Estimating Condensates From the Difference of τ Branching Fractions

Vakhtang Kartvelishvili * and Murman Margvelashvili [†]

High Energy Physics Institute, Tbilisi State University, GE-380086, Tbilisi, Georgia

Abstract

The difference of τ partial decay widths into even and odd number of pions, $R_{\tau,V-A}$, may be considered as another important constraint on the hadronic spectral function $\rho_{V-A}(s)$, in addition to four classic sum rules of current algebra. Within certain reasonable assumptions its value may be used to test the factorization hypothesis and estimate the contribution of dimension 6 condensates into the τ hadronic decay width.

^{*}E-mail: vato@vxcern.cern.ch, vato@kheta.ge

[†]E-mail: mmm@kheta.ge

1. The difference of hadronic spectral densities with vector and axial vector quantum numbers, $\rho_{V-A}(s)$, has been the object of special attention since mid sixties [1], [2]. A number of theoretical constraints imposed on this function have recently been used for improving the accuracy of vacuum condensate determination [3] [4], and even to "predict" the shape of the spectral function itself [5].

In this note we recall that the difference of τ partial decay widths into even and odd number of pions is another directly measurable quantity which is expressed via the weighted integral over the spectral function $\rho_{V-A}(s)$, and this relation may be considered as an additional constraint over the hadronic spectra. Provided the first Weinberg sum rule is valid and the corrections coming from dimension 8 condensates are not unexpectedly large, we are able to show that the difference of branching fractions can be used as the measure of the deviation from vacuum saturation hypothesis, and provides a way of estimating the contribution of the dimension 6 condensates into τ hadronic width. The latter is important in view of the increased accuracies involved in tha α_s determination from τ hadronic decay data.

2. Consider the difference of τ decay widths into even and odd number of pions, normalized as usual to the leptonic decay width:

$$R_{\tau,V-A} = \sum_{n} \frac{\Gamma(\tau \to \nu_{\tau} + 2n\pi) - \Gamma(\tau \to \nu_{\tau} + (2n+1)\pi)}{\Gamma(\tau \to \nu_{\tau} + e + \nu_{e})}$$
$$= \sum_{n} \frac{BR(\tau \to \nu_{\tau} + 2n\pi) - BR(\tau \to \nu_{\tau} + (2n+1)\pi)}{BR(\tau \to \nu_{\tau} + e + \nu_{e})}.$$
(1)

In the following we will be working in the chiral limit, which is believed to be a good approximation at the present level of accuracy, at least as far as only u and d quarks are dealt with [6], [7]; thus we confine ourselves to the Cabibbo-allowed decays of the τ . In this case, the considered quantity can be expressed as

$$R_{\tau,V-A} = 12\pi |V_{ud}|^2 \int_0^{M_\tau^2} \frac{ds}{M_\tau^2} (1 - \frac{s}{M_\tau^2})^2 (1 + \frac{2s}{M_\tau^2}) \mathrm{Im}\Pi_{V-A}(s + i\epsilon).$$
(2)

Here $\Pi_{V-A}(s)$ is the difference of vector and axial vector current correlators, defined as

$$(-g^{\mu\nu}q^2 + q^{\mu}q^{\nu})\Pi_{V-A}(q^2) =$$

$$= i \int d^4x \, e^{-iqx} < 0 | T [V^{\mu}(x)V^{\nu}(0)^{\dagger} - A^{\mu}(x)A^{\nu}(0)^{\dagger}] | 0 >$$
(3)

with $V^{\mu} = \bar{u}\gamma^{\mu}d$ and $A^{\mu} = \bar{u}\gamma^{\mu}\gamma_5 d$, while $\frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im}\Pi_{V-A}(s) = \rho_{V-A}(s)$ is the difference of even- and odd-pion spectral densities, measured in τ decays.

Let us now remember that within SVZ approach [8] Π_{V-A} has the following theoretical expression:

$$\Pi_{V-A}(-Q^2) = -\frac{W_1}{Q^2} + \frac{W_2}{Q^4} + \frac{C^6 < O^6 >}{Q^6} + \frac{C^8 < O^8 >}{Q^8} + \dots$$
(4)

where by W_1 and W_2 we denote dimension 2 and 4 operators which vanish in the chiral limit, while $C^6 < O^6 >$ and $C^8 < O^8 >$ come from the four-quark operators of dimension 6 and 8. Note that pure perturbative contributions cancel in the difference of vector and axial vector operators (4).

Using the dispersion representation for $\Pi_{V-A}(Q^2)$ it is easy to obtain a set of finite energy sum rules:

$$W_1 = \int \rho_{V-A}(s) ds \tag{5}$$

$$W_2 = \int s\rho_{V-A}(s)ds \tag{6}$$

$$C^6 < O^6 >= -\int s^2 \rho_{V-A}(s) ds$$
 (7)

$$C^8 < O^8 >= \int s^3 \rho_{V-A}(s) ds \tag{8}$$

The first two of these equations coincide with the two Weinberg sum rules [1] while the last two are FESRs used for determining the corresponding condensates [4].

One can easily notice that (2) is essentially the combination of FESRs (5),(7) and (8) with the upper limit of integration substituted by M_{τ}^2 . We believe however that this substitution is numerically unimportant due to the vanishing of $\rho_{V-A}(s)$ at high s values and the double zero of the integration weight at $s = M_{\tau}^2$. Comparing (5),(7), (8) and (2) we find

$$R_{\tau,V-A} = 12\pi^2 |V_{ud}|^2 \left(\frac{W_1}{M_\tau^2} + \frac{3C^6 < O^6 >}{M_\tau^6} + \frac{2C^8 < O^8 >}{M_\tau^8}\right)$$
(9)

$$\approx \frac{36\pi^2}{M_{\tau}^6} C^6 < O^6 > (1 + \frac{2}{3M_{\tau}^2} \frac{C^8 < O^8 >}{C^6 < O^6 >}), \tag{10}$$

where the validity of the first Weinberg sum rule $W_1 = 0$ was implied. Note that the ratio $C^8 < O^8 > /C^6 < O^6 >$ is expected to be of order (-1) GeV^2 [8], [3], [4], so that the second term in brackets in (10) may be considered as a correction of order $-(20 \div 30)\%$. Hence, accurate measurement of (1) would mean a good estimate of the dimension 6 condensate, provided the spectral function fulfils the first Weinberg sum rule.

3. Let us now try to extract some information about the size of dimension 6 condensate corrections to the sum of τ decay widths into vector and axial vector Cabibbo allowed final states. Following ref. [6] we will decompose $R_{\tau,V}$ and $R_{\tau,A}$ in the following way:

$$R_{\tau,V/A} = \frac{3}{2} |V_{ud}|^2 \left(1 + \delta^0 + \delta^2 + \delta^4 + \delta^6_{V/A} + \delta^8_{V/A}\right),\tag{11}$$

where δ^0 stands for the perturbative correction, and δ^n represent cotributions of dimension *n* condensates. Note that corrections originating from operators of dimension 2 and 4 which are different for V and A channels, are expected to be small, vanishing in the chiral limit [6].

A commonly used parametrization for $\delta_{V/A}^6$ [9] incorporates the parameter ρ which a measure of the deviation from the vacuum saturation hypothesis:

$$\delta_{V/A}^6 \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 7\\-11 \end{pmatrix} \frac{256\pi^3}{27} \frac{\rho\alpha_s < \bar{\psi}\psi >^2}{M_\tau^6} \tag{12}$$

In this notation eq. (10) can be rewritten as

$$R_{\tau,V-A} = \frac{3}{2} |V_{ud}|^2 \left(\delta_{V-A}^6 + \delta_{V-A}^8\right) = \frac{3}{2} |V_{ud}|^2 \delta_{V-A}^6 \left[1 - (0.2 \div 0.3)\right], \quad (13)$$

where

$$\delta_{V-A}^{6} \simeq \frac{512\pi^{3}}{3} \frac{\rho \alpha_{s} < \bar{\psi}\psi >^{2}}{M_{\tau}^{6}},\tag{14}$$

and an estimate of δ_{V-A}^8 was substituted, as explained at the end of the previous section. From eqs. (13-14) one readily has:

$$\rho\alpha_s < \bar{\psi}\psi >^2 \approx \frac{M_\tau^6}{256\pi^3} \frac{1}{0.7 \div 0.8} R_{\tau,V-A} = (5.2 \pm 0.5) \cdot 10^{-3} \, GeV^6 \cdot R_{\tau,V-A}.$$
(15)

On the other hand, if one assumes the universality of the ρ parameter for different four-quark condensates, then the dimension 6 correction to the total hadronic width of the τ , $\delta^6 \equiv (\delta_V^6 + \delta_A^6)/2$, can also be expressed through $R_{\tau,V-A}$ using eqs. (12-14):

$$\delta^{6} \simeq -\frac{512\pi^{3}}{27} \frac{\rho \alpha_{s} < \bar{\psi}\psi >^{2}}{M_{\tau}^{6}} \\ \approx (-\frac{2}{27}) \frac{1}{0.7 \div 0.8} R_{\tau,V-A} \approx (-0.10 \pm 0.01) R_{\tau,V-A}$$
(16)

Note that the errors quoted in (15) and (16) account only for the uncertainty in δ_{V-A}^8 , which was assumed to be around $\pm 30 \div 40\%$. This shows that eqs. (15) and (16) are not too sensitive to the above assumption.

4. Recently ALEPH collaboration has published a complete set of measured branching ratios of τ decays into h, $h\pi^0$, $h2\pi^0$, 3h, $h3\pi^0$, $3h\pi^0$ final states [10]. Naive substitution into (1) with summing up the errors in quadrature yields:

$$R^{exp}_{\tau,V-A} = 0.022 \pm 0.083. \tag{17}$$

Eqs. (15) and (16) then give:

$$\rho \alpha_s < \bar{\psi} \psi >^2 = (1.1 \pm 4.0) \cdot 10^{-4} \, GeV^6, \tag{18}$$

$$\delta^6 = (-2.2 \pm 8.3) \cdot 10^{-3},\tag{19}$$

which should be compared to the values used in the analysis [6]:

$$\rho \alpha_s < \bar{\psi} \psi >^2 = (3.8 \pm 2.0) \cdot 10^{-4} \, GeV^6, \tag{20}$$

$$\delta^6 = (-7 \pm 4) \cdot 10^{-3},\tag{21}$$

We must admit that the experimental value (17) should not be taken too seriously for two reasons: first, no charged $\pi - K$ separation was attempted in the experiment [10]; secondly, when summing up the errors in quadrature we have neglected obviously strong correlations between various decay rates. Still, we believe that future measurements will improve the situation. With the substantial increase in statistics one may expect dramatic improvements in the accuracies of the measured branching fractions of the τ hadronic decays, and a dedicated study of the *difference* of branching ratios (1) might result in the error in $R_{\tau,V-A}$ as good as 0.01, thus making our formulas (15) and (16) quite useful.

At the same time it would be highly important to measure accurately the spectral function $\rho_{V-A}(s)$, check the validity of Weinberg sum rules, and estimate dimension 6 and 8 condensates using some other techniques like Finite Energy or Borel-transformed sum rules. All this could be a good self-consistency check for both theory and experiment.

References

- [1] S.Weinberg, Phys.Rev.Lett. 18 (1967) 507.
- [2] T.Das, V.S.Mathur and S.Okubo, Phys.Rev.Lett. 19 (1967) 859.
 A.I.Vainshtein, JETP Lett. 6 (1967) 815; 7 (1967) 81 (E).
 T.Das et al., Phys.Rev.Lett. 18 (1967) 759.
- [3] V.G.Kartvelishvili and M.V.Margvelashvili, Yad.Fiz. 52 (1990).
- [4] V.G.Kartvelishvili and M.V.Margvelashvili, Z.Phys. C 55, 83 (1992).
- [5] V.G.Kartvelishvili, Phys.Lett. B 287 (1992) 159.
- [6] E.Braaten, S.Narison and A.Pich, Nucl. Phys. B 373 (1992) 581.
- [7] E.G.Floratos, S.Narison and E.de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B155 (1979) 115.
- [8] M.A.Shifman, A.I.Vainshtein and V.I.Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. B147, 385 (1979).
- [9] C.A.Dominguez and J.Sola, Z.Phys.C 40 (1988) 63.
- [10] ALEPH Collab. Busculic et al., Phys.Lett. B 307 (1993) 209.