of peculiar properties [20]. Let us mention only one example. In Jade-like algorithms, including Durham, one can always define a transition value of  $y_c$ , such that a multi-parton event classified as a  $n$ -jet event becomes a  $n + 1$ -jet event, when the value of  $y_c$  is slightly decreased. However, as pointed out in [20], this property is lost in the Cambridge algorithm, since, due to the presence of the ordering parameter, the sequence of clustering depends on the value of  $y_c$ . As a result the number of jets is not a monotonic function of  $y_c$  and it can change by a non unit number at some transition value of  $y_c$ .

With the above definitions one can show that the cross section of the  $e^+e^-$ -annihilation into three jets calculated at the leading order (LO) is the same in both Cambridge and Durham algorithms. This happens because only three-parton final state configurations contribute at LO to the three-jet cross section. Instead, the four-jet production cross section at the LO is different in the two schemes.

At the next-to-leading order (NLO) the predictions for the three-jet production cross section for the two algorithms are different. Schematically, the NLO calculation of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow 3jets$  was performed as follows. In this case the three-jet cross section receives contributions not only from one-loop corrected three-parton final states, but also from four-parton processes. In the latter process two of the four partons are combined in order to produce a three-jet final state. The ultraviolet (UV) divergences encountered in the calculation of the three-parton contribution at the one-loop level were removed by the renormalization of the parameters of the QCD Lagrangian. The infrared (IR) divergences<sup>4</sup> remaining in this part, which are due to the presence of massless gluons in the loop, were canceled in the final result for the three-jet transition probability by adding an appropriate contribution from the four-parton final state. In the latter contribution, which is a purely tree-level one, the IR divergences appear due to the radiation of soft or/and collinear massless gluons. To separate the IR divergent part of the four-parton contribution, the phase-space slicing method (see [21] and references cited therein) has been used. In this method the integration over a thin slice at the edge of the phase-space (containing the soft and the collinear singularities) is performed analytically. Then, the IR singularities coming from three- and four-parton final states are canceled analytically. The remaining finite pieces from both three-parton and four-parton processes are integrated numerically over the three-jet phase-space defined by the specific jet algorithm. The four-jet cross section at the leading order, which is IR finite, is also obtained by numerical integration over the four-jet part of the four-parton phase-space.

Details of the NLO calculation for the Durham and some other popular jet clustering algorithms were presented in [4–6]. In the case of the Cambridge algorithm, although all principal calculational steps of the three-jet heavy quark production in  $e^+e^-$ -annihilation at NLO remain the same as in other algorithms, the practical implementation of this scheme turned out to be more involved due to more complex realization of the Cambridge jet finder.

---

<sup>4</sup>Dimensional regularization was used to regularize both ultraviolet (UV) and infrared (IR) singularities in the whole calculation.

### III. THE OBSERVABLES

In this paper we study in detail the following ratio of three-jet rates in the Cambridge jet-algorithm

$$R_3^{b\ell} = \frac{\Gamma_{3j}^b(y_c)/\Gamma^b}{\Gamma_{3j}^\ell(y_c)/\Gamma^\ell} . \quad (5)$$

In the above equation  $\Gamma_{3j}^b$  and  $\Gamma^b$  stand, respectively, for the three-jet and the total decay widths of the  $Z$ -boson with a  $b$ -quark in the final state. Analogously, the quantities with the superscript  $\ell$  denote the sum of the decay widths into light quarks ( $\ell = u, d, s$ ) which all are considered massless.

The ratio  $R_3^{b\ell}$  can be written in the form of the following expansion in  $\alpha_s$

$$R_3^{b\ell} = 1 + \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} a_0(y_c) + r_b \left( b_0(r_b, y_c) + \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} b_1(r_b, y_c) \right) , \quad (6)$$

where  $r_b = M_b^2/s$ , with  $M_b$  the heavy quark pole mass, and  $s = m_Z^2$  at the  $Z$  peak.

Let us remark that the double ratio in eq. (5) differs slightly from the one,  $R_3^{bd}$ , considered in [22,4] with a normalization to the  $Z$ -decay width of only one light flavor, the  $d$ -quark. In contrast to  $R_3^{b\ell}$ , such double ratio is equal to unit for a vanishing  $b$ -quark mass. The main difference between the two observables,  $R_3^{b\ell}$  and  $R_3^{bd}$ , is due to the triangle one-loop diagrams [23], which give a non-zero contribution even in the case of massless  $b$ -quarks taken into account by a function  $a_0(y_c)$  in eq. (6). The difference is, however, very small numerically, smaller than a 0.2%.

The functions  $b_0$  and  $b_1$  in eq. (6) describe, accordingly, the quark mass effects at the leading and the next-to-leading order in the strong coupling and depend on the jet clustering scheme. Although, for convenience, the leading polynomial dependence on  $r_b$  has been factorized out in eq. (6), the exact dependence on the heavy quark mass is kept in the functions  $b_0(r_b, y_c)$  and  $b_1(r_b, y_c)$ .

Using the known relationship between the perturbative pole mass and the  $\overline{MS}$  scheme running mass [24],

$$M_b^2 = m_b^2(\mu) \left[ 1 + \frac{2\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} \left( \frac{4}{3} - \log \frac{m_b^2}{\mu^2} \right) \right] , \quad (7)$$

we can re-express eq. (6) in terms of the running mass  $m_b(\mu)$ . Then, keeping only terms of order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  we obtain

$$R_3^{b\ell} = 1 + \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} a_0(y_c) + \bar{r}_b(\mu) \left( b_0(\bar{r}_b, y_c) + \frac{\alpha_s(\mu)}{\pi} \bar{b}_1(\bar{r}_b, y_c, \mu) \right) , \quad (8)$$

where  $\bar{r}_b(\mu) = m_b^2(\mu)/m_Z^2$  and the new function  $\bar{b}_1$  is related to  $b_0$  and  $b_1$ , introduced in eq. (6), via

$$\bar{b}_1(\bar{r}_b, y_c, \mu) = b_1(\bar{r}_b, y_c) + 2b_0(\bar{r}_b, y_c) \left( \frac{4}{3} - \log \bar{r}_b + \log \frac{\mu^2}{m_Z^2} \right) . \quad (9)$$

Effectively, the use of  $m_b(\mu)$ , instead of  $M_b$ , corresponds to the use of a different renormalization scheme. Although at the perturbative level both expressions, eq. (6) and eq. (8), are equivalent, numerically they give different answers since different higher order contributions are neglected. The spread of the results gives an estimate of the size of higher order corrections.

As discussed in the previous section, the phase-space integration (up to five-fold) in the calculation of the NLO decay width of the  $Z$ -boson into three jets is done numerically. This numerical integration is rather time consuming. Hence, we found it very convenient to fit the numerical results with relatively simple analytical functions. Because very small  $y_c$ -values are considered in the case of the Cambridge scheme, these fits are more complex and involve more parameters than the ones for the Durham algorithm described in [4]. A Fortran code containing the fits to the functions  $b_0$  and  $b_1$  (or  $\bar{b}_1$ )<sup>5</sup> can be obtained from the authors upon request. The numerical results for  $R_3^{b\ell}$  are presented in the next section.

In the next section we also give numerical results for the ratio of differential two-jet rates, defined as follows

$$D_2^{b\ell} = \frac{[\Gamma_{2j}^b(y_c + \Delta y_c/2) - \Gamma_{2j}^b(y_c - \Delta y_c/2)]/\Gamma^b}{[\Gamma_{2j}^\ell(y_c + \Delta y_c/2) - \Gamma_{2j}^\ell(y_c - \Delta y_c/2)]/\Gamma^\ell} . \quad (10)$$

Here,  $\Gamma_{2j}^b$  and  $\Gamma_{2j}^\ell$  denote the two-jet decay widths of the  $Z$ -boson with a  $b$ -quark and light quarks in the final state, correspondingly. The two-jet decay width at the order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2)$  is calculated from the three- and the four-jet widths through the identity

$$\Gamma^q = \Gamma_{2j}^q + \Gamma_{3j}^q + \Gamma_{4j}^q ,$$

where  $q$  is the quark flavor and  $\Gamma_{4j}^q$  is the four-jet decay width at the leading order. The value of  $\Delta y_c$  in eq. (10) should be chosen small enough. We fix  $\Delta y_c = 0.001$  in the numerical analysis.

The differential ratio  $D_2^{b\ell}$  is interesting because it contains different information than the ratio  $R_3^{b\ell}$ . In addition, while values of  $R_3^{b\ell}$  measured at different  $y_c$  are strongly correlated, the differential rate  $D_2^{b\ell}$  can be analyzed as a function of  $y_c$ . The whole consideration of  $R_3^{b\ell}$  discussed above is also applied here. For  $D_2^{b\ell}$  we use expansions in  $\alpha_s$  similar to those in eq. (6) and eq. (8), see [5], and we fit the corresponding LO and NLO numerical results to simple analytical functions equivalent to  $b_0$  and  $b_1$  ( $\bar{b}_1$ ).

#### IV. PERTURBATIVE RESULTS

In fig. 1 we present the results for the two observables studied,  $R_3^{b\ell}$  and  $D_2^{b\ell}$ , as functions of the jet-resolution parameter  $y_c$  in the Cambridge algorithm. We plot the NLO results written either in terms of the pole mass (eq. (6)) with  $M_b = 4.6$  GeV, or in terms of the running quark mass at  $m_Z$  (eq. (8)) with  $m_b(m_Z) = 2.8$  GeV. The renormalization scale is

---

<sup>5</sup>Although, the two functions  $b_1$  and  $\bar{b}_1$  are related via eq. (9) we performed independent fits for these functions.

fixed to  $\mu = m_Z$  and  $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.118$ . For comparison we also show  $R_3^{b\ell}$  and  $D_2^{b\ell}$  at LO when the value of the pole mass,  $M_b$ , or the running mass at  $m_Z$ ,  $m_b(m_Z)$ , is used for the quark mass. Note that one can not distinguish between different definitions of the quark mass in the lower order calculation. Mass effects monotonically grow for decreasing  $y_c$ , they are very significant for both observables and in the case of  $D_2^{b\ell}$  exceed 10% for small values of  $y_c$ .

From this figure one sees a remarkable feature of the NLO result in the considered range of  $y_c$ ,  $0.005 < y_c < 0.025$ , for the Cambridge scheme : the NLO corrections, in the case when the running mass is used are significantly smaller, especially for  $R_3^{b\ell}$ , than the corrections in the case with the parameterization in terms of the pole mass. In other words, using the running mass at the  $m_Z$ -scale in the LO calculations takes into account the bulk of the NLO corrections. This situation, although does not guarantee, suggests that also next-to-next-to-leading and higher order corrections are small for the observables parameterized in terms of the running mass at the  $m_Z$ -scale, i.e. one has a better description of mass effects in terms of a short distance parameter,  $m_b(m_Z)$ , than in terms of a low-energy parameter like the perturbative pole mass.

The theoretical prediction for the observables studied contains a residual dependence on the renormalization scale  $\mu$ : when written in terms of the pole mass it only comes from the  $\mu$ -dependence in  $\alpha_s(\mu)$ , when written in terms of the running mass it comes from both  $\alpha_s(\mu)$  and the incomplete cancellation of the  $\mu$ -dependences between  $m_b(\mu)$  and the logs of  $\mu$  which appear in eq. (9). The dependence on  $\mu$  is usually regarded as an estimate of the effect of the unknown higher order perturbative corrections. In fig. 2.a we present the  $\mu$ -dependence of the two NLO predictions, the pole mass prediction (NLO- $M_b$ ) given by eq. (6) and the running mass prediction (NLO- $m_b(m_Z)$ ) given by eq. (8), for the ratio  $R_3^{b\ell}$  in the range  $m_Z/10 < \mu < m_Z$  at a fixed value of  $y_c$ . We use the following one-loop evolution equations

$$a(\mu) = \frac{a(m_Z)}{K}, \quad m_b(\mu) = m_b(m_Z) K^{-\gamma_0/\beta_0}, \quad (11)$$

where  $a(\mu) = \alpha_s(\mu)/\pi$ ,  $K = 1 + a(m_Z)\beta_0 \log(\mu^2/m_Z^2)$  and

$$\beta_0 = \frac{1}{4} \left[ 11 - \frac{2}{3} N_F \right], \quad \gamma_0 = 1,$$

with  $N_F = 5$  the number of active flavors, to obtain  $\alpha_s(\mu)$  and  $m_b(\mu)$  from  $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.118$  and  $m_b(m_Z) = 2.8$  GeV. The NLO- $m_b(m_Z)$  result (dashed line) shows a remarkable stability with respect to the variation of the renormalization scale and the corrections with respect to the LO prediction (LO- $m_b(m_Z)$ ) remain small for all the values of  $\mu$ . Instead, the NLO- $M_b$  prediction (dotted line) has noticeably stronger dependence on the renormalization scale. The NLO corrections in this case remain sizable for all the values of  $\mu$  and increase for decreasing  $\mu$ . Note also that, as one would expect, for low values of  $\mu$  the two NLO predictions, in terms of the running mass and in terms of the pole mass, become very close to each other.

For a given value of  $R_3^{b\ell}$  we can solve eq. (6) (or eq. (8)) with respect to the quark mass. The result, shown in fig. 2.b for a fixed value of  $R_3^{b\ell}$ , depends on which equation was used and has a residual dependence on the renormalization scale  $\mu$ . The curves in fig. 2.b are

obtained in the following way: first from eq. (8) we directly obtain for an arbitrary value of  $\mu$  between  $m_Z$  and  $m_Z/10$  a value for the bottom-quark running mass at that scale,  $m_b(\mu)$ , and then using eq. (11) we get a value for it at the  $Z$ -scale,  $m_b(m_Z)$ . Second, using eq. (6) we extract, also for an arbitrary value of  $\mu$  between  $m_Z$  and  $m_Z/10$ , a value for the pole mass,  $M_b$ . Then we use eq. (7) at  $\mu = M_b$  and again eq. (11) to perform the evolution from  $\mu = M_b$  to  $\mu = m_Z$  and finally get a value for  $m_b(m_Z)$ . The two procedures, we denote them NLO- $m_b(m_Z)$  and NLO- $M_b$  respectively, give different answers, since different higher orders have been neglected in the intermediate steps. The maximum spread of the two results in the whole  $\mu$ -range under consideration can be interpreted as an estimate of the size of higher order corrections, i.e. of the theoretical error in the determination of the bottom-quark mass from the experimental measurement of  $R_3^{b\ell}$ .

We see from fig. 2.b that the first approach is very stable with respect to the choice of the scale used in eq. (8). The obtained  $b$ -quark mass,  $m_b(m_Z)$ , varies only  $\pm 50$  MeV when the scale is varied in the range  $\mu = m_Z$  and  $\mu = m_Z/10$ . In the same range of  $\mu$ , the estimated error in the Durham algorithm was found [4] to be  $\pm 200$  MeV. On the contrary, if one uses eq. (6) the extracted quark mass has a strong scale dependence, specially for small  $\mu$ -values and the estimated error is very sensitive to the choice of the smallest possible value of the renormalization scale. Cutting as before at  $\mu = m_Z/10$ , the extracted pole mass varies in the range  $\pm 300$  MeV which is translated into  $\pm 240$  MeV for  $m_b(m_Z)$ . Let us note that a further  $\pm 20$  MeV should be added due to the uncertainty in the strong coupling constant  $\Delta\alpha_s(m_Z) = \pm 0.003$ .

Although, our observables are formally of order  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  and, therefore, compatible with the use of one-loop renormalization group equations (RGE) to connect the running parameters at different scales, as a check of the stability of our results we have also repeated the analysis using two-loop evolution equations [25]

$$\begin{aligned}
a(\mu) &= \frac{a(m_Z)}{K + a(m_Z) b_1 \left( L + a(m_Z) b_1 \frac{1-K+L}{K} \right)}, \\
m_b(m_Z) &= m_b(\mu) K^{g_0} \frac{1 + a(m_Z) c_1}{1 + a(\mu) c_1},
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where  $L = \log K$  and  $c_1 = g_1 - b_1 g_0$  with  $b_1 = \beta_1/\beta_0$ ,  $g_i = \gamma_i/\beta_0$  and

$$\beta_1 = \frac{1}{16} \left[ 102 - \frac{38}{3} N_F \right], \quad \gamma_1 = \frac{1}{16} \left[ \frac{202}{3} - \frac{20}{9} N_F \right]. \tag{13}$$

The use of two-loop RGE corresponds to the dashed lines in Fig 2.b. Again a value of the quark mass extracted via the running mass parameterization remains more stable with respect to variation of the scale  $\mu$  and changes only slightly. The mass extracted through the pole mass receives a significant shift of 200 MeV when the two-loop RGE are used.

## V. HADRONIZATION CORRECTIONS

In the DELPHI analysis on the measurement of the  $b$ -quark mass effects based on the Durham jet clustering algorithm the impact of the fragmentation process on the observable



$R_3^{b\ell}$  was studied [3] and quantified by adding in quadrature two different source of errors. The first uncertainty,  $\sigma_{tun}$ , was obtained by varying the most relevant parameters of the string fragmentation model incorporated in JETSET [26] within an interval of  $\pm 2\sigma$  from its central value as tuned by DELPHI [27] and explained in reference [3]. The second uncertainty,  $\sigma_{mod}$ , was the result of analyzing the dependence on the fragmentation model itself by comparing the HERWIG [28] model with JETSET [26]. The difference on the fragmentation correction factors obtained for each model were considered as a source of systematic errors. This in fact was the largest contribution to the total error of the measurement. The final correction adopted was the average of those two models and the *fragmentation model* uncertainty ( $\sigma_{mod}$ ) was taken to be half of their difference. The total error due to the lack of knowledge on the hadronization process was expressed as:

$$\sigma_{had}(y_c) = \sqrt{\sigma_{tun}^2(y_c) + \sigma_{mod}^2(y_c)} \quad (14)$$

which at  $y_c = 0.02$  in the Durham scheme was  $\sigma_{had}(y_c) = 0.007$  [3] and its dependence as a function of  $y_c$  is shown in Fig. 3. The decision of the measurable  $y_c$  interval region,  $y_c > 0.015$  was also connected to the fragmentation correction which was required to be relatively flat and the four-jet contribution small ( $\leq 2\%$ ). For comparison purposes, an equivalent analysis has been performed using the new Cambridge jet reconstruction algorithm and the results obtained are also presented in Fig. 3. A larger flat  $y_c$ -region is observed in the case of Cambridge with respect to Durham which can be extended up to  $y_c = 0.004$  with the four jet contribution still being small,  $\leq 8\%$ . The total absolute error is higher for Cambridge than for Durham but the relative sensitivity to the mass correction is higher for Cambridge at  $y_c$  values around 0.005 than for Durham at  $y_c$  values around 0.02. In Fig. 3 the difference between the theoretical prediction of  $R_3^{b\ell}$  at LO in terms of the pole mass,  $M_b = 4.6$  GeV with respect to that obtained using the running mass  $m_b(m_Z) = 2.8$  GeV is also shown. A higher sensitivity to this difference is again found for the new Cambridge jet algorithm in the valid, flat,  $y_c$ -region ( $y_c > 0.004$ ) thus enabling to test more significantly which of the two predictions agrees better with data.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have calculated the next-to-leading order QCD corrections to the heavy quark three-jet production cross section in  $e^+e^-$ -annihilation as well as the leading order four-jet production cross section using the new Cambridge jet clustering algorithm. The hadronization corrections were also estimated. Comparing with previous studies, this algorithm allows to extend the analysis into a region of smaller values of the jet resolution parameter, down to  $y_c \approx 0.004$ , where the sensitivity to the heavy quark mass effects increase.

In particular we have studied in detail the double ratio  $R_3^{b\ell}$  and the differential double ratio  $D_2^{b\ell}$ . We have compared the NLO results expressed in terms of the perturbative pole mass and in terms of the running mass of the heavy quark at the  $m_Z$  scale. We found that the NLO corrections in the case when the running mass was used are remarkably small. This is especially true for  $R_3^{b\ell}$ , where tree-level expressions in terms of  $m_b(m_Z)$  give a very good approximation to the complete NLO result, which, when expressed in terms of  $m_b(m_Z)$ , is almost independent of the renormalization scale. In contrast, the calculations done in terms

of the pole quark mass have sizable NLO corrections with a strong renormalization scale dependence. The hadronization corrections also favor the use of the Cambridge algorithm with respect to Durham by keeping a relatively stable uncertainty for small  $y_c$ .

Summarizing, the results of this paper indicate that a new determination of the  $b$ -quark with the Cambridge jet algorithm will improve our present understanding on quark mass effects at LEP/SLC energies.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by CICYT under the Grant AEN-96-1718, by DGEIC under the Grant PB97-1261 and by the Generalitat Valenciana under the Grant GV98-01-80. The work of G.R. has also been supported by INFN and E.U. QCDNET contract FMRX-CT98-0194. The work of M.B. was partly supported by the grant GAČR-2020506.

## REFERENCES

- [1] SLD Coll., P.N. Burrows *et. al.*, hep-exp/9808017.
- [2] S. Martí i Garcia, J. Fuster, and S. Cabrera, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* **64**, 376 (1998).
- [3] DELPHI Coll., P. Abreu *et. al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **B418**, 430 (1998).
- [4] G. Rodrigo, A. Santamaria, and M. Bilenky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 193 (1997).
- [5] G. Rodrigo, A. Santamaria, and M. Bilenky, hep-ph/9905276 to appear in *Nucl. Phys. B*; *J. Phys.* **G25**, 1593 (1999).
- [6] G. Rodrigo, hep-ph/9703359; *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* **54A** 60, (1997).
- [7] A. Brandenburg and P. Uwer, *Nucl. Phys.* **B515**, 279 (1998).
- [8] W. Bernreuther, A. Brandenburg, and P. Uwer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 189 (1997).
- [9] C. Oleari, “Next-to-leading order corrections to the production of heavy flavor jets in  $e^+e^-$  collisions”, hep-ph/9802431.
- [10] P. Nason and C. Oleari, *Nucl. Phys.* **B521**, 237 (1998); *Phys. Lett.* **B407**, 57 (1997).
- [11] S. Catani, Y. L. Dokshitzer, M. Olsson, G. Turnock, and B. R. Webber, *Phys. Lett.* **B269**, 432 (1991).
- [12] SLD Coll., K. Abe *et. al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D59**, 012002 (1999).
- [13] A. Brandenburg *et al.*, “Measurement of the running b-quark mass using  $e^+e^- \rightarrow b\bar{b}g$  events”, hep-ph/9905495.
- [14] OPAL Coll., G. Abbiendi *et. al.*, hep-ex/9904013.
- [15] M. Jamin and A. Pich, *Nucl. Phys.* **B507**, 334 (1997). V. Giménez, G. Martinelli, and C. T. Sachrajda, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)* **53**, 365 (1997); *Phys. Lett.* **B393**, 124 (1997).
- [16] Y. L. Dokshitzer, G. D. Leder, S. Moretti, and B. R. Webber, *JHEP* **9708**, 001 (1997).
- [17] S. Moretti, L. Lonnblad, and T. Sjöstrand, *JHEP* **9808**, 001 (1998).
- [18] G. Rodrigo, A. Santamaria and M. Bilenky, hep-ph/9812433, hep-ph/9811465, hep-ph/9807489.
- [19] DELPHI Coll., J. Fuster, S. Cabrera and S. Martí, contributing paper #152 to ICHEP98 Conf., Vancouver, 1998.
- [20] S. Bentvelsen and I. Meyer, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C4**, 623 (1998).
- [21] S. Keller and E. Laenen, *Phys. Rev.* **D59**, 114004 (1999).
- [22] M. Bilenky, G. Rodrigo, and A. Santamaria, *Nucl. Phys.* **B439**, 505 (1995).
- [23] K. Hagiwara, T. Kuruma, and Y. Yamada, *Nucl. Phys.* **B358**, 80 (1991).
- [24] R. Tarrach, *Nucl. Phys.* **B183**, 384 (1981).
- [25] G. Rodrigo, A. Pich, and A. Santamaria, *Phys. Lett.* **B424**, 367 (1998).
- [26] T. Sjöstrand, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **39** 346, (1986).
- [27] DELPHI Coll., P. Abreu *et. al.*, *Z. Phys.* **C73**, 11 (1996).
- [28] G. Marchesini *et. al.*, *Comp. Phys. Comm.* **67** 465, (1992).

FIGURES




FIG. 1. The observables  $R_3^{bl}$  and  $D_2^{bl}$  as a function of  $y_c$  in the Cambridge algorithm at the NLO. The dotted lines give the NLO corrected values using eq. (6) for a pole mass of  $M_b = 4.6$  GeV. The dashed lines give the observables at the NLO using eq. (8) for a running mass of  $m_b(m_Z) = 2.8$  GeV. The renormalization scale is fixed to  $\mu = m_Z$  and  $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.118$ . For comparison we also plot the LO results for  $M_b = 4.6$  GeV (lower solid lines) and  $m_b(m_Z) = 2.8$  GeV (upper solid lines).




FIG. 2. a) Renormalization scale dependence for a fixed value of  $y_c$ . Same labels as in Fig. 1. b) Extracted value of  $m_b(m_Z)$  from a fixed value of  $R_3^{bl}$  using either the pole mass expression (NLO- $M_b$ ) in eq. (6) or the running mass expression (NLO- $m_b(m_Z)$ ) in eq. (8) as explained in the text. Solid lines obtained by using one-loop running evolution equations to connect the results at different scales and dashed lines obtained by using two-loop expressions.




FIG. 3. Comparison of the hadronization uncertainty ( $\sigma_{had}$ ) obtained when using either the Cambridge or Durham algorithm. The dashed curve shows the mass correction at LO for the pole mass,  $M_b = 4.6$  GeV. The dotted curve indicates the value of the difference between the LO predictions for the two mass values,  $M_b = 4.6$  GeV and  $m_b(m_Z) = 2.8$  GeV. The Cambridge algorithm is observed to have a larger stable region on  $y_c$  than Durham reaching at the same time a higher sensitivity to both, the mass correction and the difference between the two LO predictions.