CM-P00057591

Archive

Ref. TH. 775

A CURRENT ALGEBRA CALCULATION OF THE $\pi - \pi$ SCATTERING LENGTHS

J. Iliopoulos

CERN - Geneva

A B S T R A C T

A new approach is presented for the calculation of the $\pi - \pi$ scattering lengths based on current algebra. The parametrization chosen for the amplitude allows for the elastic unitarity cuts. A family of solutions has been found which contains Weinberg's results.

The current algebra techniques have been extensively used during the last months for the calculation of the pion-pion s wave scattering lengths ¹⁾⁻⁶⁾. However, in all cases, one had to make additional assumptions and the purpose of this letter is to try to investigate how sensitive the results were on these extra assumptions.

We shall follow mainly the method introduced by Weinberg ³⁾ and we shall try to weaken some of his assumptions.

Let us consider the expression

$$(2\pi)^4 \delta^4(\sum k_i) \frac{F_\pi^4 m_\pi^2}{M} =$$

$$= -i \int d^4x \langle 0 | T(\partial_\mu A_\mu^a(x_1), \partial_\nu A_\nu^b(x_2), \partial_\rho A_\rho^c(x_3), \partial_\sigma A_\sigma^d(x_4)) | 0 \rangle \times$$

$$\times \prod_{i=1}^4 \left((k_i^2 + m_\pi^2) e^{-ik_i x_i} \right) \quad (1)$$

where d^4x stands for $d^4x_1, \dots, d^4x_4$ and a, b, c and d are the isospin indices. F_π is the pion decay coupling constant defined by

$$\langle 0 | \partial_\mu A_\mu^a | \pi_k^b \rangle = \frac{F_\pi m_\pi^2 \delta_{ab}}{\sqrt{(2\pi)^3 2k_0}} \quad (2)$$

M , as defined by (1), is a function of six variables and it is symmetric under the exchange of any pair of isospin indices together with the corresponding k 's. Furthermore, at $k_i^2 = -m_\pi^2$ ($i=1, \dots, 4$), M is proportional to the physical $\pi-\pi$ scattering amplitude. It is convenient to write M in the form usually used for the $\pi-\pi$ amplitude:

2.

$$M = \delta_{ab} \delta_{cd} M_1 + \delta_{ad} \delta_{cb} M_2 + \delta_{ac} \delta_{bd} M_3 \quad (3)$$

where M_1 , M_2 and M_3 are functions which have the correct symmetry properties under the exchange of any pair of axial spurious.

The important thing about M is that its value is known in some particular points:

a. At $k_1^2 = k_2^2 = k_3^2 = -m_\pi^2$ M is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(\sum k_i) F_\pi m_\pi^2 M &= \\ &= -i \int d^4 x_4 \langle \pi_1^a(-k_1), \pi_2^b(-k_2); \text{out} | \partial_\sigma A_\sigma^d(x_4) | \pi_3^c(k_3) \rangle (k_4^2 + m_\pi^2) e^{-ik_4 x_4} \\ &= k_4^\sigma \int d^4 x_4 \langle \pi_1^a, \pi_2^b; \text{out} | A_\sigma^d(x_4) | \pi_3^c \rangle (k_4^2 + m_\pi^2) e^{-ik_4 x_4} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where, in the last step, the translational properties of the matrix element have been used. Equation (4) shows clearly that M vanishes when $k_4 = 0$. This is the well-known Adler's self consistency condition ⁷⁾. In terms of M_1 , M_2 and M_3 it reads:

$$M_1 = M_2 = M_3 = 0 \quad \text{for } k_1^2 = k_2^2 = k_3^2 = -m_\pi^2, \quad k_4 = 0 \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{O}(x)$ is an unspecified local, scalar operator. In deriving Eq. (8), only the isospin structure of the commutation relation (10) is required. However, we want to emphasize that Eq. (10) represents a further assumption, outside the usual framework of current algebra, although it is true in some particular models. Physically Eq. (10) means that, at the point $k_2^2 = k_4^2 = -m_\pi^2$ and $k_1 = k_3 = 0$, the $I=2$ part of the amplitude in the t channel vanishes. It would be interesting to investigate the influence of Eq. (8) on the values of the scattering lengths. In this case (10) should be replaced by a more general assumption, namely that the commutator is symmetric in a and b , but not necessarily proportional to δ_{ab} , allowing for an $I=2$ non-zero part of the amplitude in the t channel. Unfortunately, we have not been able to find any other relation to replace Eq. (8) and, with our parametrization of the amplitude, we cannot afford to leave out any of the equations.

The system of equations (5), (7) and (8) gives the maximum of information that current algebra can provide us. As we see, none of this information concerns the physical points. One could, of course, assume that, as in the $\pi - N$ case, the amplitude does not vary significantly when one or two of the pions go to zero energy momentum, but for the $\pi - \pi$ amplitude this is a rather dubious assumption and furthermore, as we shall see later, it may lead to inconsistencies. Therefore, a reasonable way to continue is to assume a parametrization of M and to use these equations to fix the arbitrary parameters. Weinberg³⁾ has assumed that M can be expanded in powers of s , t and u , and one can neglect all powers higher than the first⁸⁾. Therefore, he assumes the following form for M :

$$M = \delta_{ab} \delta_{cd} [A + B(s+u) + Ct + \dots] + \text{permutations} \quad (11)$$

b. At $k_2^2 = k_4^2 = -m_\pi^2$ M can be written as:

$$(2\pi)^4 \delta^4(\sum k_i) F_\pi^2 m_\pi^4 M =$$

$$= -i \int d^4x_1 d^4x_3 \langle \pi_2^b(-k_2) | T(\partial_\mu A_\mu^a(x_1), \partial_\mu A_\mu^c(x_3)) | \pi_4^d(k_4) \rangle \times$$

$$\times (k_1^2 + m_\pi^2)(k_3^2 + m_\pi^2) e^{-ik_1 x_1} e^{-ik_3 x_3} \quad (6)$$

By applying into Eq. (6) the standard current algebra manipulations, one can show ³⁾ that for $k_1 = -k_3 \rightarrow 0$:

$$\frac{1}{2}(M_2 - M_3) = 8 \left(\frac{1}{F_\pi} \right)^2 (k_1 \cdot k_2) \quad (7)$$

and

$$M_2 + M_3 = 0 \quad (8)$$

In deriving Eq. (7) use has been made of the commutation relation:

$$\delta(x_0 - y_0) [A_\mu^a(x), A_\mu^b(y)] = 2i \varepsilon_{abc} V_\mu^c(x) \delta^4(x - y) \quad (9)$$

Equation (8) follows from the commutation relation:

$$\delta(x_0 - y_0) [A_\mu^a(x), \partial_\mu A_\mu^b(y)] = \delta_{ab} \sigma(x) \delta^4(x - y) \quad (10)$$

where $s = -(k_1 + k_2)^2$, $t = -(k_1 + k_3)^2$, $u = -(k_1 + k_4)^2$ and A , B and C are constants to be determined by the three equations above. In Weinberg's original approach (11) was assumed to be valid up to and somewhat beyond the physical threshold. However, such an assumption clearly violates the unitarity condition. Therefore, Weinberg has remarked that his small scattering lengths could be due to the fact that, in writing (11), one had already assumed them to be negligible so that, strictly speaking, current algebra does not prove them to be small. Thus, it is interesting to investigate what happens if one does not assume that M , as a function of s , t and u , is analytic at threshold. There are several ways to avoid this assumption. In this paper we shall do it by replacing Eq. (11) by a more flexible parametrization which allows for the elastic unitarity cuts ⁹⁾. As it is well known, these cuts are of the square root type, so, let us introduce the variables:

$$k_s = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4 - s} \quad , \quad k_t = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4 - t} \quad , \quad k_u = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4 - u} \quad (12)$$

In terms of these variables M has a much larger analytic domain which contains the physical threshold. Note that the symmetry properties of M do not allow for any terms proportional to k_i^2 other than the ones already contained in s , t and u . On the other hand, if one neglects the singularities of M in the k_i^2 variables, it follows that, up to second order in k_s , k_t and k_u , M is a function of only those three variables. Therefore M is assumed to have the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} M = & \delta_{ab} \delta_{cd} [A + B(k_s + k_u) + C k_t + D k_t^2 + E(k_s^2 + k_u^2) + F k_s k_u + G k_t(k_s + k_u)] \\ & + \delta_{ad} \delta_{cb} [A + B(k_s + k_t) + C k_u + D k_u^2 + E(k_s^2 + k_t^2) + F k_s k_t + G k_u(k_s + k_t)] \\ & + \delta_{ac} \delta_{bd} [A + B(k_t + k_u) + C k_s + D k_s^2 + E(k_t^2 + k_u^2) + F k_t k_u + G k_s(k_t + k_u)] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Eq. (13) [or (11)] is a weak form of the so called PDDAC hypothesis ¹⁰⁾ (pole dominance to the divergence of the axial current). In order to see it more clearly let us consider the matrix element of $\partial_\mu A_\mu$ between two states $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$:

$$N = \langle a | \partial_\mu A_\mu | b \rangle \quad (14)$$

Since N has the pion pole in the variable k^2 , where $k = p_a - p_b$, it can be written as:

$$N(k^2) = \frac{R}{k^2 + m_\pi^2} + N_1(k^2) \quad (15)$$

where R is independent of k^2 and N_1 has no singularity at $k^2 = -m_\pi^2$. A rigorous application of PDDAC (hereafter called "restricted PDDAC") would mean that $N_1 = 0$. However, this assumption is too strong and furthermore it is meaningless unless one specifies which are the other variables. For example, suppose that $|a\rangle$ is a two-particle state and $|b\rangle$ a single-particle one. Then N is a function of three variables. It is clear that if the restricted PDDAC holds for one set of variables, say s, t and k^2 , it will certainly fail for some others, for example, s, u and k^2 , since $u = \sum m^2 + k^2 - s - t$, unless R is a constant with respect to all variables ¹¹⁾. It is worth while noticing that the formal replacement $\partial_\mu A_\mu = c\phi_\pi$ does not solve the problem at all, since the same ambiguity arises for the matrix elements of the operator ϕ_π for which Eq. (15) holds with the same analytic properties. Therefore, a more meaningful approximation would be to assume that N_1 is a constant but not necessarily equal to zero ¹²⁾. One can still give a meaning to the restricted PDDAC assumption ($N_1 = 0$) if one agrees to neglect all terms that are of the order of m_π^2 in the expression $(k^2 + m_\pi^2)N = R + (k^2 + m_\pi^2)N_1$. This can be the case, namely, if the states $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$ contain heavy particles and the success of calculations,

such as the π -N scattering lengths based on this restricted PDDAC hypothesis, seems to support this point of view. Note that, restricted PDDAC, implies that the matrix elements of the $\mathcal{O}$ operator of Eq. (10) vanish. These terms had, in fact, been neglected in the π -N case. In our case this would have given us a fourth equation expressing the vanishing of the $\mathcal{O}$ term. The system of these four equations is incompatible with Eq. (11). Tomozawa²⁾ has applied this method, together with the assumption of no significant variation of the amplitude with the external momenta, and ended with a result that was in conflict with Bose statistics. This inconsistency however, is not due to his asymmetric way of reducing with respect to the two pions, but to a too strong PDDAC assumption. By using PDDAC, as given by Eq. (15), with N_1 a constant, no inconsistency is found.

Let us come back to Eq. (13). At the point $k_2^2 = k_4^2 = -m_\pi^2$, $k_1 = -k_3 \rightarrow 0$ we find:

$$s = 1 - 2 k_1 \cdot k_2, \quad t = 0, \quad u = 1 + 2 k_1 \cdot k_2 \quad (16)$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} k_s &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}} (s-1) + \dots \\ k_t &= 1 \\ k_u &= \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}} (u-1) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

8.

where the units $\hbar = c = m_\pi = 1$ have been used. In the same way we find that, at the point $k_1^2 = k_2^2 = k_3^2 = -m_\pi^2$, $k_4 = 0$

$$k_s = k_t = k_u = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \quad (18)$$

Using (13), (17) and (18), the equations (5), (7) and (8) read:

$$A + \sqrt{3} B + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} C + \frac{3}{4} D + \frac{3}{2} E + \frac{3}{4} F + \frac{3}{2} G = 0 \quad (19)$$

$$B - C + F - G + \sqrt{3} (E - D) = -19.1 \quad (20)$$

$$2A + (\sqrt{3} + 2)B + \sqrt{3} C + \frac{3}{2} D + \frac{7}{2} E + \sqrt{3} F + (\sqrt{3} + \frac{3}{2}) G = 0 \quad (21)$$

In writing Eq. (20) the value of F_π , given by (2), has been used ($\frac{1}{F_\pi^2} = 0.69$).

In order to obtain some more information we use the unitarity of the partial waves:

$$\frac{8\pi W}{q} \operatorname{Im} F_\ell^I(q) = |F_\ell^I(q)|^2 \quad (22)$$

where W equals $\sqrt{s}$ and q is the magnitude of the three momentum in the c.m.s. F_ℓ^I is the ℓ partial wave for the I isospin state given in terms of phase shifts, by:

$$F_\ell^I = \frac{8\pi W}{q} e^{i\delta_\ell^I} \sin \delta_\ell^I \quad (23)$$

Of course, we cannot expect that a simple form like (13) could satisfy unitarity everywhere, so, we require (22) to be satisfied at threshold ¹³⁾. In this way we obtain two equations, one for each isospin state of the s wave:

$$2B + 3C + 2F + 8G = \frac{-1}{32\pi} (5A + 8B + 2C + 2D + 8E + 3F + 2G)^2 \quad (24)$$

$$B + F + G = \frac{-1}{16\pi} (A + B + C + D + E + G)^2 \quad (25)$$

Equations (24) and (25) come respectively from the $I=0$ and $I=2$ parts of the s wave.

Finally, we use the known properties of the $\pi-\pi$ amplitude obtained from axiomatic field theory. Martin ¹⁴⁾ has proved the following relations for the $\pi^0 \pi^0$ combination of the amplitude.

Let us define $F^{00}(s,t)$ to be the on-the-mass shell $\pi^0 \pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ scattering amplitude given, in terms of the F^I 's by:

$$F^{00}(s,t) \approx \left[\frac{1}{3} F^0(s,t) + \frac{2}{3} F^2(s,t) \right] \quad (26)$$

and let $F_0^{00}(s)$ be its s wave projection. We shall use the following results proved by Martin:

a. $F^{00}(s,t)$ has a minimum at the symmetric point $s=t=u=4/3$. The existence of an extremum at that point follows from crossing symmetry, so it is automatically satisfied if one assumes a parametrization like (11) or (13). Thus, the only information that we can get from this property is the sign of the second derivative:

$$\left. \frac{\partial^2 F^{00}(s,t)}{\partial s^2} \right|_{s=t=\frac{4}{3}} > 0 \quad (27)$$

As we shall see all our solutions will satisfy (27). This was not a priori obvious since, to prove (27), one needs the positivity of the absorptive parts, not only at threshold but everywhere.

b. $F_0^{00}(s)$ and its derivatives satisfy the following inequalities:

$$F_0^{00}(s) < F_0^{00}(4) \quad 0 \leq s < 4 \quad (28a)$$

$$F_0^{00}(0) \geq F_0^{00}\left(2\left[1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right]\right) \quad (28b)$$

$$\frac{dF_0^{00}(s)}{ds} > 0 \quad 1.7 \leq s \leq 4 \quad (28c)$$

$$\frac{dF_0^{00}(s)}{ds} < 0 \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1.29 \quad (28d)$$

In particular (28c) ¹⁵⁾ and (28d) show that $dF_0^{00}(s)/ds$ vanishes for s_0 between 1.29 and 1.7. In terms of our parameters $A, \dots, G$ this condition reads:

$$\frac{d\Sigma_0}{ds} (2B+C) + \frac{d\Sigma\Sigma_0}{ds} (F+2G) = 0 \quad s=s_0 \quad (29)$$

where $\Sigma = k_s + k_t + k_u$ and $\Sigma\Sigma = k_s k_t + k_t k_u + k_u k_s$ and Σ_0 and $\Sigma\Sigma_0$ are the s wave projections of Σ and $\Sigma\Sigma$ respectively. After some simple algebra we find:

$$\left. \frac{d\Sigma_0}{ds} \right|_{s=s_0} = -\frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{\sqrt{4-s_0}} + \frac{2}{3} \frac{\frac{1}{2} s_0^{3/2} - 6 s_0^{1/2} + 8}{(s_0 - 4)^2} \quad (30)$$

$$\left. \frac{d \Sigma \Sigma_0}{ds} \right|_{s=s_0} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{s_0^{3/2} - 6s_0^{1/2} + 4}{(4-s_0)^{3/2}} - \frac{\sqrt{s_0}}{4(4-s_0)} + \frac{s_0^2 - 8s_0 - 48}{16(s_0-4)^2} \sin^{-1} \frac{s_0-4}{s_0+4} \quad (31)$$

s_0 varies between 1.29 and 1.7 but the results are practically independent (1% or less) of its precise value.

The scattering lengths a_0 and a_2 for the $I=0$ and $I=2$ s waves respectively are given by the formulae:

$$a_0 = - \frac{1}{32\pi} (5A + 8B + 2C + 2D + 8E + 3F + 2G) \quad (32)$$

$$a_2 = - \frac{1}{16\pi} (A + B + C + D + E + G) \quad (33)$$

The equations (19), (20), (21), (24), (25) and (29) form a system of six equations with seven unknowns, so we are not able to determine the scattering lengths exactly. The inequalities (27) and (28) have been found to be satisfied in the entire region of solutions. Therefore, we establish a relation between a_0 and a_2 which is represented graphically by the hyperbola shown on the Figure. The following remarks can be made from the inspection of this graph:

a. Weinberg's solution $a_0 = 0.2$ and $a_2 = -0.06$ belongs, with an excellent agreement, to our family of solutions (for $a_2 = -0.06$ we find $a_0 = 0.175$).

b. There is a forbidden range for a_2 , namely the gap between -0.46 and -1.9. Since the left branch of the hyperbola can most probably be excluded on the basis of the available experimental results, we conclude that:

$$a_2 > -0.46 \quad (34)$$

This limit can be further improved if we add the requirement, which is strongly supported by all experimental results, that a_0 should be positive:

$$a_2 > -0.14 \quad (34a)$$

For a_0 no restrictions have been found.

c. If a_0 is large and positive of the order of 1.5, as some results for π -N scattering¹⁶⁾ or K_{e4} decay¹⁷⁾ seemed to indicate, a_2 must also be positive and quite appreciable of the order of 0.7¹⁸⁾.

d. For the whole physically interesting range of $a_0 > 0$ the right-hand of the hyperbola can be approximated with a very good accuracy by the linear form:

$$a_0 - 2a_2 = 0.28 \quad (35)$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. J. Bell for numerous suggestions and clarifying remarks and Dr. J.D. Bessis and Dr. A. Martin for very helpful discussions.

R E F E R E N C E S

- 1) A.P. Balachandran, M.G. Gundzik and F. Nicodemi (to be published).
- 2) Y. Tomozawa (to be published).
- 3) S. Weinberg, Phys.Rev.Letters 17, 616 (1966).
- 4) N.N. Khuri, Phys.Rev. 153, 1477 (1967).
- 5) T. Akiba and K. Kang (to be published).
- 6) J. Sucher and C-H. Woo (to be published).
- 7) S.L. Adler, Phys.Rev. 137, B1022 (1965) and Phys.Rev. 139, B1638 (1965).
- 8) N.N. Khuri in Ref. ⁴⁾ has considered also the second order terms by adding some further assumptions.
- 9) T. Akiba and K. Kang in Ref. ⁵⁾ have followed a different method: Eq. (11) has been assumed for the region below threshold and dispersion relations have been used to estimate the corrections due to the extrapolation up to the physical region. A third and very interesting alternative has been examined by A. Donnachie (to be published).
- 10) We thank Dr. J. Bell for very clarifying remarks concerning this point.

- 11) This has already been pointed out by several authors. See, for example, Ref. ⁷⁾, W.I. Weisberger, Phys.Rev. 143, 1302 (1966) and F.T. Meiere and M. Sugawara, Phys.Rev. 153, 1709 (1967).

- 12) In terms of the residue function R , the restricted PDDAC means that R is a constant as we have already remarked. This new assumption would mean that, in a power series expansion of R with respect to the other variables, one could keep also linear terms.

- 13) If we expand (22) in powers of q^2 only the zero order term can be considered. In order to calculate the next term we need the q^3 terms of $\text{Im } F_\ell$. But these terms are unreliable since we have neglected third order terms in the expansion (13).

- 14) A. Martin, Nuovo Cimento 47, 265 (1967). See also A. Martin and Y.S. Jin, Phys.Rev. 135, B1369 (1964).

- 15) The range of validity of (28c) has been extended in the region $1.76 \leq s \leq 2$, by A.D. Common (unpublished). We thank A. Martin for informing us about this work.

- 16) See, for example, J. Hamilton "Strong Interactions and High Energy Physics", Ed. R.G. Moorhouse, Oliver and Boyd, London (1964). For a review of other experimental results, see also N.E. Booth and A. Abashian, Phys.Rev. 132, 2314 (1963) and specially Sect. 7. We must however remark that in all these analyses the formulae used did not allow for an $I=0$ s wave low mass resonance (σ particle). C. Lovelace, R.M. Heinz and A. Donnachie, Phys.Letters 22, 332 (1966), have examined this possibility and they have found that, if one includes the σ resonance, the experimental results are consistent with small scattering lengths.

- 17) C. Kacser, P. Singer and T.N. Truong, Phys.Rev. 137, B1605 (1965)
and 139, AB5 (1965);
N. Cabibbo and A. Maksymowicz, Phys.Rev. 137, B438 (1965);
J. Iliopoulos, Nuovo Cimento 38, 907 (1965) and 39, 413 (1965).
- 18) A. Donnachie, Ref. ⁹⁾, has arrived to similar conclusions. We wish
to thank him for communicating his results to us prior to
publication.

Plot of a_0 as a function of a_2 . The units are $h = c = m_e = 1$.