

# CHIRAL PERTURBATION THEORY\*

G. Ecker  
Institut für Theoretische Physik  
Universität Wien  
Boltzmanngasse 5, A-1090 Wien, Austria

## Abstract

The main elements and methods of chiral perturbation theory, the effective field theory of the Standard Model below the scale of spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking, are summarized. Applications to the interactions of mesons and baryons at low energies are reviewed, with special emphasis on developments of the last three years. Among the topics covered are the strong, electromagnetic and semileptonic weak interactions of mesons at and beyond next-to-leading order in the chiral expansion, nonleptonic weak interactions of mesons, virtual photon corrections and the meson-baryon system. The discussion is limited to processes at zero temperature, for infinite volume and with at most one baryon.

To appear in  
Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics, Vol. 35  
Pergamon Press, Oxford

\* Work supported in part by FWF (Austria), Project No. P09505-PHY and by HCM, EEC-Contract No. CHRX-CT920026 (EURODAΦNE)

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>EFFECTIVE FIELD THEORIES</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>CHIRAL SYMMETRY</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Nonlinear realization . . . . .	5
2.2	Chiral symmetry breaking interactions . . . . .	8
2.3	Effective chiral Lagrangians of lowest order . . . . .	10
2.3.1	Strong interactions of mesons . . . . .	11
2.3.2	Strong interactions of mesons and baryons . . . . .	12
2.3.3	Nonleptonic weak interactions of mesons . . . . .	12
2.3.4	Mesons and virtual photons . . . . .	13
2.4	Generalized CHPT . . . . .	13
2.5	Generating functional of Green functions . . . . .	16
<b>3</b>	<b>STRONG INTERACTIONS OF MESONS</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1	Generating functional of $O(p^4)$ . . . . .	18
3.2	Low-energy constants of $O(p^4)$ . . . . .	20
3.3	Light quark masses . . . . .	23
3.4	Odd-intrinsic-parity sector . . . . .	25
3.5	Phenomenology at next-to-leading order . . . . .	27
3.5.1	$\pi\pi$ scattering . . . . .	27
3.5.2	Semileptonic $K$ decays . . . . .	30
3.5.3	The decays $P \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ ( $P = \pi^0, \eta, K^0$ ; $\ell = e, \mu$ ) . . . . .	32
3.5.4	$\eta$ decays . . . . .	33
<b>4</b>	<b>NONLEPTONIC WEAK INTERACTIONS OF MESONS</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1	Generating functional of $O(G_F p^4)$ . . . . .	35
4.2	Low-energy constants of $O(G_F p^4)$ . . . . .	36
4.3	$K \rightarrow 2\pi, 3\pi$ . . . . .	37
4.4	Chiral anomaly in nonleptonic kaon decays . . . . .	39
4.5	Radiative kaon decays . . . . .	40
<b>5</b>	<b>CHPT BEYOND NEXT-TO-LEADING ORDER</b>	<b>42</b>
5.1	Generating functional of $O(p^6)$ . . . . .	42
5.2	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ . . . . .	45
5.3	Phenomenology beyond next-to-leading order . . . . .	47
<b>6</b>	<b>MESONS AND VIRTUAL PHOTONS</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1	Generating functional of $O(e^2 p^2)$ . . . . .	51
6.2	Applications . . . . .	53
6.2.1	Meson masses . . . . .	53
6.2.2	$P_{l3}$ form factors . . . . .	54
<b>7</b>	<b>CHPT WITH BARYONS</b>	<b>56</b>
7.1	Relativistic formulation . . . . .	56
7.2	Heavy baryon CHPT . . . . .	57
7.3	Renormalization to $O(p^3)$ . . . . .	61
7.4	Pion-nucleon scattering . . . . .	64

7.5	Photo–nucleon reactions . . . . .	67
7.6	Chiral $SU(3)$ . . . . .	72
	<b>References</b>	<b>76</b>

## 1 EFFECTIVE FIELD THEORIES

Effective field theories have become valuable tools in many branches of physics, in particular in particle and nuclear physics. The notion of effective field theories seems to suggest a basic difference to fundamental field theories. In the same spirit, a distinction is often made between (fundamental) renormalizable and (effective) non–renormalizable quantum field theories. These traditional discriminations tend to mask the common features. Firstly, all known quantum field theories of particle and nuclear physics are probably effective field theories in the sense that they are low–energy approximations of some underlying, more “fundamental” theories. Secondly, all quantum field theories in four space–time dimensions have to be renormalized, whether they be renormalizable or non–renormalizable in the standard terminology. The renormalization procedure transfers the unknown structure of the theory at short distances (high energies) to a few low–energy constants (LECs). As long as we are only interested in phenomena at comparatively low energies, all the short–distance structure is encoded in those LECs.

Although all quantum field theories have to be renormalized, they differ in their sensitivity to the high–energy structure of the underlying theory. It is convenient to distinguish between two categories of quantum field theories.

### i. Asymptotically free theories

These ultraviolet stable theories are the only candidates for truly fundamental quantum field theories. Nothing in their structure indicates a limiting energy beyond which they can no more be applied. Most likely, they are also the only ones that can be defined by constructive quantum field theory in a mathematically complete way (Balaban, 1987, 1988, 1989).

### ii. Ultraviolet unstable theories

Such theories contain information about their limited validity. This information may be of little practical use as for QED where the limiting energy is much higher than the scale where QED is embedded in a more fundamental theory, the Standard Model (Glashow, 1961; Weinberg, 1967; Salam, 1968). The information may be of phenomenological relevance as for the Higgs sector of the Standard Model: the mathematical concept of “triviality” becomes physical reality by yielding an upper limit for the Higgs mass. The non–renormalizable theories belong to this category. They differ from the renormalizable members of this class only insofar as the loop expansion produces new LECs at every order. The limitation of these theories to the low–energy domain is more manifest than for the renormalizable ones, but in principle similar. It probably does not even make sense to construct ultraviolet unstable theories in axiomatic field theory. They have to be modified at short distances both for physical and for mathematical reasons. Nevertheless, it is both useful and mathematically well defined to treat them in perturbation theory as long as one is sufficiently below the problematic scale. The convergence of the perturbation expansion is physically irrelevant. The real issue is how well the asymptotic expansion works at low energies.

Effective field theories are the quantum field theoretical implementation of the quantum ladder. As the energy increases and smaller distances are probed, new degrees of freedom become relevant

that must be included in the theory. At the same time, other fields may lose their status of fundamental fields as the corresponding states are recognized as bound states of the new degrees of freedom. Conversely, as the energy is lowered, some degrees of freedom are frozen out and disappear from the accessible spectrum of states. To model the effective field theory at low energies, we rely especially on the symmetries of the “fundamental” underlying theory, in addition to the usual axioms of quantum field theory embodied in an effective Lagrangian. This Lagrangian must contain *all* terms allowed by the symmetries of the fundamental theory for the given set of fields (Weinberg, 1979). This completeness guarantees that the effective theory is indeed the low-energy limit of the fundamental theory.

One can distinguish two kinds of effective field theories.

## A. Decoupling effective field theories

For energies below a certain scale  $\Lambda$ , all heavy (with respect to  $\Lambda$ ) degrees of freedom are integrated out leaving only the light degrees of freedom in the effective theory. No light particles are generated in the transition from the fundamental to the effective level. The effective Lagrangian has the general form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_{d \leq 4} + \sum_{d > 4} \frac{1}{\Lambda^{d-4}} \sum_{i_d} g_{i_d} O_{i_d} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}_{d \leq 4}$  contains the potentially renormalizable terms with operator dimension  $d \leq 4$ , the  $g_{i_d}$  are dimensionless coupling constants expected to be of  $O(1)$ , and the  $O_{i_d}$  are monomials in the light fields with operator dimension  $d$ . At energies much below  $\Lambda$ , corrections due to the non-renormalizable parts ( $d > 4$ ) are suppressed by powers of  $E/\Lambda$ . For  $E/\Lambda$  small enough,  $\mathcal{L}_{d \leq 4}$  can be regarded as the “fundamental” Lagrangian at low energies. There are many examples of this type: QED for  $E \ll m_e$  (Euler, 1936; Heisenberg and Euler, 1936), the Fermi theory of weak interactions for  $E \ll M_W$  and, although we do not know the relevant scale in this case, the Standard Model itself. There are many candidates for an underlying theory at smaller distances (composite Higgs, SUSY, grand unification, superstrings, ...). With the exception of the Higgs sector, the Standard Model does not provide any clues for the scale  $\Lambda$ . There is also no experimental evidence for terms in the effective Lagrangian with  $d > 4$ .

## B. Non-decoupling effective field theories

The transition from the fundamental to the effective level occurs through a phase transition via the spontaneous breakdown of a symmetry generating light ( $M \ll \Lambda$ ) pseudo-Goldstone bosons. Since a spontaneously broken symmetry relates processes with different numbers of Goldstone bosons, the distinction between renormalizable ( $d \leq 4$ ) and non-renormalizable ( $d > 4$ ) parts in the effective Lagrangian like in (1.1) becomes meaningless in general. With some exceptions (see Sect. 2.1), the effective Lagrangian of a non-decoupling theory is generically non-renormalizable. Nevertheless, as already emphasized, such Lagrangians define perfectly consistent quantum field theories at sufficiently low energies. Instead of the operator dimension as in (1.1), the number of derivatives of the fields distinguishes successive terms in the Lagrangian.

The general structure of effective Lagrangians with spontaneously broken symmetries is largely independent of the specific physical realization. This is exemplified by two examples in particle physics, but there are many more in condensed matter physics (Leutwyler, 1994b; Fradkin, 1991).

### a. The Standard Model without Higgs bosons

Even if there is no fundamental Higgs boson, the gauge symmetry  $SU(2) \times U(1)$  can be spontaneously broken to  $U(1)_{\text{em}}$  (heavy-Higgs scenario). As a manifestation of the universality

of Goldstone boson interactions, the scattering of longitudinal gauge vector bosons is in first approximation analogous to  $\pi\pi$  scattering.

**b. The Standard Model for  $E \ll 1$  GeV**

At low energies, the relevant degrees of freedom of the Standard Model are not quarks and gluons, but the pseudoscalar mesons and other hadrons. The pseudoscalar mesons play a special role as the pseudo-Goldstone bosons of spontaneously broken chiral symmetry. The Standard Model in the hadronic sector at low energies is described by a non-decoupling effective theory called chiral perturbation theory (CHPT).

The similarities in these two examples are evident. Although the renormalizable Higgs model is a part of the Standard Model, nature has made a different choice in the low-energy realization of the Standard Model. The analogue of the Higgs model, the linear sigma model, is known to be only a toy model that cannot be regarded as the effective theory of QCD at low energies. As will be discussed in Sect. 2, the constraints of renormalizability are too restrictive for a realistic low-energy approximation of QCD.

As the effective field theory of the Standard Model at low energies, CHPT is becoming the common language of nuclear and low-energy particle physics. Following Weinberg (1990, 1991), CHPT is now also used in such genuine nuclear domains as the nucleon-nucleon force where the traditional potential approach is being merged with concepts of effective field theory. Except for a brief excursion in Sect. 7, this review covers applications of CHPT to low-energy reactions of mesons and baryons with at most one incoming and one outgoing baryon (at temperature  $T = 0$  and for infinite volume). In Sect. 2, the basic elements of chiral symmetry and its spontaneous breaking are put together. The lowest-order Lagrangians are listed for all those sectors that will be covered in this review. Generalized CHPT is contrasted with the standard approach. The strong, electromagnetic and semileptonic weak interactions to  $O(p^4)$  in the chiral expansion are the subject of Sect. 3. Among the topics considered are the values of the light quark masses, the values and the interpretation of the LECs of  $O(p^4)$  and the odd-intrinsic-parity sector. Recent phenomenological applications to pion-pion scattering, semileptonic kaon decays, meson decays to a lepton pair and  $\eta$  decays are reviewed. The nonleptonic weak interactions are treated in Sect. 4. To  $O(p^4)$ , both the dominant kaon decay modes to pions as well as the large class of radiative nonleptonic decays are discussed. The manifestation of the chiral anomaly in the nonleptonic weak sector is examined. Sect. 5 summarizes recent and ongoing work beyond next-to-leading order in the meson sector. The calculation of the generating functional of  $O(p^6)$  is outlined, in particular the two-loop diagrams appearing at that order. In addition to the recent complete  $O(p^6)$  calculation of  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ , attempts to determine the dominant higher-order corrections for the decay  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$  are also discussed. Recent work on virtual photons in the mesonic sector is described in Sect. 6. Applications include electromagnetic corrections to meson masses and isospin violating transitions like semileptonic  $\eta$  decays. Finally, Sect. 7 tries to summarize the large body of work that has been done in the meson-baryon system during recent years. On the theoretical side, the heavy baryon approach to CHPT and the renormalization of the generating functional to  $O(p^3)$  are discussed. Most of the detailed work in this sector has been done in the framework of chiral  $SU(2)$ , e.g., in pion-nucleon scattering and in the prospering field of photo-nucleon reactions. The three-flavour meson-baryon sector [chiral  $SU(3)$ ] is also considered where most investigations have concentrated on the leading non-analytic chiral corrections.

The purpose of this review is to give a self-contained introduction to the methods and a summary of recent applications of CHPT. Concerning the applications, the main emphasis will be on developments of the last three years till the end of 1994. More material, both on the foundations and methods as well as on applications of CHPT, can be found in the following books, reviews,

lecture notes and proceedings of specialized workshops and conferences: Bernstein and Holstein (1995), de Rafael (1995), Maiani et al. (1995, 1992), Leutwyler (1994d, 1993, 1991), Ecker (1994a, 1993a), Meißner (1994c, 1993, 1992), Bijnsens (1993a), Pich (1993), Donoghue et al. (1992a), Gasser (1990), Georgi (1984).

## 2 CHIRAL SYMMETRY

### 2.1 Nonlinear realization

The QCD Lagrangian with  $N_f$  ( $N_f = 2$  or  $3$ ) massless quarks  $q = (u, d, \dots)$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}^0 &= \bar{q}i\gamma^\mu \left( \partial_\mu + ig_s \frac{\lambda_\alpha}{2} G_\mu^\alpha \right) q - \frac{1}{4} G_{\mu\nu}^\alpha G^{\alpha\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{heavy quarks}} \\ &= \bar{q}_L i \not{D} q_L + \bar{q}_R i \not{D} q_R - \frac{1}{4} G_{\mu\nu}^\alpha G^{\alpha\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{heavy quarks}} \\ q_{R,L} &= \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \gamma_5)q\end{aligned}\tag{2.1}$$

has a global symmetry

$$\underbrace{SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R}_{\text{chiral group } G} \times U(1)_V \times U(1)_A .$$

At the effective hadronic level, the quark number symmetry  $U(1)_V$  is realized as baryon number. The axial  $U(1)_A$  is not a symmetry at the quantum level due to the Abelian anomaly ('t Hooft, 1976; Callan et al., 1976; Crewther, 1977). The Noether currents of the chiral group  $G$  are

$$J_A^{a\mu} = \bar{q}_A \gamma^\mu \frac{\lambda_a}{2} q_A \quad (A = L, R ; a = 1, \dots, N_f^2 - 1)\tag{2.2}$$

with associated Noether charges

$$Q_A^a = \int d^3x J_A^{a0} .\tag{2.3}$$

A classical symmetry can be realized in quantum field theory in two different ways depending on how the vacuum responds to a symmetry transformation. All theoretical and phenomenological evidence suggests that the chiral group  $G$  is spontaneously broken to the vectorial subgroup  $SU(N_f)_V$ . The axial generators of  $G$  are non-linearly realized and there are  $N_f^2 - 1$  massless pseudoscalar Goldstone bosons (Goldstone, 1961). There is a well-known procedure (Coleman et al., 1969; Callan et al., 1969) how to realize a spontaneously broken symmetry on quantum fields. In the special case of chiral symmetry with its parity transformation, the Goldstone fields can be collected in a unitary matrix field  $U(\varphi)$  transforming as

$$U(\varphi) \xrightarrow{G} g_R U(\varphi) g_L^{-1} , \quad (g_L, g_R) \in G\tag{2.4}$$

under chiral rotations. There are different parametrizations of  $U(\varphi)$  corresponding to different choices of coordinates for the chiral coset space  $SU(N_f)_L \times SU(N_f)_R / SU(N_f)_V$ . A convenient choice is the exponential parametrization (for  $N_f = 3$ )

$$U(\varphi) = \exp(i\lambda_a \varphi^a / F) , \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \lambda_a \varphi^a = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta_8}{\sqrt{6}} & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & -\frac{\pi^0}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\eta_8}{\sqrt{6}} & K^0 \\ K^- & \bar{K}^0 & -\frac{2\eta_8}{\sqrt{6}} \end{pmatrix} ,\tag{2.5}$$

where  $F$  will turn out to be the meson decay constant in the chiral limit.

A more basic quantity from a geometrical point of view is another matrix field  $u(\varphi)$ , the square root of  $U(\varphi)$  with the standard choice of coset coordinates. Its chiral transformation

$$u(\varphi) \xrightarrow{G} g_R u(\varphi) h(g, \varphi)^{-1} = h(g, \varphi) u(\varphi) g_L^{-1} \quad (2.6)$$

introduces the so-called compensator field  $h(g, \varphi)$  representing an element of the conserved subgroup  $SU(N_f)_V$ . For  $g \in SU(N_f)_V$ , i.e. for  $g_L = g_R$ , the compensator  $h(g)$  is a usual unitary representation matrix, independent of the Goldstone fields  $\varphi$  (linear representation à la Wigner–Weyl). For a proper chiral transformation ( $g_L \neq g_R$ ), on the other hand,  $h(g, \varphi)$  does depend on  $\varphi$  (non-linear realization à la Nambu–Goldstone).

It is instructive to see the abstract quantities introduced above emerge naturally in a specific example. The simplest such example is the linear  $\sigma$ -model (Schwinger, 1957; Gell-Mann and Lévy, 1960). It is a seeming counterexample to the classification of Sect. 1 because it is a renormalizable quantum field theory describing the spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry. Rewriting it in the form of a non-decoupling effective field theory will bring the ingredients of spontaneously broken chiral symmetry to the surface. The exercise will also demonstrate the price of renormalizability: although it has the right symmetries by construction, the linear  $\sigma$ -model is not general enough to describe the real world (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1984). It serves the purpose of a toy model, but it should not be mistaken for the effective field theory of QCD at low energies.

We rewrite the  $\sigma$ -model Lagrangian for the pion–nucleon system

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\mu \sigma \partial^\mu \sigma + \partial_\mu \vec{\pi} \partial^\mu \vec{\pi}) - \frac{\lambda}{4} (\sigma^2 + \vec{\pi}^2 - v^2)^2 + \bar{\psi} i \not{\partial} \psi - g \bar{\psi} (\sigma + i \vec{\tau} \vec{\pi} \gamma_5) \psi \quad (2.7)$$

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ n \end{pmatrix}$$

in the form

$$\mathcal{L}_\sigma = \frac{1}{4} \langle \partial_\mu \Sigma \partial^\mu \Sigma \rangle - \frac{\lambda}{16} (\langle \Sigma^\dagger \Sigma \rangle - 2v^2)^2 + \bar{\psi}_L i \not{\partial} \psi_L + \bar{\psi}_R i \not{\partial} \psi_R - g \bar{\psi}_R \Sigma \psi_L - g \bar{\psi}_L \Sigma^\dagger \psi_R \quad (2.8)$$

$$\Sigma = \sigma \mathbf{1} - i \vec{\tau} \vec{\pi} , \quad \langle A \rangle = \text{tr} A$$

to exhibit the chiral symmetry  $G = SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ :

$$\psi_A \xrightarrow{G} g_A \psi_A , \quad g_A \in SU(2)_A \quad (A = L, R) , \quad \Sigma \xrightarrow{G} g_R \Sigma g_L^{-1} .$$

For  $v^2 > 0$ , the chiral symmetry is spontaneously broken and the “physical” fields are the massive field  $\hat{\sigma} = \sigma - v$  and the Goldstone fields  $\vec{\pi}$ . The Lagrangian with its non-derivative couplings for the fields  $\vec{\pi}$  seems to be at variance with the Goldstone theorem predicting a vanishing amplitude whenever the momentum of a Goldstone boson goes to zero.

In order to make the Goldstone theorem manifest in the Lagrangian, we perform a field transformation from the original fields  $\psi$ ,  $\sigma$ ,  $\vec{\pi}$  to a new set  $\Psi$ ,  $S$ ,  $\vec{\varphi}$  through a polar decomposition of the matrix field  $\Sigma$ :

$$\Sigma = (v + S)U(\varphi) , \quad \Psi_L = u\psi_L , \quad \Psi_R = u^\dagger\psi_R \quad (2.9)$$

$$S^\dagger = S , \quad U^\dagger = U^{-1} , \quad \det U = 1 , \quad U = u^2 .$$

From the chiral transformation properties of the coset elements  $u(\varphi)$  in (2.6) one finds

$$U \xrightarrow{G} g_R U g_L^{-1} , \quad S \xrightarrow{G} S , \quad \Psi_A \xrightarrow{G} h(g, \varphi) \Psi_A \quad (A = L, R) . \quad (2.10)$$

In the new fields, the  $\sigma$ -model Lagrangian (2.7) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \frac{v^2}{4} \left(1 + \frac{S}{v}\right)^2 \langle u_\mu u^\mu \rangle \\ &+ \bar{\Psi} i \not{\nabla} \Psi + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\Psi} \not{\gamma}_5 \Psi - g(v + S) \bar{\Psi} \Psi + \dots\end{aligned}\quad (2.11)$$

with a covariant derivative  $\nabla = \partial + \Gamma$  and

$$\begin{aligned}u_\mu(\varphi) &= i(u^\dagger \partial_\mu u - u \partial_\mu u^\dagger) = iu^\dagger \partial_\mu U u^\dagger \\ \Gamma_\mu(\varphi) &= \frac{1}{2}(u^\dagger \partial_\mu u + u \partial_\mu u^\dagger) .\end{aligned}\quad (2.12)$$

The Lagrangian (2.11) allows a clear separation between the model independent Goldstone boson interactions induced by spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking and the model dependent part involving the scalar field  $S$  [the kinetic term and the self-couplings of the scalar field are omitted in (2.11)].

We can draw the following conclusions:

- i. The Goldstone theorem is now manifest at the Lagrangian level: the Goldstone bosons  $\vec{\varphi}$  contained in the matrix fields  $u_\mu(\varphi)$ ,  $\Gamma_\mu(\varphi)$  have derivative couplings only.
- ii. S-matrix elements are unchanged under the field transformation (2.9), but the Green functions are very different. For instance, in the pseudoscalar meson sector the field  $S$  does not contribute at all at lowest order,  $O(p^2)$ , whereas  $\hat{\sigma}$  exchange is essential to repair the damage done by the non-derivative couplings of the  $\vec{\pi}$ .
- iii. The manifest renormalizability of the Lagrangian (2.7) has been traded for the manifest chiral structure of (2.11). Of course, the Lagrangian (2.11) is still renormalizable, but this renormalizability has its price. It requires specific relations between various couplings that have nothing to do with chiral symmetry and, which is worse, are not in agreement with experiment. For instance, the model contains the Goldberger-Treiman relation (Goldberger and Treiman, 1958) in the form ( $m$  is the nucleon mass)

$$m = gv \equiv g_{\pi NN} F_\pi . \quad (2.13)$$

Thus, instead of the physical value  $g_A = 1.26$  for the axial-vector coupling constant  $g_A$  the model has  $g_A = 1$  [compare with the CHPT Lagrangian (2.36) in Sect. 2.3]. As already emphasized, the problems with the linear  $\sigma$ -model are even more severe in the meson sector (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1984).

- iv. The transformation of the linear into the nonlinear  $\sigma$ -model is also a manifestation of the universality of the lowest-order effective Lagrangian for Goldstone fields. Every spontaneously broken symmetry of a Poincaré invariant quantum field theory will give rise to a nonlinear  $\sigma$ -model for the interaction of Goldstone bosons at lowest order. At this order, the only difference between different physical realizations is the value of the low-energy constant (LEC)  $F$  ( $F = v$  in the linear  $\sigma$ -model) defined by the Goldstone matrix elements

$$\langle 0 | J_\mu^a(0) | \varphi^b(p) \rangle = i \delta_{ab} F p_\mu \quad (2.14)$$

for the spontaneously broken currents  $J_\mu^a$  and corresponding Goldstone bosons  $\varphi^a$ . The situation is a little different in non-relativistic quantum field theories (Leutwyler, 1994b; Fradkin, 1991).



## 2.2 Chiral symmetry breaking interactions

The Lagrangian of the Standard Model is not chiral invariant. The chiral symmetry of the strong interactions is broken by the electroweak interactions generating in particular non-zero quark masses. The basic assumption of CHPT is that the chiral limit constitutes a realistic starting point for a systematic expansion in chiral symmetry breaking interactions.

It is necessary to distinguish between external and dynamical fields. External fields do not propagate. They are introduced in the CHPT framework to generate Green functions of quark currents. Following Gasser and Leutwyler (1984, 1985a), we extend the chiral invariant QCD Lagrangian (2.1) by coupling the quarks to external hermitian matrix fields  $v_\mu, a_\mu, s, p$ :

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}^0 + \bar{q}\gamma^\mu(v_\mu + a_\mu\gamma_5)q - \bar{q}(s - ip\gamma_5)q . \quad (2.15)$$

The external field method has two major advantages:

- i. External photons and  $W$  boson fields are among the gauge fields  $v_\mu, a_\mu$  ( $N_f = 3$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} r_\mu = v_\mu + a_\mu &= -eQA_\mu^{\text{ext}} + \dots \\ l_\mu = v_\mu - a_\mu &= -eQA_\mu^{\text{ext}} - \frac{e}{\sqrt{2}\sin\theta_W}(W_\mu^{\text{ext},+}T_+ + \text{h.c.}) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

$$Q = \frac{1}{3}\text{diag}(2, -1, -1), \quad T_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V_{ud} & V_{us} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} .$$

$Q$  is the quark charge matrix and the  $V_{ij}$  are Kobayashi–Maskawa mixing matrix elements. Green functions for electromagnetic and semileptonic weak currents can be obtained as functional derivatives of a generating functional  $Z[v, a, s, p]$  (cf. Sect. 2.5) with respect to external photon and  $W$  boson fields.

- ii. The scalar and pseudoscalar fields  $s, p$  give rise to Green functions of (pseudo)scalar quark currents, but they also provide a very convenient way of incorporating explicit chiral symmetry breaking through the quark masses. The physically interesting Green functions are functional derivatives of the generating functional  $Z[v, a, s, p]$  at

$$v_\mu = a_\mu = p = 0$$

and

$$s = \mathcal{M}_q = \text{diag}(m_u, m_d, \dots) . \quad (2.17)$$

The practical advantage is that  $Z[v, a, s, p]$  can be calculated in a manifestly chiral invariant way. The actual Green functions with broken chiral symmetry are then obtained by taking appropriate functional derivatives.

Inclusion of external fields promotes the global chiral symmetry  $G$  to a local one:

$$\begin{aligned} q &\xrightarrow{G} g_R \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_5)q + g_L \frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma_5)q \\ r_\mu &\xrightarrow{G} g_R r_\mu g_R^{-1} + i g_R \partial_\mu g_R^{-1} \\ l_\mu &\xrightarrow{G} g_L l_\mu g_L^{-1} + i g_L \partial_\mu g_L^{-1} \\ s + ip &\xrightarrow{G} g_R(s + ip)g_L^{-1} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

The local nature of  $G$  requires the introduction of a covariant derivative

$$D_\mu U = \partial_\mu U - ir_\mu U + iU l_\mu, \quad D_\mu U \xrightarrow{G} g_R D_\mu U g_L^{-1}, \quad (2.19)$$

and of associated non-Abelian field strength tensors

$$\begin{aligned} F_R^{\mu\nu} &= \partial^\mu r^\nu - \partial^\nu r^\mu - i[r^\mu, r^\nu] \\ F_L^{\mu\nu} &= \partial^\mu l^\nu - \partial^\nu l^\mu - i[l^\mu, l^\nu]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

External fields do not have kinetic parts. Consequently, the external gauge fields are not affected by the spontaneous breakdown of  $G$ . On the fundamental level, the electroweak gauge symmetry is broken in two steps, at the Fermi scale and at the chiral symmetry breaking scale. Thus, there is in principle a small mixing between  $\bar{q}q$  and whichever fields are responsible for the electroweak breaking at the Fermi scale (Higgs, technicolour, ...). Via the Higgs–Kibble mechanism, three of those states become the longitudinal components of  $W$  and  $Z$  bosons. Here, we are only interested in the light orthogonal states, the pseudoscalar pseudo-Goldstone bosons.

Green functions of electromagnetic and semileptonic weak currents appear in physical amplitudes with either real photons (radiative transitions) or virtual photons and  $W$  bosons coupling to lepton pairs (electromagnetic form factors, lepton pair production, semileptonic weak interactions). Although introduced as non-propagating external fields, the gauge fields  $A_\mu^{\text{ext}}$ ,  $W_\mu^{\text{ext}}$  may also be viewed as dynamical fields in these cases turning into real photons or lepton pairs.

The situation is very much different if the gauge fields connect hadronic degrees of freedom. In this case, the strong interactions cannot be disentangled from the electroweak interactions any more. In other words, Green functions of quark currents are not sufficient to describe the nonleptonic weak interactions or virtual photons. Consider as a specific example the nonleptonic weak decay  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$ . As indicated in Fig. 2.1, the decay amplitude is not just given by the  $1W$ -reducible contribution on the right-hand side. The hadrons on both sides of the  $W$  interact strongly with each other. At the low energies relevant for CHPT, the correct procedure is to first integrate out the  $W$  together with the heavy quarks to arrive at an effective Hamiltonian already at the quark level (Gilman and Wise, 1979):

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\Delta S=1} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{ud} V_{us}^* \sum_i C_i(\mu) Q_i + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.21)$$

The  $C_i(\mu)$  are Wilson coefficients depending on the QCD renormalization scale  $\mu$ . The  $Q_i$  are local four-quark operators if we limit the operator product expansion (2.21) to the leading  $d = 6$  operators. For the effective realization at the hadronic level, the explicit form of the  $Q_i$  (or of the Wilson coefficients) is of no concern. All that is needed is the transformation property of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\Delta S=1}$  under chiral rotations:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\Delta S=1} \sim (8_L, 1_R) + (27_L, 1_R). \quad (2.22)$$

In order to calculate Green functions with a single insertion of (2.21), one introduces two spurion fields that transform contragrediently to the two pieces in (2.22). In particular, the octet spurion field  $\lambda(x)$  transforms as

$$\lambda(x) \xrightarrow{G} g_L \lambda(x) g_L^{-1}. \quad (2.23)$$

Since we are only interested in weak amplitudes to first order in  $G_F$ , the effective chiral Lagrangian for the nonleptonic weak interaction will be constructed as the most general chiral invariant Lagrangian linear in  $\lambda(x)$  (and in the corresponding 27-plet spurion field). Setting  $\lambda(x)$  equal to the constant value

$$\lambda(x) = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_6 - i\lambda_7) \quad (2.24)$$




Figure 2.1: The nonleptonic  $K \rightarrow 3\pi$  amplitude cannot be obtained from a contraction of two semileptonic Green functions.

projects out the octet part of the  $\Delta S = 1$  nonleptonic weak interaction (and similarly for the 27-plet).

Unlike for the massive  $W$  boson, integrating out the (massless) photons cannot just be described by a local operator at low energies. In a first step, the electromagnetic field is made dynamical by including the appropriate kinetic term and by enlarging the external vector field  $v_\mu$  [cf. Eq. (2.16)]:

$$v_\mu \rightarrow v_\mu - eQA_\mu . \quad (2.25)$$

CHPT then generates automatically all diagrams with virtual (and real) photons. However, this cannot be the whole story. For instance, loop diagrams with virtual photons will in general be divergent requiring appropriate local counterterms. Restricting attention to single-photon exchange, one must therefore add the most general chiral Lagrangian of  $O(e^2)$  that transforms as the product of two electromagnetic currents under chiral rotations. For  $N_f = 3$ , the electromagnetic current is pure octet. The relevant chiral Lagrangian for virtual photons is, in addition to the replacement (2.25), given by the most general chiral invariant Lagrangian that is bilinear in the spurion fields  $Q_L(x), Q_R(x)$  with transformation properties

$$Q_A(x) \xrightarrow{G} g_A Q_A(x) g_A^{-1}, \quad A = L, R . \quad (2.26)$$

Identifying the spurion fields with the quark charge matrix,

$$Q_A(x) = Q = \text{diag}(2/3, -1/3, -1/3) , \quad (2.27)$$

gives rise to the effective chiral Lagrangian of  $O(e^2)$  with the correct transformation properties.

For the remainder of this review, the spurion fields will not appear as explicit fields anymore, but will be set equal to their constant values. The spurion notation can always be reintroduced to check the proper chiral behaviour of the various effective Lagrangians.

### 2.3 Effective chiral Lagrangians of lowest order

CHPT is the low-energy effective field theory of the Standard Model. The chiral Lagrangians are organized in a derivative expansion based on the chiral counting rules

$$\begin{array}{ll} U & O(p^0) \\ D_\mu U, v_\mu, a_\mu & O(p) \\ F_{L,R}^{\mu\nu} & O(p^2) . \end{array} \quad (2.28)$$

The baryon and the spurion fields have zero chiral dimension. CHPT is also an expansion in quark masses around the chiral limit. In principle, one can formulate CHPT as an independent expansion in both derivatives and quark masses (cf. Sect. 2.4). It is convenient, however, to combine these two expansions in a single one by making use of the relations between meson and quark masses. Standard CHPT is defined by the simplest choice corresponding to the counting rule [see Eq. (2.32) below]

$$s, p \qquad \qquad \qquad O(p^2) \qquad \qquad \qquad (2.29)$$

for the scalar and pseudoscalar external fields. The more general framework of Generalized CHPT (Fuchs et al., 1991; Stern et al., 1993; Knecht et al., 1993) will be discussed in Sect. 2.4.

### 2.3.1 Strong interactions of mesons

The locally chiral invariant Lagrangian of lowest order describing the strong, electromagnetic and semileptonic weak interactions of mesons is given by (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1984, 1985a)

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \frac{F^2}{4} \langle D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger + \chi U^\dagger + \chi^\dagger U \rangle, \quad \chi = 2B(s + ip). \quad (2.30)$$

The two LECs of  $O(p^2)$  are related to the pion decay constant and to the quark condensate in the chiral limit:

$$\begin{aligned} F_\pi &= F[1 + O(m_q)] = 92.4 \text{ MeV} \\ \langle 0 | \bar{u}u | 0 \rangle &= -F^2 B[1 + O(m_q)]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Using for instance the parametrization (2.5) for  $U(\varphi)$  and setting the external scalar field equal to the quark mass matrix [cf. Eq. (2.17)], one can immediately read off from (2.30) the pseudoscalar meson masses to leading order in  $m_q$ :

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\pi^+}^2 &= 2\hat{m}B \\ M_{\pi^0}^2 &= 2\hat{m}B + O\left[\frac{(m_u - m_d)^2}{m_s - \hat{m}}\right] \\ M_{K^+}^2 &= (m_u + m_s)B \\ M_{K^0}^2 &= (m_d + m_s)B \\ M_{\eta_8}^2 &= \frac{2}{3}(\hat{m} + 2m_s)B + O\left[\frac{(m_u - m_d)^2}{m_s - \hat{m}}\right] \\ \hat{m} &:= \frac{1}{2}(m_u + m_d). \end{aligned} \quad (2.32)$$

With the quark condensate assumed to be non-vanishing in the chiral limit ( $B \neq 0$ ), these relations explain the chiral counting rule (2.29). Moreover, they give rise to several well-known relations:

$$F_\pi^2 M_\pi^2 = -2\hat{m} \langle 0 | \bar{u}u | 0 \rangle \quad (\text{Gell-Mann et al., 1968}) \quad (2.33)$$

$$B = \frac{M_\pi^2}{2\hat{m}} = \frac{M_{K^+}^2}{m_s + m_u} = \frac{M_{K^0}^2}{m_s + m_d} \quad (\text{Gell-Mann et al., 1968; Weinberg, 1977}) \quad (2.34)$$

$$3M_{\eta_8}^2 = 4M_K^2 - M_\pi^2 \quad (\text{Gell-Mann, 1957; Okubo, 1962}). \quad (2.35)$$

### 2.3.2 Strong interactions of mesons and baryons

The chiral Lagrangian starts at  $O(p)$  (Gasser et al., 1988; Krause, 1990):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(1)} = \bar{\Psi}(i \not{\nabla} - m + \frac{g_A}{2} \not{u} \gamma_5) \Psi \quad (N_f = 2) \quad (2.36)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{MB}^{(1)} = \langle \bar{B}(i \not{\nabla} - m)B + \frac{d}{2} \bar{B} \gamma^\mu \{u_\mu, B\} + \frac{f}{2} \bar{B} \gamma^\mu \gamma_5 [u_\mu, B] \rangle \quad (N_f = 3) . \quad (2.37)$$

The Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(1)}$  is of the form expected from the discussion of the linear  $\sigma$ -model in Sect. 2.1. The connection  $\Gamma_\mu$  defining the covariant derivative and the vielbein field  $u_\mu$  now include the external gauge fields:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\mu &= \frac{1}{2} \{u^\dagger (\partial_\mu - i r_\mu) u + u (\partial_\mu - i l_\mu) u^\dagger\} \\ u_\mu &= i \{u^\dagger (\partial_\mu - i r_\mu) u - u (\partial_\mu - i l_\mu) u^\dagger\} . \end{aligned} \quad (2.38)$$

$B(x)$  is the octet of lowest-lying baryons in the usual matrix notation.

At  $O(p)$ , there are two (three) LECs for  $N_f = 2$  (3) :  $m$  is the nucleon (baryon) mass and  $g_A$  is the nucleon axial-vector coupling constant in the chiral limit. The axial  $SU(3)$  coupling constants  $f, d$  are related to  $g_A$  via

$$g_A = f + d . \quad (2.39)$$

With the usual definition of the  $\pi N$  coupling constant  $g_{\pi NN}$ , the Goldberger–Treiman relation (Goldberger and Treiman, 1958)

$$g_{\pi NN} = \frac{g_A m}{F} \quad (2.40)$$

is an exact relation in the chiral limit.

### 2.3.3 Nonleptonic weak interactions of mesons

The effective chiral Lagrangian describing the  $\Delta S = 1$  nonleptonic weak interaction of mesons starts at  $O(G_F p^2)$  (Cronin, 1967):

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1} = G_8 \langle \lambda L_\mu L^\mu \rangle + G_{27} \left( L_{\mu 23} L_{11}^\mu + \frac{2}{3} L_{\mu 21} L_{13}^\mu \right) + \text{h.c.} \quad (2.41)$$

$$\lambda = (\lambda_6 - i \lambda_7)/2 , \quad L_\mu = i F^2 U^\dagger D_\mu U .$$

The two parts of this Lagrangian correspond to the two pieces of  $\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}^{\Delta S=1}$  in (2.22). The octet and 27-plet coupling constants  $G_8, G_{27}$  can be extracted from  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  decay rates:

$$|G_8| \simeq 9 \cdot 10^{-6} \text{ GeV}^{-2} , \quad G_{27}/G_8 \simeq 1/18 . \quad (2.42)$$

The large disparity between these constants ( $\Delta I = 1/2$  rule, octet enhancement) is input for CHPT. In practice, this implies that the 27-plet contribution can usually be neglected, unless there is no octet amplitude for the transition in question.

### 2.3.4 Mesons and virtual photons

Since the spurion fields  $Q_L, Q_R$  have vanishing chiral dimension, the chiral Lagrangian of lowest order is of  $O(e^2 p^0)$  and it consists of a single term (Gasser and Leutwyler, unpublished; Ecker et al., 1989a):

$$\mathcal{L}_{(e^2 p^0)} = e^2 C \langle QUQU^\dagger \rangle . \quad (2.43)$$

This Lagrangian yields both Dashen's theorem <sup>1</sup> (Dashen, 1969)

$$M_{\pi^+}^2 = M_{K^+}^2 = \frac{2e^2 C}{F^2} + O(m_q) \quad (2.44)$$

and Sutherland's theorem (Sutherland, 1966)

$$A(\eta \rightarrow 3\pi) = O(m_u - m_d, e^2 m_q) . \quad (2.45)$$

The pion electromagnetic mass difference is dominated by (2.43) because the corrections to (2.44) are of  $O[(m_u - m_d)^2]$  in this case. From the experimental mass difference (Review Part. Prop., 1994) one extracts

$$C = 6 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{ GeV}^4 . \quad (2.46)$$

## 2.4 Generalized CHPT

CHPT is based on a two-fold expansion. As a low-energy effective field theory, it is an expansion in small momenta. On the other hand, it is also an expansion in the quark masses  $m_q$  around the chiral limit. In full generality, the effective chiral Lagrangian is of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{L}_{ij} , \quad \mathcal{L}_{ij} = O(p^i m_q^j) . \quad (2.47)$$

The two expansions become related by expressing the pseudoscalar meson masses in terms of the quark masses. If the quark condensate is non-vanishing in the chiral limit, the squares of the meson masses (2.32) start out linear in  $m_q$ . Assuming the linear terms to give the dominant contributions to the meson masses, one arrives at the standard chiral counting with  $m_q = O(p^2)$  and

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_d \mathcal{L}_d , \quad \mathcal{L}_d = \sum_{i+2j=d} \mathcal{L}_{ij} . \quad (2.48)$$

In addition to simplicity, there are at the moment two significant pieces of evidence in favour of the standard counting. The first one is the experimentally well satisfied Gell-Mann–Okubo relation (2.35), which is modified in Generalized CHPT (see below). There is also increasing evidence from lattice gauge theory that the quark condensate is not only non-vanishing in the chiral limit but also of the size expected in the standard picture. Some recent results for both the quark condensate (extrapolated to the chiral limit) and the pion decay constant obtained with different methods are collected in Table 2.1. Also shown are the experimental value of  $F_\pi$  and the standard value for  $\langle 0|\bar{u}u|0\rangle$  from the quark masses (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1982).

Taken at face value, Table 2.1 suggests good agreement between the standard picture and lattice results. With due caution in view of the present limitations of lattice simulations, there is strong evidence for the ratio

$$-\frac{\langle 0|\bar{u}u|0\rangle}{F^3} = \frac{B}{F} \quad (2.49)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The neutral mesons remain massless in the chiral limit.

Table 2.1: The pion decay constant  $F_\pi$  and the quark condensate  $\langle 0|\bar{u}u|0\rangle$  from various lattice calculations [see also Negele (1995)]. Also shown are the experimental value of  $F_\pi$  and the standard CHPT value for the quark condensate (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1982). The scale dependent condensate is not always given at the same scale; for details consult the original literature.

method	$F_\pi$ (MeV)	$[-\langle 0 \bar{u}u 0\rangle]^{1/3}$ (MeV)
quenched Wilson fermions (Daniel et al., 1992; Weingarten, 1994)	$82 \pm 11$	$\sim 260$
dynamical staggered fermions 2 flavours (Fukugita et al., 1993)	$94 - 105$	$310 - 370$
dynamical staggered fermions 4 flavours (Altmeyer et al., 1993)	$75 \pm 10$	$215 \pm 25$
experiment (Review Part. Prop., 1994) CHPT (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1982)	92.4	$225 \pm 25$

to be substantially bigger than one.

Neither the Gell-Mann–Okubo relation nor lattice gauge theory establish the standard picture once and for all. If one is very cautious (and this caution will have its price), one may want to include the case where  $B$  is comparable to  $F$ , much smaller than indicated in Table 2.1. Generalized CHPT (Fuchs et al., 1991; Stern et al., 1993; Knecht et al., 1993) is a scheme that is adapted for small values of  $B$ . It amounts to a different ordering of the  $\mathcal{L}_{ij}$  in the effective chiral Lagrangian (2.47). To keep track of the different chiral counting, the parameter  $B$  is formally declared to be a quantity of  $O(p)$  implying via (2.32) that also  $m_q$  is  $O(p)$ . The effective Lagrangian (2.47) is then written as (Knecht and Stern, 1994b)

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_d \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_d, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_d = \sum_{i+j+k=d} B^k \mathcal{L}_{ij}. \quad (2.50)$$

## Remarks

- i. The effective chiral Lagrangian is the same in Standard and in Generalized CHPT. In the generalized picture, more terms appear at a given order that are relegated to higher orders in the standard counting. Obviously, this procedure increases the number of undetermined LECs at any given order.
- ii. In the standard framework, Lorentz invariance implies that the chiral dimension  $d$  increases in steps of two in the meson sector:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_4 + \mathcal{L}_6 + \dots \quad (2.51)$$

In contrast, due to  $m_q = O(p)$  the generalized expansion is of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_3 + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_4 + \dots \quad (2.52)$$

- iii. The generalized counting needs some accustoming. Both  $m_q$  and  $B$  are counted as  $O(p)$ , although  $B$  does not have to vanish in the chiral limit. Even though Generalized CHPT is relevant for  $B \simeq F$ ,  $F$  must not be treated as a quantity of  $O(p)$ .

A major difference between the two schemes already appears at lowest order,  $O(p^2)$ . Instead of the standard Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2$  in (2.30), the most general form of  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2$  is (Knecht and Stern, 1994b)

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 &= \frac{F^2}{4} \{ \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle + 2B \langle \tilde{\chi} U^\dagger + \tilde{\chi}^\dagger U \rangle \\ &\quad + A_0 \langle (U^\dagger \tilde{\chi})^2 + (\tilde{\chi}^\dagger U)^2 \rangle + Z_0^S \langle \tilde{\chi} U^\dagger + \tilde{\chi}^\dagger U \rangle^2 \\ &\quad + Z_0^P \langle \tilde{\chi} U^\dagger - \tilde{\chi}^\dagger U \rangle^2 + H_0 \langle \tilde{\chi}^\dagger \tilde{\chi} \rangle \} \\ \tilde{\chi} &= s + ip = \frac{\chi}{2B} .\end{aligned}\tag{2.53}$$

The difference between  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2$  is part of  $\mathcal{L}_4$  [cf. Eq. (3.1)]:  $A_0 \sim L_8$ ,  $Z_0^S \sim L_6$  (Zweig rule suppressed),  $Z_0^P \sim L_7$ ,  $H_0 \sim L_{12}$  (not directly observable). The number of observable LECs increases from two in the standard picture ( $F, B$ ) to five ( $F, B, A_0, Z_0^S, Z_0^P$ ) in the generalized scheme. Consequently, there are fewer constraints among physical quantities already at lowest order. Turning to the meson masses, one finds that the quark mass ratio

$$r = \frac{m_s}{\hat{m}}$$

can no longer be expressed in terms of meson mass ratios only as in (2.34). Instead, Generalized CHPT suggests a range (Knecht and Stern, 1994b)

$$6 \simeq \frac{2M_K}{M_\pi} - 1 = r_1 \leq r \leq r_2 = \frac{2M_K^2}{M_\pi^2} - 1 \simeq 26\tag{2.54}$$

where  $r = r_2$  corresponds to the standard picture ( $A_0 = Z_0^S = Z_0^P = 0$ ), while  $r = r_1$  is reached for  $B = 0$  with  $M^2 \sim m_q^2$  at leading order.

As expected, another consequence of Generalized CHPT is a modification of the Gell-Mann–Okubo relation (2.35) already at  $O(p^2)$ :

$$3M_{\eta_8}^2 + M_\pi^2 - 4M_K^2 = 4(m_s - \hat{m})^2(A_0 + 2Z_0^P) + O(p^3).\tag{2.55}$$

There is no argument known (Knecht and Stern, 1994b) why  $A_0 + 2Z_0^P \simeq 0$ . The Gell-Mann–Okubo relation is an accidental relation in Generalized CHPT.

The proponents of Generalized CHPT face the task of providing convincing evidence that the additional LECs introduced are indeed as big as the generalized counting suggests. This is difficult for at least two reasons:

- At every order in the derivative expansion, Standard and Generalized CHPT yield the same results in the chiral limit. Explicit chiral symmetry breaking effects are small in general and difficult to isolate.
- It is tempting, but not necessarily significant, to find better agreement with experiment with more free parameters. Only a comprehensive analysis of many different processes can provide a consistent picture.

Such a comprehensive analysis is not yet available. The present state of Generalized CHPT has been reviewed recently by Knecht and Stern (1994b) where references to the original work can be found. There are mainly two areas where more precise data are expected to shed light on the size of the quark condensate and of the quark mass ratios: low-energy  $\pi\pi$  scattering (cf. Sect. 3.5) and the coupling strength of the  $\pi'$ , the first radial recurrence of the pion, to the axial–vector current. The second question can in principle be answered by measuring angular asymmetries at the percent level in the decays  $\tau \rightarrow 3\pi\nu_\tau$  in the  $\pi'$  region (Stern et al., 1994).



## 2.5 Generating functional of Green functions

To lowest order in the chiral expansion, all amplitudes are tree-level amplitudes that can be read off directly from the lowest-order effective chiral Lagrangians in Sect. 2.3. In order to have a systematic procedure for the calculation of higher orders, it is useful to introduce the generating functional of connected Green functions. Restricting the discussion for the moment to the strong, electromagnetic and semileptonic weak interactions of mesons, all amplitudes of interest can be obtained from the generating functional of connected Green functions of quark currents  $Z[v, a, s, p]$ . At the fundamental level it is defined in the usual way,

$$e^{iZ[v, a, s, p]} = \langle 0 \text{ out} | 0 \text{ in} \rangle_{v, a, s, p} , \quad (2.56)$$

in terms of the vacuum transition amplitude in the presence of external fields associated with the Lagrangian (2.15).

At the hadronic level,  $Z[v, a, s, p]$  is calculated with an effective chiral Lagrangian. Following Weinberg (1979), one writes down the most general Lagrangian of pseudoscalar meson fields (and possibly other degrees of freedom) that shares the symmetries of the underlying theory. However, there is a loophole in this line of reasoning. The chiral Lagrangian is obviously not uniquely defined. For instance, adding a total derivative will not change the physical content of the effective field theory. The question is then whether the effective Lagrangian must really be locally chiral symmetric for the generating functional  $Z[v, a, s, p]$  to have this property. After all, the local chiral symmetry has been the main ingredient for writing down the most general effective chiral Lagrangians. The loophole was recently closed by Leutwyler (1994a) who showed that the freedom of adding total derivatives and performing meson field redefinitions can always be used to bring the effective Lagrangian to a manifestly locally chiral invariant form. The only exception to the theorem is the chiral anomaly that requires a Wess–Zumino term (see Sect. 3), but the rest is gauge invariant (see also D’Hoker and Weinberg, 1994). Therefore, the generating functional  $Z[v, a, s, p]$  may be calculated at the hadronic level as

$$e^{iZ[v, a, s, p]} = \int [dU(\varphi)] e^{i \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}} , \quad (2.57)$$

with the gauge invariant effective chiral Lagrangian written as an expansion in derivatives and external fields according to the counting rules (2.28), (2.29):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_4 + \dots \quad (2.58)$$

The chiral expansion of  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$  induces a corresponding expansion for the generating functional

$$Z = Z_2 + Z_4 + \dots \quad (2.59)$$

At lowest order, the functional  $Z_2$  is the classical action

$$Z_2[v, a, s, p] = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_2(U, v, a, s, p) \quad (2.60)$$

where

$$U = U[v, a, s, p]$$

is to be understood as a functional of the external fields via the equation of motion for  $\mathcal{L}_2$  :

$$\square U U^\dagger - U \square U^\dagger = \chi U^\dagger - U \chi^\dagger - \frac{1}{3} \langle \chi U^\dagger - U \chi^\dagger \rangle \mathbf{1} . \quad (2.61)$$

As already noted, this amounts to reading off the relevant tree-level amplitudes directly from the lowest-order Lagrangian (2.30) by using an explicit parametrization of  $U(\varphi)$  like (2.5).

Why not stop here? In the sixties, many proponents of effective Lagrangians argued that due to their non-renormalizability such Lagrangians only make sense at tree level. Today, we view effective field theories on almost the same footing as the “fundamental” gauge theories. They admit a perfectly consistent loop expansion that ensures all axiomatic properties of a quantum field theory like unitarity and analyticity. Unitarity, written schematically as

$$\Im m \, T \sim |T|^2 , \quad (2.62)$$

requires that in general loop amplitudes start contributing at  $O(p^4)$  in the meson sector, because the (real) amplitudes are at least  $O(p^2)$ . The non-renormalizability manifests itself in the appearance of additional terms that are not present in the lowest-order Lagrangian. However,  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$  is already the most general chiral invariant Lagrangian. Since the divergences can be absorbed by local counterterms that exhibit the same symmetries as the initial Lagrangian (Weinberg, 1960),  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$  automatically includes all terms needed for renormalization to every order in the loop expansion. Although one needs a specific regularization procedure for the loop amplitudes, the renormalized theory is independent of the chosen regularization. In practice, a mass-independent regularization scheme like dimensional regularization is best suited for the purpose. It respects all the symmetries of the chiral Lagrangians, both in the meson and in the meson-baryon system (Sect. 7).

To keep track of the chiral counting, it is convenient to define the chiral dimension of an amplitude. For the case under consideration where only pseudoscalar mesons appear in internal lines [cf. (2.57)], the chiral dimension  $D$  of a connected  $L$ -loop amplitude with  $N_d$  vertices of  $O(p^d)$  ( $d = 2, 4, \dots$ ) is given by (Weinberg, 1979)

$$D = 2L + 2 + \sum_d (d - 2)N_d , \quad d = 2, 4, \dots \quad (2.63)$$

and therefore, up to  $O(p^4)$  :

$$\begin{aligned} D = 2 : \quad L = 0, d = 2 & \quad Z_2 = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_2 \\ D = 4 : \quad L = 0, d = 4 & \quad Z_4^{\text{tree}} = \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_4 + Z_{\text{WZW}} \\ L = 1, d = 2 & \quad Z_4^{(L=1)} \text{ for } \mathcal{L}_2 . \end{aligned} \quad (2.64)$$

$Z_{\text{WZW}}$  is the Wess–Zumino–Witten functional (Wess and Zumino, 1971; Witten, 1983) to be discussed in Sect. 3.4.

For a given amplitude, the chiral dimension  $D$  increases with  $L$  according to Eq. (2.63). In order to reproduce the (fixed) physical dimension of the amplitude, each loop produces a factor  $1/F^2$ . Together with the geometric loop factor  $(4\pi)^{-2}$ , the loop expansion suggests

$$4\pi F_\pi = 1.2 \text{ GeV} \quad (2.65)$$

as the natural scale of the chiral expansion (Manohar and Georgi, 1984). A more refined analysis indicates

$$4\pi F_\pi / \sqrt{N_f} \quad (2.66)$$

as the relevant scale for  $N_f$  light flavours (Soldate and Sundrum, 1990; Chivukula et al., 1993). Restricting the domain of applicability of CHPT to momenta  $|p| \lesssim O(M_K)$ , the natural expansion parameter of chiral amplitudes based on the naive estimate (2.65) is expected to be of the order

$$\frac{M_K^2}{16\pi^2 F_\pi^2} = 0.18 . \quad (2.67)$$

The more sophisticated estimate (2.66) would yield an additional factor three for chiral  $SU(3)$ . In addition, these terms often appear multiplied with chiral logarithms. It is therefore no surprise that substantial higher-order corrections in the chiral expansion are the rule rather than the exception for chiral  $SU(3)$ . On the other hand, for  $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$  and for momenta  $|p| \lesssim O(M_\pi)$  the chiral expansion is expected to converge considerably faster.

The generalization to the meson–baryon system will be discussed in Sect. 7. For the nonleptonic weak interactions and for the treatment of virtual photons the generating functional can easily be extended to depend also on the respective spurion fields. Since one is in practice only interested in amplitudes to first order in  $G_F$  or  $e^2$ , one adds the corresponding effective Lagrangians to  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}$  in (2.58) and calculates the amplitudes to  $O(G_F)$  and  $O(e^2)$ , respectively.

### 3 STRONG INTERACTIONS OF MESONS

#### 3.1 Generating functional of $O(p^4)$

The Green functions and amplitudes of lowest order (current algebra level) can be obtained from the classical action (2.60). At next-to-leading order,  $O(p^4)$ , the functional  $Z_4[v, a, s, p]$  consists of three parts (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1984, 1985a) in accordance with (2.64):

- Tree diagrams with a single vertex from the effective chiral Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_4$  of  $O(p^4)$  and any number of vertices from  $\mathcal{L}_2$  via the equation of motion (2.61).
- The one-loop functional for the lowest-order Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2$ .
- The Wess–Zumino–Witten functional  $Z_{\text{WZW}}$  (Wess and Zumino, 1971; Witten, 1983) to account for the chiral anomaly (Adler, 1969a; Bell and Jackiw, 1969; Bardeen, 1969). The corresponding odd-intrinsic-parity sector will be discussed in Sect. 3.4.

The effective chiral Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_4(U, v, a, s, p)$  for chiral  $SU(3)$  has the form (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1985a)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_4 = & L_1 \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle^2 + L_2 \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D_\nu U \rangle \langle D^\mu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle \\ & + L_3 \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U D_\nu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle + L_4 \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle \langle \chi^\dagger U + \chi U^\dagger \rangle \\ & + L_5 \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U (\chi^\dagger U + U^\dagger \chi) \rangle + L_6 \langle \chi^\dagger U + \chi U^\dagger \rangle^2 + L_7 \langle \chi^\dagger U - \chi U^\dagger \rangle^2 \\ & + L_8 \langle \chi^\dagger U \chi^\dagger U + \chi U^\dagger \chi U^\dagger \rangle - i L_9 \langle F_R^{\mu\nu} D_\mu U D_\nu U^\dagger + F_L^{\mu\nu} D_\mu U^\dagger D_\nu U \rangle \\ & + L_{10} \langle U^\dagger F_R^{\mu\nu} U F_{L\mu\nu} \rangle + L_{11} \langle F_{R\mu\nu} F_R^{\mu\nu} + F_{L\mu\nu} F_L^{\mu\nu} \rangle + L_{12} \langle \chi^\dagger \chi \rangle . \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

It is the most general Lagrangian of  $O(p^4)$  that satisfies local chiral invariance, Lorentz invariance,  $P$  and  $C$ . Since the loop expansion is a systematic expansion around the classical solution (see also Sect. 5), the equation of motion (2.61) has been used to reduce the number of terms. A similar Lagrangian can be written down for chiral  $SU(2)$  (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1984).

Before turning to the physics behind the new LECs  $L_1, \dots, L_{12}$ , let us consider the one-loop functional  $Z_4^{(L=1)}[v, a, s, p]$ . Formally, it can be given in closed form as

$$Z_4^{(L=1)} = \frac{i}{2} \ln \det D_2 = \frac{i}{2} \text{tr} \ln D_2 , \quad (3.2)$$

where  $D_2$  is a differential operator associated with the lowest-order Lagrangian (2.30). However,  $Z_4^{(L=1)}$  is divergent and must be properly defined by means of a regularization. In a mass-independent regularization scheme like dimensional regularization, chiral power counting (2.63)

Table 3.1: Phenomenological values and source for the renormalized coupling constants  $L_i^r(M_\rho)$ , taken from Bijmens et al. (1994e). The quantities  $\Gamma_i$  in the fourth column determine the scale dependence of the  $L_i^r(\mu)$  according to Eq. (3.6).  $L_{11}^r$  and  $L_{12}^r$  are not directly accessible to experiment.

i	$L_i^r(M_\rho) \times 10^3$	source	$\Gamma_i$
1	$0.4 \pm 0.3$	$K_{e4}, \pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$	$3/32$
2	$1.35 \pm 0.3$	$K_{e4}, \pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$	$3/16$
3	$-3.5 \pm 1.1$	$K_{e4}, \pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$	0
4	$-0.3 \pm 0.5$	Zweig rule	$1/8$
5	$1.4 \pm 0.5$	$F_K : F_\pi$	$3/8$
6	$-0.2 \pm 0.3$	Zweig rule	$11/144$
7	$-0.4 \pm 0.2$	Gell-Mann–Okubo, $L_5, L_8$	0
8	$0.9 \pm 0.3$	$M_{K^0} - M_{K^+}, L_5,$ $(2m_s - m_u - m_d) : (m_d - m_u)$	$5/48$
9	$6.9 \pm 0.7$	$\langle r^2 \rangle_V^\pi$	$1/4$
10	$-5.5 \pm 0.7$	$\pi \rightarrow e\nu\gamma$	$-1/4$
11			$-1/8$
12			$5/24$

shows that all one-loop divergences have chiral dimension  $D = 4$ . Since the divergent part  $Z_{4,\text{div}}^{(L=1)}$  has the form of a local action with all the symmetries of  $\mathcal{L}_2$  (Weinberg, 1960), the corresponding Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{4,\text{div}}^{(L=1)}$  must be of the form (3.1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{4,\text{div}}^{(L=1)} &= -\Lambda(\mu) \sum_{i=1}^{12} \Gamma_i P_i \\ \Lambda(\mu) &= \frac{\mu^{d-4}}{(4\pi)^2} \left\{ \frac{1}{d-4} - \frac{1}{2} [\ln 4\pi + 1 + \Gamma'(1)] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

with coefficients  $\Gamma_i$  listed in Table 3.1. The  $P_i$  are the field monomials in the chiral Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_4$  in (3.1) and the explicit form of  $\Lambda(\mu)$  holds for dimensional regularization. The renormalization of the one-loop functional (3.2) is then implemented by defining renormalized coupling constants  $L_i^r(\mu)$  as

$$L_i = L_i^r(\mu) + \Gamma_i \Lambda(\mu) \quad (3.4)$$

in order to cancel the divergent piece (3.3) in the one-loop functional. By construction, the sum

$$Z_4^{(L=1)} + \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_4(L_i) = Z_{4,\text{fin}}^{(L=1)}(\mu) + \int d^4x \mathcal{L}_4(L_i^r(\mu)) \quad (3.5)$$

is both finite and independent of the arbitrary scale  $\mu$ . The separate scale dependences of the loop and of the counterterm parts cancel in all Green functions and therefore in all physical amplitudes.

The renormalized coupling constants  $L_i^r(\mu)$  are measurable LECs that characterize QCD at  $O(p^4)$ . Although the total Green functions of  $O(p^4)$  are independent of the chosen regularization,

the split between loop and tree-level contributions does depend on the regularization scheme via the definition of  $\Lambda(\mu)$  in (3.3). The scale dependence of the  $L_i^r(\mu)$  follows from Eq. (3.4):

$$L_i^r(\mu_2) = L_i^r(\mu_1) + \frac{\Gamma_i}{(4\pi)^2} \ln \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_2} . \quad (3.6)$$

Eqs. (3.5) and (3.6) show that the  $\Gamma_i$  are also the coefficients of the so-called chiral logs  $\sim \ln p^2/\mu^2$  in the one-loop functional.

It is clear from the structure of the one-loop functional that the chiral dimension  $D = 4$  does not imply that the relevant Green functions are just fourth-order polynomials in external momenta and masses. Instead, the chiral dimension has to do with the degree of homogeneity of the amplitudes in momenta and masses. Consider the Feynman amplitude  $A$  for a general process with  $D_F$  external photons and  $W$  bosons (semileptonic transitions). If we define in addition to (2.63)

$$D = D_L + D_F , \quad (3.7)$$

then  $D_L$  is the degree of homogeneity of the amplitude  $A$  as a function of external momenta ( $p$ ) and meson masses ( $M$ ):

$$A(p, M; C_i^r(\mu), \mu/M) = M^{D_L} A(p/M, 1; C_i^r(\mu), \mu/M) . \quad (3.8)$$

The  $C_i^r(\mu)$  denote renormalized LECs. In the meson sector at  $O(p^4)$ , they are just the  $L_i^r(\mu)$ , but the structure (3.8) is completely general.

### 3.2 Low-energy constants of $O(p^4)$

The LECs parametrize the most general solutions of the chiral Ward identities, but they are themselves not constrained by the symmetries. They can be interpreted as describing the influence of all degrees of freedom not explicitly contained in the chiral Lagrangians. In principle, they are calculable quantities in the Standard Model. In practice and for the time being, they are extracted from experimental input or estimated with additional model dependent assumptions.

Comparing the lowest-order Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2$  with  $\mathcal{L}_4$  in (3.1), chiral dimensional analysis suggests as an approximate upper bound

$$|L_i| \lesssim \frac{N_f}{4(4\pi)^2} \simeq 5 \cdot 10^{-3} \quad (3.9)$$

for  $N_f = 3$  light flavours. The present values for the  $L_i^r$  at  $\mu = M_\rho$  are displayed in Table 3.1. Chiral dimensional analysis appears to be quite successful here: only  $L_3$ ,  $L_9$  and  $L_{10}$  are close to the upper bound (3.9).

The main new input in Table 3.1 comes from a recent analysis of  $K_{e4}$  decays (Bijnens et al., 1994a). In particular, incorporation of the  $K_{e4}$  data (see also Sect. 3.5.2) allows for a test of the Zweig rule classification of  $L_1, L_2, L_3$  (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1985a):

$$2L_1 - L_2 \quad O(1) \quad (3.10)$$

$$L_1, L_2, L_3 \quad O(N_c) , \quad (3.11)$$

where  $N_c$  is the number of colours. The recent analysis of Bijnens et al. (1994a) finds

$$\frac{L_2 - 2L_1}{L_3} = -0.17 \begin{matrix} +0.12 \\ -0.22 \end{matrix} \quad (3.12)$$

in support of the Zweig rule.

A promising first attempt to calculate the  $L_i$  “directly” from QCD has been undertaken by Myint and Rebbi (1994). Their work documents the feasibility of extracting LECs from the lattice. The first analytic results obtained in the strong-coupling and large- $N_c$  limits are not too realistic, but the announced numerical analysis is expected to come closer to the real world.

The actual values of the  $L_i$  can be understood in terms of meson resonance exchange (Ecker et al., 1989a; Donoghue et al., 1989a). The situation can be summarized as follows:

**Chiral duality:**

The  $L_i^r(M_\rho)$  are practically saturated by resonance exchange.

**Chiral VMD:**

Whenever spin-1 resonances can contribute at all ( $i = 1, 2, 3, 9, 10$ ), the  $L_i^r(M_\rho)$  are almost completely dominated by  $V$  and  $A$  exchange.

With additional QCD-inspired assumptions, all  $V, A$  couplings can be expressed in terms of  $F_\pi$  and  $M_V \simeq M_\rho$  only (Ecker et al., 1989b):

$$8L_1^V = 4L_2^V = -\frac{4}{3}L_3^V = L_9^V = -\frac{4}{3}L_{10}^{V+A} = \frac{F_\pi^2}{2M_V^2} . \quad (3.13)$$

These relations are in good agreement with the phenomenological values of the  $L_i^r(M_\rho)$  and they also explain why only  $L_3, L_9$  and  $L_{10}$  are close to the naive upper limit (3.9).

Two objections are sometimes raised against the interpretation of resonance dominated  $L_i$ .

**Objection # 1 :** Resonance exchange produces scale independent LECs although they are in fact scale dependent.

A more precise formulation of resonance dominance (Ecker et al., 1989a) clarifies the situation: decomposing the  $L_i^r(\mu)$  into resonance contributions  $L_i^R$  and remainders  $\hat{L}_i(\mu)$  carrying the scale dependence,

$$L_i^r(\mu) = \sum_R L_i^R + \hat{L}_i(\mu) , \quad (3.14)$$

there is a range in  $\mu$  (depending on the renormalization scheme, as discussed in the previous subsection) with

$$|\hat{L}_i(\mu)| \ll |L_i^r(\mu)| \quad \forall i . \quad (3.15)$$

**Objection # 2 :** The resonance parameters are determined at  $p^2 = M_R^2$ , but the  $L_i$  describe physics for  $p^2 \ll M_R^2$ .

Consider the  $VV - AA$  two-point functions as a specific example:

$$\begin{aligned} i \int d^4x e^{ip \cdot x} \langle 0 | T \{ V_\mu^i(x) V_\nu^j(0) - A_\mu^i(x) A_\nu^j(0) \} | 0 \rangle = \\ = (p_\mu p_\nu - g_{\mu\nu} p^2) \Pi_{LR,ij}^{(1)}(p^2) + p_\mu p_\nu \Pi_{LR,ij}^{(0)}(p^2) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Any given model for the spin-1 resonances will produce a spectral function  $\Pi_{LR}^{(1)}$  of the following structure in the narrow-width approximation (only  $V$  exchange is considered here):

$$\Pi_{LR}^{(1)}(p^2) = \frac{P_V(p^2)^2}{M_V^2 - p^2} + P_c(p^2) , \quad (3.17)$$

where  $P_V(p^2)$ ,  $P_c(p^2)$  are model dependent polynomials characterizing the off-shell behaviour of  $V$  exchange. From resonance decays (e.g.,  $\rho \rightarrow e^+e^-$  in this case) one can fix  $F_V = P_V(M_V^2)$ , but unless  $P_V(p^2)$  is a constant, the decay width tells us nothing about  $P_V(p^2)$  for  $p^2 \neq M_V^2$  nor about  $P_c(p^2)$ .

The solution of the puzzle is provided by the connection between low and high energies characteristic for a quantum field theory like QCD. In fact, QCD requires a relation between the polynomials  $P_V(p^2)$  and  $P_c(p^2)$  such that the off-shell behaviour of  $P_V(p^2)$  is actually irrelevant. The key to the solution is the unsubtracted dispersion relation satisfied by  $\Pi_{LR}^{(1)}$ :

$$\Pi_{LR}^{(1)}(p^2) = \int_0^\infty \frac{ds}{s-p^2} [\rho_V^{(1)}(s) - \rho_A^{(1)}(s)] . \quad (3.18)$$

Again in the narrow-width approximation,  $V$  exchange yields

$$\rho_V^{(1)}(s) = F_V^2 \delta(s - M_V^2) \quad (3.19)$$

and therefore [recall  $F_V = P_V(M_V^2)$ ]

$$\Pi_{LR}^{(1)}(p^2) = \frac{P_V(M_V^2)^2}{M_V^2 - p^2} = \frac{P_V(p^2)^2}{M_V^2 - p^2} + P_c(p^2) , \quad (3.20)$$

fixing the counterterm polynomial  $P_c(p^2)$  uniquely:

$$P_c(p^2) = (M_V^2 - p^2)^{-1} [P_V(M_V^2)^2 - P_V(p^2)^2] . \quad (3.21)$$

The general conclusion is that Green functions at small  $p^2$  are determined by the on-shell resonance parameters, *independently* of higher-order couplings (Ecker et al., 1989b; Ecker, 1989d). It is this universality that implies in particular the equivalence of all realistic models for spin-1 meson resonances to  $O(p^4)$  (Ecker et al., 1989b).

The symmetry breaking sector (involving the quark masses) is characterized at  $O(p^4)$  by the LECs  $L_4$ ,  $L_5$ ,  $L_6$ ,  $L_7$ ,  $L_8$ . These LECs are only sensitive to scalar (octet  $S$  and singlet  $S_1$ ) and pseudoscalar ( $\eta'$ ) exchange. In the case of  $L_5$ , only the scalar octet can contribute. Saturating the unsubtracted dispersion relation for the scalar form factor  $\langle \pi | \bar{u}s | K \rangle$  with  $S$  exchange, one finds (Leutwyler, 1990)

$$L_5 \simeq \frac{F_\pi^2}{4M_S^2} . \quad (3.22)$$

The LEC  $L_5$  governs  $SU(3)$  breaking in the meson decay constants (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1985a):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F_K}{F_\pi} &= 1 + \frac{4L_5^r}{F^2} (M_K^2 - M_\pi^2) + \text{chiral logs} \\ &\simeq 1 + \frac{M_K^2 - M_\pi^2}{M_S^2} + \text{chiral logs} \\ &\simeq 1.22 \quad (\text{Review Part. Prop., 1994}) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

With  $M_S \simeq M_{\eta'} \simeq 1$  GeV, one understands why  $SU(3)$  breaking in the meson sector is generally of  $O(25\%)$ , except for the pseudoscalar masses. It is precisely in the symmetry breaking sector that Generalized CHPT follows a different approach. For a discussion of the corresponding LECs in that scheme, I refer to the review of Knecht and Stern (1994b).

There has been a lot of activity in recent years to obtain the LECs from different models of hadronic interactions at low energies. Most prominent and also most successful among them are different variants of the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model (Nambu and Jona-Lasinio, 1961). Those developments are outside the scope of the present article. There exist specialized reviews of the subject (de Rafael, 1995; Bijmans, 1994b; Hatsuda and Kunihiro, 1994; Alkofer et al., 1994; Volkov, 1993) that can also be consulted for further references.

### 3.3 Light quark masses

The quark masses depend on the QCD renormalization scale. Since the effective Lagrangians cannot depend on this scale, the quark masses always appear multiplied by quantities that transform contragrediently under changes of the renormalization scale. The chiral Lagrangian (2.58) contains the quark masses via the scalar field  $\chi$  defined in (2.30). As long as one does not use direct or indirect information on  $B$ , one can only extract ratios of quark masses.

The lowest-order mass formulas (2.32) together with Dashen's theorem (2.44) lead to the Weinberg (1977) ratios

$$\frac{m_u}{m_d} = 0.55 \ , \quad \frac{m_s}{m_d} = 20.1 \ . \quad (3.24)$$

These ratios are subject to higher-order corrections. The most important ones are corrections of  $O(p^4) = O(m_q^2)$  and  $O(e^2 m_s)$ . The corrections of  $O(p^4)$  were worked out by Gasser and Leutwyler (1985a) who found that the ratios

$$\frac{M_K^2}{M_\pi^2} = \frac{m_s + \hat{m}}{m_u + m_d} [1 + \Delta_M + O(m_s^2)] \quad (3.25)$$

$$\frac{(M_{K^0}^2 - M_{K^+}^2)_{\text{QCD}}}{M_K^2 - M_\pi^2} = \frac{m_d - m_u}{m_s - \hat{m}} [1 + \Delta_M + O(m_s^2)] \quad (3.26)$$

depend on the same correction  $\Delta_M$  of  $O(m_s)$ :

$$\Delta_M = \frac{8(M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)}{F^2} (2L_8^r - L_5^r) + \text{chiral logs} \ . \quad (3.27)$$

Using again (2.44) to express  $(M_{K^0}^2 - M_{K^+}^2)_{\text{QCD}}$  in terms of experimental mass differences [ $(M_{\pi^+}^2 - M_{\pi^0}^2)_{\text{QCD}}$  is negligibly small], one obtains a parameter-free relation for the ratio

$$Q^2 := \frac{m_s^2 - \hat{m}^2}{m_d^2 - m_u^2} : \quad (3.28)$$

$$Q^2 = \frac{M_K^2}{M_\pi^2} \cdot \frac{M_K^2 - M_\pi^2}{M_{K^0}^2 - M_{K^+}^2 + M_{\pi^+}^2 - M_{\pi^0}^2} \cdot \left[ 1 + O(m_s^2) + O\left(e^2 \frac{m_s}{m_d - m_u}\right) \right] . \quad (3.29)$$

Without the corrections, this relation implies  $Q \simeq 24$ . As will be discussed in Sect. 6, corrections of  $O(e^2 m_s)$  to Dashen's relation (2.44) tend to decrease  $Q$  by approximately 10%. Plotting  $m_s/m_d$  versus  $m_u/m_d$  leads to Leutwyler's ellipse (Leutwyler, 1990) which is to a very good approximation given by

$$\frac{1}{Q^2} \left( \frac{m_s}{m_d} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{m_u}{m_d} \right)^2 = 1 \ . \quad (3.30)$$

In Fig. 3.1, the relevant quadrant of the ellipse is shown for  $Q = 24$  (upper curve) and  $Q = 21.5$  (lower curve).

To the order considered, the quark mass ratios  $m_s/m_d$  and  $m_u/m_d$  cannot be determined separately from low-energy data alone due to an accidental symmetry of  $\mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_4$  (Kaplan and Manohar, 1986). The chiral Lagrangian is invariant to this order under the transformations

$$\begin{aligned} m'_u &= \alpha_1 m_u + \alpha_2 m_d m_s & (\text{and cyclic permutations}) \\ B' &= B/\alpha_1, & L'_6 &= L_6 - \alpha, & L'_7 &= L_7 - \alpha, & L'_8 &= L_8 + 2\alpha \\ \alpha &= \frac{\alpha_2 F^2}{32\alpha_1 B} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$






Figure 3.1: First quadrant of Leutwyler's ellipse (Leutwyler, 1990) for  $Q = 24$  (upper curve) and  $Q = 21.5$  (lower curve). The dotted lines correspond to  $\Theta_{\eta\eta'} = -15^\circ$  (upper line) and  $-25^\circ$  (lower line). The wedge between the two dashed lines corresponds to  $35 \leq R \leq 50$ .

Consequently, all Green functions of vector and axial-vector currents and thus all S-matrix elements are invariant under the Kaplan–Manohar transformations (3.31). Since  $\Delta_M$  in (3.27) is not invariant, it can only be fixed via Green functions of (pseudo)scalar quark densities. Expressing  $L_5$  and  $L_8$  through the well-measured corrections to  $F_K/F_\pi$  and to the Gell-Mann–Okubo formula (2.35),  $\Delta_M$  can also be written in the form (Leutwyler, 1990)

$$\Delta_M = -\frac{32(M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)}{F^2} L_7 - 0.33 , \quad (3.32)$$

reducing the problem to a determination of the scale independent LEC  $L_7$ .

Various arguments lead to a consistent picture for  $L_7$  corresponding to the value given in Table 3.1. Both at leading order in  $1/N_c$  (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1985a) and from saturation of spectral function sum rules (Leutwyler, 1990), one finds

$$L_7 = -\frac{F^2}{48M_{\eta'}^2} . \quad (3.33)$$

$L_7$  also accounts for  $\eta - \eta'$  mixing at  $O(p^4)$  leading to the relation (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1985a)

$$F^2(M_{\eta'}^2 - M_\eta^2) \sin^2 \Theta_{\eta\eta'} = -24L_7(M_\eta^2 - M_\pi^2)^2 . \quad (3.34)$$

Experimentally,  $\Theta_{\eta\eta'} \simeq -20^\circ$  (Review Part. Prop., 1994). For a given value of  $\Theta_{\eta\eta'}$ , Eq. (3.25) defines a linear relation between  $m_s/m_d$  and  $m_u/m_d$ . Allowing for higher-order chiral corrections, the dotted lines in Fig. 3.1 correspond to  $\Theta_{\eta\eta'} = -15^\circ$  (upper line) and  $-25^\circ$  (lower line), respectively. Using  $L_7$  from (3.33), one obtains  $\Delta_M \simeq -0.16$ . Although the destructive interference between the two terms in (3.32) enhances the uncertainty, the conclusion is that  $\Delta_M$  is indeed small as expected for a higher-order correction.

There is completely independent information on the quark mass ratios from mass splittings in the baryon octet. From an analysis of the leading non-analytic corrections to the baryon masses of  $O(m_q^{3/2})$  (Gasser, 1981; Gasser and Leutwyler, 1982), one can extract the ratio

$$R = \frac{m_s - \hat{m}}{m_d - m_u} = 43.5 \pm 3.2 . \quad (3.35)$$

Information from  $\rho - \omega$  mixing confirms this value (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1982). Although electromagnetic corrections (Lebed and Luty, 1994) are not included in these estimates, a rather conservative range  $35 \leq R \leq 50$  is used in Fig. 3.1 to define the wedge between the two dashed lines. Independent information on  $R$  from the branching ratio  $\Gamma(\psi' \rightarrow \psi\pi^0)/\Gamma(\psi' \rightarrow \psi\eta)$  is compatible with this range (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1982; Donoghue and Wyler, 1992b; Luty and Sundrum, 1993a).

Altogether, a consistent picture emerges as shown in Fig. 3.1. The allowed values for the quark mass ratios are still close to the Weinberg values (3.24). Nevertheless, there are pertinacious claims in the literature that  $m_u = 0$  is a perfectly acceptable value for the mass of the lightest quark. The issue at stake is the problem of strong  $CP$  violation [for a review, see Peccei (1989)] that would find a natural solution for  $m_u = 0$ . Let me therefore briefly review some arguments (Leutwyler, 1990, 1993, 1994c) that make this scenario very unrealistic.

For  $m_u = 0$ , one would be confronted with very large flavour asymmetries in the matrix elements of (pseudo)scalar operators jeopardizing the basic assumption of CHPT that the light quark masses can be treated as perturbations. For instance, the lowest-order formula for  $M_{K^0} - M_{K^+}$  would be off by a factor four. Requiring the higher-order terms in this mass difference not to exceed the leading term, already leads to a lower bound  $m_u/m_d > 1/3$ . An often quoted model with large flavour symmetry breaking and  $m_u = 0$  is due to Choi (1992, and references therein). However, Leutwyler (1994c) has demonstrated that the model is in conflict with spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking because it is incompatible with  $B \neq 0$ . As the model is unable to account for a LEC of lowest order, it can hardly be trusted for a calculation of higher-order corrections. Note incidentally that for small  $|B|$  Generalized CHPT (discussed in Sect. 2.4) requires a bigger value of  $m_u$  than the standard scheme.

For the absolute magnitude of quark masses, the most reliable estimates are based on QCD sum rules (e.g., Bijnens et al., 1994c; Jamin and Münz, 1994; Chetyrkin et al., 1994; Adami et al., 1993; Eletsky and Ioffe, 1993; Dominguez et al., 1991; Narison, 1989; Dominguez and de Rafael, 1986). Although the inherent uncertainties of the method are difficult to quantify, the values from different sources are remarkably stable and consistent with the standard values of Gasser and Leutwyler (1982). The most recent determinations give for the running  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  masses at a scale of 1 GeV

$$m_u + m_d = (12 \pm 2.5) \text{ MeV} \quad (\text{Bijnens et al., 1994c}) \quad (3.36)$$

and

$$m_s = \begin{cases} (189 \pm 32) \text{ MeV} & (\text{Jamin and Münz, 1994}) \\ (171 \pm 15) \text{ MeV} & (\text{Chetyrkin et al., 1994}) \end{cases} . \quad (3.37)$$

As for many other quantities of interest in the low-energy domain, the final word is expected to come from lattice evaluations (LATTICE 93, 1994).

### 3.4 Odd-intrinsic-parity sector

The effective Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_4$  is by construction locally chiral invariant. Because dimensional regularization preserves this symmetry, the one-loop functional is invariant as well. On the other

hand, the vacuum transition amplitude (2.56) is not invariant under the transformations (2.18) due to the chiral anomaly. The definition of the fermionic determinant responsible for the chiral anomaly may be chosen such that the generating functional is invariant under the transformations generated by the vector currents. For infinitesimal chiral  $SU(3)$  transformations

$$g_R(x) = 1 + i\alpha(x) + i\beta(x) , \quad g_L(x) = 1 + i\alpha(x) - i\beta(x) , \quad (3.38)$$

the change in  $Z$  then only involves the difference  $\beta(x)$  between  $g_R$  and  $g_L$  (Bardeen, 1969; Wess and Zumino, 1971),

$$\begin{aligned} \delta Z &= - \int d^4x \langle \beta(x) \Omega(x) \rangle \\ \Omega(x) &= \frac{N_c}{16\pi^2} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \left[ v_{\mu\nu} v_{\rho\sigma} + \frac{4}{3} D_\mu a_\nu D_\rho a_\sigma + \frac{2i}{3} \{v_{\mu\nu}, a_\rho a_\sigma\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{8i}{3} a_\rho v_{\mu\nu} a_\sigma + \frac{4}{3} a_\mu a_\nu a_\rho a_\sigma \right] \\ v_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_\mu v_\nu - \partial_\nu v_\mu - i[v_\mu, v_\nu] \\ D_\mu a_\nu &= \partial_\mu a_\nu - i[v_\mu, a_\nu] \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

$$\varepsilon_{0123} = 1 .$$

Notice that  $\Omega$  depends only on the external fields  $v_\mu$  and  $a_\mu$ , but not on the quark masses. A functional  $Z[U, l, r]$  that reproduces the chiral anomaly was first constructed by Wess and Zumino (1971). For practical purposes, it is useful to write it in the explicit form given by Witten (1983):

$$\begin{aligned} Z[U, l, r]_{\text{WZW}} &= -\frac{iN_c}{240\pi^2} \int_{M^5} d^5x \epsilon^{ijklm} \langle \Sigma_i^L \Sigma_j^L \Sigma_k^L \Sigma_l^L \Sigma_m^L \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{iN_c}{48\pi^2} \int d^4x \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} (W(U, l, r)^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - W(\mathbf{1}, l, r)^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

$$\begin{aligned} W(U, l, r)_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} &= \langle U l_\mu l_\nu l_\rho U^\dagger r_\sigma + \frac{1}{4} U l_\mu U^\dagger r_\nu U l_\rho U^\dagger r_\sigma + i U \partial_\mu l_\nu l_\rho U^\dagger r_\sigma \\ &\quad + i \partial_\mu r_\nu U l_\rho U^\dagger r_\sigma - i \Sigma_\mu^L l_\nu U^\dagger r_\rho U l_\sigma + \Sigma_\mu^L U^\dagger \partial_\nu r_\rho U l_\sigma \\ &\quad - \Sigma_\mu^L \Sigma_\nu^L U^\dagger r_\rho U l_\sigma + \Sigma_\mu^L l_\nu \partial_\rho l_\sigma + \Sigma_\mu^L \partial_\nu l_\rho l_\sigma \\ &\quad - i \Sigma_\mu^L l_\nu l_\rho l_\sigma + \frac{1}{2} \Sigma_\mu^L l_\nu \Sigma_\rho^L l_\sigma - i \Sigma_\mu^L \Sigma_\nu^L \Sigma_\rho^L l_\sigma \rangle \\ &\quad - (L \leftrightarrow R) , \\ \Sigma_\mu^L &= U^\dagger \partial_\mu U , \quad \Sigma_\mu^R = U \partial_\mu U^\dagger \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

where  $(L \leftrightarrow R)$  stands for the interchange

$$U \leftrightarrow U^\dagger , \quad l_\mu \leftrightarrow r_\mu , \quad \Sigma_\mu^L \leftrightarrow \Sigma_\mu^R .$$

The first term in Eq. (3.40) bears the mark of the anomaly: this part of the action is local in *five* dimensions, but it cannot be written as a finite polynomial in  $U$  and  $\partial_\mu U$  in four dimensions. This term involves at least five pseudoscalar fields. It contributes to  $K_{e5}$  decays, but its contribution is proportional to the electron mass and therefore strongly suppressed (Blaser, 1994). The convention used in Eq. (3.40) ensures that  $Z[U, l, r]_{\text{WZW}}$  conserves parity.

The Wess–Zumino–Witten functional contains all anomalous contributions to electromagnetic and semileptonic weak meson decays. However, this does not imply that there are no other contributions to transitions of odd intrinsic parity, which are characterized by an  $\varepsilon$  tensor in the

amplitude. Clearly, up to and including  $O(p^4)$ , only the chiral anomaly can contribute to such amplitudes (at tree level). At next-to-leading order in the odd-intrinsic-parity sector (one should avoid the misleading expression “anomalous” sector),  $O(p^6)$ , there are two contributions analogous to the even-parity sector at  $O(p^4)$ : the one-loop functional with a single vertex from the Wess–Zumino–Witten Lagrangian and tree-level diagrams from an effective chiral Lagrangian of  $O(p^6)$  containing an  $\varepsilon$  tensor.

The renormalization of the one-loop functional was carried out by several groups (Donoghue and Wyler, 1989b; Issler, 1989; Bijmans et al., 1990b; Akhoury and Alfakih, 1991). Chiral power counting shows that the coefficients of the Wess–Zumino–Witten functional are not renormalized in higher orders. Since this functional satisfies the anomalous Ward identity for the generating functional, all additional higher-order terms in the odd-intrinsic-parity sector must be chiral invariant. This can indeed be shown in an explicit regularization at every order in the loop expansion (Issler, 1989). In the usual way, the divergences of the one-loop functional are absorbed by the coefficients of the chiral Lagrangian of  $O(p^6)$  with odd intrinsic parity. This Lagrangian has been written down by three groups with three different results (Issler, 1989; Akhoury and Alfakih, 1991; Fearing and Scherer, 1994). The most careful analysis is due to Fearing and Scherer (1994) who find 32 independent terms.

It is rather clear that we will not be able to fix all 32 renormalized LECs of  $O(p^6)$  with odd intrinsic parity from experiment. Two approaches have been pursued to arrive at (model dependent) predictions for those coefficients: resonance saturation (Bijmans et al., 1990b; Pallante and Petronzio, 1993; Moussallam, 1994) and the constituent quark model based on the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model (Bijmans, 1991). Such predictions are essential to make contact with experiment in the “anomalous” sector. Among the observables investigated are the slope parameters in the decays  $P \rightarrow \gamma \gamma^*$  ( $P = \pi^0, \eta$ ). It turns out that the LECs of  $O(p^6)$  are absolutely necessary to understand the experimental slopes because the loop amplitudes at reasonable values of the renormalization scale are much too small. Both  $V$  exchange (Bijmans et al., 1990b) and the constituent quark model with  $M_Q \simeq 250$  MeV (Bijmans, 1991) can account for the data. Another interesting area is the  $P^3\gamma$  complex, in particular  $\gamma \pi^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$  and  $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$ . Again the finite parts are needed although the loop contributions are not negligible in this case (Bijmans et al., 1990b). For details I refer to the review by Bijmans (1993a). There is also considerable interest now on the experimental side to improve the existing measurements, especially concerning the  $\gamma \rightarrow 3\pi$  transition (Miskimen, 1994; Moinester, 1994). Further applications of CHPT to  $O(p^6)$  in the odd-intrinsic-parity sector will be mentioned in the next subsection.

### 3.5 Phenomenology at next-to-leading order

#### 3.5.1 $\pi\pi$ scattering

$\pi\pi$  scattering is a traditional testing ground for spontaneously broken chiral symmetry. It involves only the pseudo-Goldstone bosons of chiral  $SU(2)$ . Near threshold, the chiral expansion for  $SU(2)$  is expected to converge rather rapidly because the natural expansion parameter is of the order

$$\frac{4M_\pi^2}{16\pi^2 F_\pi^2} = 0.06 . \quad (3.42)$$

Of course, chiral logarithms will often enhance this value. Nevertheless,  $\pi\pi$  scattering offers a crucial test of the validity of the chiral expansion and of Standard CHPT in particular. The elastic scattering of pions is also one of the more promising instances to answer the questions raised by Generalized CHPT (Sect. 2.4).

The scattering amplitude for

$$\pi^a(p_a) + \pi^b(p_b) \rightarrow \pi^c(p_c) + \pi^d(p_d) \quad (3.43)$$

is determined by a single scalar function  $A(s, t, u)$  defined by the isospin decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} T_{ab,cd} &= \delta_{ab}\delta_{cd}A(s, t, u) + \delta_{ac}\delta_{bd}A(t, s, u) + \delta_{ad}\delta_{bc}A(u, t, s) \\ A(s, t, u) &= A(s, u, t) \quad [\text{crossing}] \end{aligned} \quad (3.44)$$

$$\begin{aligned} s &= (p_a + p_b)^2 = 4(M_\pi^2 + q^2) \\ t &= (p_a - p_c)^2 = -2q^2(1 - \cos \theta) \\ u &= (p_a - p_d)^2 = -2q^2(1 + \cos \theta) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.45)$$

Here,  $q$  and  $\theta$  are the center-of-mass momentum and scattering angle. The amplitudes  $T^I(s, t)$  of definite isospin ( $I = 0, 1, 2$ ) in the  $s$ -channel are decomposed into partial waves:

$$T^I(s, t) = 32\pi \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} (2l+1) P_l(\cos \theta) t_l^I(s) . \quad (3.46)$$

Unitarity implies that in the elastic region  $4M_\pi^2 \leq s \leq 16M_\pi^2$  the partial-wave amplitudes  $t_l^I$  can be described by real phase shifts  $\delta_l^I$ ,

$$t_l^I(s) = \left( \frac{s}{s - 4M_\pi^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{1}{2i} \{ e^{2i\delta_l^I(s)} - 1 \} . \quad (3.47)$$

The behaviour of the partial waves near threshold is of the form

$$\Re t_l^I(s) = q^{2l} \{ a_l^I + q^2 b_l^I + O(q^4) \} . \quad (3.48)$$

The quantities  $a_l^I$  ( $b_l^I$ ) are referred to as the  $\pi\pi$  scattering lengths (slope parameters).

The amplitude  $A(s, t, u)$  was evaluated to  $O(p^4)$  in the framework of chiral  $SU(2)$  by Gasser and Leutwyler (1983, 1984). The threshold parameters for  $l \leq 1$ ,  $I \leq 1$  are shown in Table 3.2 taken from a recent compilation of Gasser (1994a). The results are compared with the lowest-order predictions (Weinberg, 1966) and with experiment (Nagels et al., 1979). As emphasized by Gasser (1994a), the  $S$ -wave scattering lengths vanish in the chiral limit and are therefore especially sensitive to electromagnetic corrections. Although these corrections have not been calculated yet, one can get a feeling for their relevance by using  $M_{\pi^0}$  instead of the conventionally used  $M_{\pi^+}$ . This lowers the value for  $a_0^0$  by 0.016, comparable to the expected size of higher-order chiral corrections.

The phase shifts  $\delta_l^I$  may be calculated from the partial-wave amplitudes as (Gasser and Meißner, 1991a)

$$\delta_l^I(s) = (1 - 4M_\pi^2/s)^{1/2} \Re t_l^I(s) + O(p^6) . \quad (3.49)$$

In Fig. 3.2, the phase shift difference  $\delta_0^0 - \delta_1^1$  is compared with  $K_{e4}$  data from Rosset et al. (1977). Both in Fig. 3.2 and in Table 3.2, one sees a clear improvement of the  $O(p^4)$  predictions compared to the lowest-order results.

At the present level of accuracy, CHPT to  $O(p^4)$  is completely compatible with the experimental information. However, neglecting errors, one may be tempted to perceive a tendency for both the scattering length  $a_0^0$  and the phase shift difference  $\delta_0^0 - \delta_1^1$  to be a little on the low side in comparison with experiment. Clearly, one has to wait for more precise data, e.g., from  $K_{e4}$  experiments at the  $\Phi$  factory DAΦNE under construction in Frascati (Maiani et al., 1992, 1995). A proposed experiment

Table 3.2: Threshold parameters in units of  $M_{\pi^+}$  taken from Gasser (1994a). The errors of the  $O(p^4)$  results do not account for higher-order corrections.

	$O(p^2)$	$O(p^4)$	Experiment
$a_0^0$	0.16	$0.20 \pm 0.005$	$0.26 \pm 0.05$
$b_0^0$	0.18	$0.25 \pm 0.02$	$0.25 \pm 0.03$
$a_1^1$	0.030	$0.038 \pm 0.003$	$0.038 \pm 0.002$
$b_1^1$		$(5 \pm 3) \times 10^{-3}$	




Figure 3.2: The phase shift difference  $\delta_0^0 - \delta_1^1$  as a function of  $E = \sqrt{s}$  taken from Gasser (1994a). The data are from Rosselet et al. (1977). The solid line stands for the CHPT result at one-loop accuracy, whereas the dashed line displays the leading-order term.

at CERN (Czapek et al., 1992) measuring the lifetime of  $\pi^+\pi^-$  atoms would be a completely independent source of information for the difference  $|a_0^0 - a_0^2|$ .

On the theoretical side, attempts to calculate  $A(s, t, u)$  to  $O(p^6)$  are under way (Bijnens et al., in preparation; Colangelo, 1994; see also Sect. 5). In addition, elastic pion–pion scattering has been studied within the framework of Generalized CHPT (Stern et al., 1993; Knecht et al., 1994c). Although the amplitude  $A(s, t, u)$  has been calculated to  $O(p^4)$  in the generalized counting, the main message can already be extracted from the lowest–order amplitude of  $O(p^2)$ . In the notation of Sect. 2.4, the amplitude of  $O(p^2)$  is given by

$$A(s, t, u) = \frac{1}{F_\pi^2} \left( s - \frac{4}{3} M_\pi^2 \right) + \alpha \frac{M_\pi^2}{3F_\pi^2} \quad (3.50)$$

$$\alpha = 1 + 6 \frac{r_2 - r}{r^2 - 1} \left( 1 + \frac{2Z_0^S}{A_0} \right). \quad (3.51)$$

Ignoring the Zweig suppressed parameter  $Z_0^S$ , it is easy to check that both the scattering length  $a_0^0$  and the phase shift difference  $\delta_0^0 - \delta_1^1$  increase as  $r$  decreases from its standard value  $r_2$  (at tree level) towards its lower limit  $r_1$  given in (2.54). For  $r \simeq 10$ , the predictions agree nearly perfectly with experiment even if the errors were considerably smaller. This conclusion is not much changed by the  $O(p^4)$  calculation especially since quite a number of new unknown LECs enter for which only rough order–of–magnitude estimates can be given (Knecht et al., 1994c). In any case, Generalized CHPT can only make its point if there are noticeable differences to the standard scenario already at lowest order. It is interesting, although not completely unrelated to  $\pi\pi$  scattering, that a similar analysis of  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$  also favours  $r \simeq 10$  (Knecht et al., 1994a). We shall come back to this process in Sect. 5 within the standard approach where the experimental data can be fully understood on the basis of a calculation to  $O(p^6)$  (Bellucci et al., 1994).

### 3.5.2 Semileptonic $K$ decays

All semileptonic  $K$  decays, including radiative transitions, that can be investigated experimentally in the near future have now been calculated to  $O(p^4)$  [for an up–to–date review, see Bijnens et al. (1994d)]. Here, I want to review briefly the recent work of Bijnens et al. (1994a) on  $K_{l4}$  decays.

The decays

$$K \rightarrow \pi\pi\ell\nu \quad (\ell = e, \mu) \quad (3.52)$$

are described by four form factors  $F, G, H, R$ . In CHPT, one sets up an energy expansion of the form

$$A = \frac{M_K}{F_\pi} \{A_0 + A_2 + A_4 + \dots\} \quad (A = F, G, H, R) \quad (3.53)$$

where  $A_n$  is a quantity of  $O(p^n)$  due to the generating functional of  $O(p^{n+2})$ . The difference in the chiral dimension is of course due to the external  $W$  field and to the momenta in the definition of the transition amplitude in terms of form factors.

The form factor  $H$  involves an  $\varepsilon$  tensor and therefore three momenta in the amplitude. Consequently,  $H_0 = 0$  and the leading contribution is due to the Wess–Zumino–Witten functional. For the decay  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\ell^+\nu_\ell$ , it is given by (Bijnens, 1990a; Rigenbach et al., 1991)

$$H = -\frac{\sqrt{2}M_K^3}{8\pi^2 F_\pi^3} = -2.7, \quad (3.54)$$

in excellent agreement with the experimental value  $H = -2.68 \pm 0.68$  (Rosset et al., 1977). The agreement persists if corrections of  $O(p^6)$ , i.e.  $H_4$ , are included. The loop and the local contributions

Table 3.3: Results of fits with one-loop and unitarized form factors, respectively (Bijnens et al., 1994a). The errors quoted for the  $L_i^r$  are statistical only. The  $L_i^r$  are given in units of  $10^{-3}$  at the scale  $\mu = M_\rho$ , the scattering lengths  $a_i^I$  and the slopes  $b_i^I$  in appropriate powers of  $M_{\pi^+}$ .

	$K_{e4}$ data alone		$K_{e4}$ and $\pi\pi$ data		experiment
	one-loop	unitarized	one-loop	unitarized	Nagels et al. (1979)
$L_1^r$	$0.65 \pm 0.27$	$0.36 \pm 0.26$	$0.60 \pm 0.24$	$0.37 \pm 0.23$	
$L_2^r$	$1.63 \pm 0.28$	$1.35 \pm 0.27$	$1.50 \pm 0.23$	$1.35 \pm 0.23$	
$L_3$	$-3.4 \pm 1.0$	$-3.4 \pm 1.0$	$-3.3 \pm 0.86$	$-3.5 \pm 0.85$	
$a_0^0$	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	$0.26 \pm 0.05$
$b_0^0$	0.26	0.25	0.26	0.25	$0.25 \pm 0.03$
$-10 a_0^2$	0.40	0.41	0.40	0.41	$0.28 \pm 0.12$
$-10 b_0^2$	0.67	0.72	0.68	0.72	$0.82 \pm 0.08$
$10 a_1^1$	0.36	0.37	0.36	0.37	$0.38 \pm 0.02$
$10^2 b_1^1$	0.44	0.47	0.43	0.48	
$10^2 a_2^0$	0.22	0.18	0.21	0.18	$0.17 \pm 0.03$
$10^3 a_2^2$	0.39	0.21	0.37	0.20	$0.13 \pm 0.3$
$\chi^2/N_{\text{DOF}}$	0/0	0/0	8.8/7	4.9/7	

(estimated with vector meson exchange, cf. Sect. 3.4) almost compensate the renormalization of the kaon decay constant, leaving the prediction (3.54) practically unchanged (Ametller et al., 1993).

The form factor  $R$  was calculated to  $O(p^4)$  by Bijnens et al. (1994a). Effectively, it only contributes to  $K_{\mu 3}$  decays because its contribution to the rate is suppressed by a factor  $m_\ell^2$ . The corrections of  $O(p^4)$  for the form factors  $F$ ,  $G$  had been calculated before (Bijnens, 1990a; Riggensbach et al., 1991) and were found to be substantial. In fact, the experimental results from  $K_{e3}$  decays are  $30 \div 50$  % above the leading contributions  $F_0$ ,  $G_0$ . In order to reduce the uncertainties of the chiral prediction, Bijnens et al. (1994a) have estimated the size of higher-order contributions to the form factor  $F$  that is dominantly  $S$ -wave. Following Donoghue et al. (1990), they write down a dispersion relation for the  $S$ -wave projection of the relevant amplitude and fix the subtraction constants via CHPT. Then they perform a partial unitarization by employing an Omnés-type representation for the partial-wave amplitude. It turns out that the effects of final state interactions are sizable in this case because they are related to the  $I = 0$   $S$ -wave  $\pi\pi$  phase shift. This procedure leads both to a reduction of uncertainties in the LECs  $L_1$ ,  $L_2$ ,  $L_3$  and to improved predictions for the form factor  $G$  and for the total decay rates. In Table 3.3, I reproduce the results of fits (Bijnens et al., 1994a) to  $K_{e4}$  form factors and  $\pi\pi$  threshold parameters to determine the  $L_i$  ( $i=1,2,3$ ). One observes that inclusion of the unitarity corrections produces a noticeable shift especially for  $L_1$ . Moreover, the overall description of the  $\pi\pi$  scattering data is improved in this way, in particular for the  $D$ -wave scattering lengths. The results in column 5 give rise to the new values of  $L_1$ ,  $L_2$ ,  $L_3$  in Table 3.1, taking into account theoretical error estimates in addition to the purely statistical errors in Table 3.3.

Once the leading partial waves are known from, e.g.,  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-e^+\nu_e$  decays, the chiral representation allows one to predict the remaining rates with rather small uncertainties (Bijnens et al., 1994a). In the near future, substantial higher precision can be expected in  $K_{l4}$  experiments,



e.g., at the  $\Phi$  factory DAΦNE (Maiani et al., 1992, 1995). This precision will be especially welcome for extracting the  $\pi\pi$  phase shift difference  $\delta_0^0 - \delta_1^1$  and for determining the corresponding threshold parameters with small uncertainties (see also Sects. 3.5.1 and 2.4).

### 3.5.3 The decays $P \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ ( $P = \pi^0, \eta, K^0$ ; $\ell = e, \mu$ )

The decays of pseudoscalar mesons into a lepton pair proceed through two-photon intermediate states and via local  $P\ell^+\ell^-$  operators. The latter have not been included in the effective Lagrangians discussed so far, but it is straightforward to do so.

The amplitude for the decay of a neutral spin-0 meson  $P$  of mass  $M$  into a lepton pair has the general form

$$T(P \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-) = \bar{u}(iB + A\gamma_5)v \quad (3.55)$$

with a decay rate

$$\Gamma(P \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-) = \frac{M\beta_\ell}{8\pi}(|A|^2 + \beta_\ell^2|B|^2), \quad \beta_\ell = \left(1 - \frac{4m_\ell^2}{M^2}\right)^{1/2}. \quad (3.56)$$

In the limit of  $CP$  conservation, the transitions for  $P = \pi^0, \eta, K_2^0$  proceed via the  $S$ -wave amplitude  $A$ , while the decay with  $P = K_1^0$  is determined by the  $P$ -wave amplitude  $B$ .

For  $P = \pi^0$  or  $\eta$ , the strong and electromagnetic interactions are relevant. The effective Lagrangian for  $P \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$  of lowest chiral dimension has the form (Savage et al., 1992)

$$\mathcal{L}(P \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-) = \frac{3i\alpha^2}{32\pi^2} \bar{\ell}\gamma^\mu\gamma_5\ell \left\{ 2\chi_1 \langle Q^2 U \partial_\mu U^\dagger \rangle + \chi_2 \langle Q(UQ\partial_\mu U^\dagger - \partial_\mu UQ U^\dagger) \rangle \right\} \quad (3.57)$$

where  $\ell = e$  or  $\mu$  and  $Q$  is the quark charge matrix defined in Eq. (2.16). The decay amplitudes depend on the sum  $\chi_1 + \chi_2$ . In fact, this coefficient is needed to renormalize the divergent one-loop contribution with a two-photon intermediate state and an anomalous  $P\gamma\gamma$  vertex (Savage et al., 1992). Thus, one can determine the renormalized LEC  $\chi_1^r + \chi_2^r$  from one decay rate to get absolute predictions for the remaining ones. Taking the recently measured branching ratio (Kessler et al., 1993; Review Part. Prop., 1994)  $BR(\eta \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = (5.7 \pm 0.8) \cdot 10^{-6}$  as input, Savage et al. (1992) predicted

$$\begin{aligned} BR(\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-) &= (7 \pm 1) \cdot 10^{-8} \\ BR(\eta \rightarrow e^+ e^-) &= (5 \pm 1) \cdot 10^{-9} \end{aligned} \quad (3.58)$$

compared with the present experimental values (Review Part. Prop., 1994)

$$\begin{aligned} BR(\pi^0 \rightarrow e^+ e^-)_{\text{exp}} &= (7.5 \pm 2.0) \cdot 10^{-8} \\ BR(\eta \rightarrow e^+ e^-)_{\text{exp}} &< 3 \cdot 10^{-4} \quad (90\% \text{ c.l.}) \end{aligned} \quad (3.59)$$

The nonleptonic weak interactions (cf. Sect. 4) are responsible for the decays  $K^0 \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ .  $CPS$  invariance (Bernard et al., 1985; Crewther, 1986; Leurer, 1988) and chiral symmetry dictate the lowest-order coupling (Ecker and Pich, 1991)

$$\partial^\mu K_2^0 \bar{\ell}\gamma_\mu\gamma_5\ell \quad (3.60)$$

contributing only to the  $S$ -wave amplitude  $A$ . There is in fact a well-known short-distance contribution of this type for  $K_L \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$  (Gaillard and Lee, 1974) with an important top-quark contribution. However, this decay is dominated by the absorptive part of the transition  $K_L \rightarrow \gamma^* \gamma^* \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ :

$$|\Im A_2^{\gamma\gamma}| = \frac{\alpha m_\ell}{4\beta_\ell M_K} \ln \frac{1 + \beta_\ell}{1 - \beta_\ell} \left[ \frac{64\pi\Gamma(K_L \rightarrow 2\gamma)}{M_K} \right]^{1/2} \quad (3.61)$$

or

$$BR(K_L \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-)_{\text{abs}} \simeq \frac{\alpha^2 m_\ell^2}{2\beta_\ell M_K^2} \left( \ln \frac{1 + \beta_\ell}{1 - \beta_\ell} \right)^2 B(K_L \rightarrow 2\gamma) . \quad (3.62)$$

The experimental branching ratio (Review Part. Prop., 1994)  $BR(K_L \rightarrow 2\gamma) = (5.73 \pm 0.27) \cdot 10^{-4}$  yields for  $\ell = \mu$

$$|\Im m A_2^{\gamma\gamma}| = (2.21 \pm 0.05) \cdot 10^{-12} \quad (3.63)$$

and

$$BR(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)_{\text{abs}} = (6.85 \pm 0.32) \cdot 10^{-9} . \quad (3.64)$$

Comparing with the latest measurements

$$BR(K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-) = \begin{cases} (7.9 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3) \cdot 10^{-9} & (\text{Akagi et al., 1991}) \\ (7.0 \pm 0.5) \cdot 10^{-9} & (\text{Heinson et al., 1991}) \\ (7.4 \pm 0.4) \cdot 10^{-9} & (\text{Review Part. Prop., 1994}) \end{cases} , \quad (3.65)$$

one finds that the two-photon absorptive part (unitarity bound) nearly saturates the total rate.

The dispersive part for the two-photon intermediate state is model dependent. There are various models in the literature (Bergström et al., 1983, 1990; Bélanger and Geng, 1991; Ko, 1992) that make different predictions for the dispersive part. As long as not even the sign of the interference between the dispersive and the short-distance part is definitely established, the decay  $K_L \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$  is of limited use for the determination of the CKM mixing matrix element  $V_{td}$ . For  $K_L \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ , the unitarity bound due to the two-photon absorptive part is  $BR(K_L \rightarrow e^+ e^-) = 3 \cdot 10^{-12}$ .

The decays  $K_S \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$  are theoretically interesting because the lowest-order amplitude in CHPT is unambiguously calculable (Ecker and Pich, 1991). It is given by a two-loop diagram describing the transition  $K_1^0 \rightarrow \gamma^* \gamma^* \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$ . The loop amplitude must be finite because, unlike (3.60), there is no corresponding counterterm for  $K_1^0$ . Normalizing to the rate for  $K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ , one obtains the relative branching ratios (Ecker and Pich, 1991)

$$\frac{\Gamma(K_S \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)}{\Gamma(K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)} = 2 \cdot 10^{-6} , \quad \frac{\Gamma(K_S \rightarrow e^+ e^-)}{\Gamma(K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)} = 8 \cdot 10^{-9} , \quad (3.66)$$

well below the present experimental upper limits (Review Part. Prop., 1994).

### 3.5.4 $\eta$ decays

Although there are still several open questions in  $\eta$  decays, progress has recently been made concerning the rates of the dominant hadronic decay modes  $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$  and  $3\pi^0$ . To  $O(p^4)$ , the rate for the charged channel can be written (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1985c) as

$$\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0) = \frac{\Gamma_0}{Q^4} , \quad \Gamma_0 \simeq 51 \text{ MeV} , \quad (3.67)$$

where  $\Gamma_0$  depends only on pseudoscalar masses and decay constants and on  $L_3$  (cf. Table 3.1). Using Dashen's theorem to calculate  $Q \simeq 24$  (see Sect. 3.3) and accounting for possible higher-order chiral corrections, Gasser and Leutwyler (1985c) found  $\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0) = (160 \pm 50) \text{ eV}$ . In comparison, the present experimental value for this rate is  $(283 \pm 26) \text{ eV}$  (Review Part. Prop., 1994).

This long-standing problem has come closer to a solution through the recent calculations of corrections to Dashen's theorem discussed in Sect. 6.2. For instance, taking  $Q = 21$  in (3.67) leads to  $\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0) = 262 \text{ eV}$ . Conversely, using the experimental width in (3.67) gives

$Q = 20.6 \pm 0.5$ , compatible with the estimates in Sect. 6.2. Before declaring the  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi$  problem to be solved, some more work is certainly needed. The effect of final state interactions beyond  $O(p^4)$  should be estimated (Anisovich, 1993; Kambor et al., 1994b). In addition, including the relatively large  $\eta - \eta'$  mixing beyond  $O(p^4)$  (where it only enters via the LEC  $L_7$ ) could modify the picture (Pich, 1990).

A step in this direction has recently been taken by Moussallam (1994) who investigated  $O(p^6)$  corrections to the decays  $P \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  ( $P = \pi^0, \eta, \eta'$ ). He argues that in order to perform the large  $N_c$  expansion consistently with the chiral expansion one should treat terms of  $O(1/N_c)$  effectively as  $O(p^2)$ . Working to  $O(p^4)$  according to this general counting with the  $\eta'$  as an explicit field in the chiral Lagrangian, he finds  $\eta_8 - \eta_0$  mixing both in the kinetic and in the mass terms. Consequently, the diagonalization requires two different mixing angles instead of the familiar single one of previous treatments. In order to obtain agreement with the experimental  $P \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  widths, a local term of  $O(p^6)$  involving the external (pseudo)scalar field and therefore the quark mass matrix is needed. A small increase of  $\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma)$  is also predicted (Moussallam, 1994), but much higher experimental precision would be required to detect such a small correction.

The decay  $\eta \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma\gamma$  is an interesting example of a transition where the naive chiral dimensional analysis fails dramatically. The decay has many things in common with  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$  (cf. Sect. 5.2): there are no contributions from either  $\mathcal{L}_2$  or  $\mathcal{L}_4$  and the amplitude is given exclusively by the finite one-loop contribution. However, the corresponding rate (Ecker, 1989c)

$$\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma\gamma)_{\text{loop}} = 0.35 \cdot 10^{-2} \text{ eV} \quad (3.68)$$

is about a factor 230 lower than the (single) experimental measurement (Binon et al., 1982)

$$\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma\gamma)_{\text{exp}} = (0.82 \pm 0.17) \text{ eV} . \quad (3.69)$$

The reason for this discrepancy is well understood: the usually dominating pion-loop amplitude is suppressed by  $m_u - m_d$ , while the kaon-loop contribution is small anyway. Not even the two-loop amplitude is of much help (Ecker, 1989c). The dominant contribution arises at  $O(p^6)$  due to vector meson exchange and gives at least the right order of magnitude (Cheng, 1967). Ametller et al. (1992) have put the relevant contributions together including effects of  $O(p^8)$  and higher. Assuming positive interference between the significant contributions, they conclude that the theoretical answer for the rate is probably still lower than the experimental result (3.69), but the discrepancy is no more than two standard deviations. Additional resonance contributions have been investigated by Ko (1993a).

There are many other  $\eta$  decays worth investigating. The decays  $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma^*$  and  $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$  are considered in Sect. 3.4. The transitions  $\eta \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^-$  are discussed in the previous subsection and the semileptonic  $\eta_{13}$  decays are analysed in Sect. 6.2. Further calculations of semileptonic  $\eta$  decays, all below  $10^{-13}$  in branching ratio, can be found in a recent paper of Bramon and Shabalin (1994). Ko (1993b) has given the following estimates for channels that could soon be (or have already been) detected:

$$\begin{aligned} BR(\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- e^+ e^-) &\simeq 7 \cdot 10^{-4} \\ BR(\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \mu^+ \mu^-) &\simeq 6 \cdot 10^{-8} \\ BR(\eta \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 e^+ e^-) &\simeq 7 \cdot 10^{-8} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.70)$$

With a special model incorporating vector mesons, Picciotto and Richardson (1993) obtained  $BR(\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- e^+ e^-) = (3.2 \pm 0.3) \cdot 10^{-4}$ .

## 4 NONLEPTONIC WEAK INTERACTIONS OF MESONS

### 4.1 Generating functional of $O(G_F p^4)$

At tree level, the effective Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$  in (2.41) gives rise to the current algebra relations between  $K \rightarrow 2\pi$  and  $K \rightarrow 3\pi$  amplitudes. Even more so than in the strong sector (see especially Sect. 4.5), it is necessary to go beyond the leading order in the nonleptonic sector for a meaningful comparison with experiment.

As in the strong sector, the nonleptonic weak amplitudes of  $O(G_F p^4)$  consist in general of several parts, which may contain arbitrary tree structures associated with the lowest-order strong Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2$  :

- i. Tree-level amplitudes from the effective chiral Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_4^{\Delta S=1}$  of  $O(G_F p^4)$  with the transformation properties of a nonleptonic weak Lagrangian.
- ii. One-loop amplitudes from diagrams with a single vertex of  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$  in the loop.
- iii. Reducible tree-level amplitudes with a single vertex from  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$  and with a single vertex from  $\mathcal{L}_4$  in (3.1) or from the anomalous action (3.40).
- iv. One-loop amplitudes of the reducible type, consisting of a strong loop diagram connected to a vertex of  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$  by a single meson line. A frequently occurring diagram of this type contains an external  $K - \pi$  or  $K - \eta$  transition as weak vertex, possibly with one or two photons (generalized “pole diagrams”). The calculation of such diagrams can be simplified by rediagonalizing the kinetic and mass terms of  $\mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$  [“weak rotation” (Ecker et al., 1987b, 1988)].

The most general weak chiral Lagrangian of  $O(G_F p^4)$  with the appropriate  $(8_L, 1_R)$  and  $(27_L, 1_R)$  transformation properties is quite involved. Using *CPS* invariance (Bernard et al., 1985; Crewther, 1986; Leurer, 1988), the lowest-order equation of motion and the Cayley–Hamilton theorem for 3-dimensional matrices, 35 independent structures (plus 2 contact terms involving external fields only) remain in the octet sector alone (Kambor et al., 1990; Ecker, 1990b; Esposito-Farèse, 1991). However, many of those couplings contribute only to transitions that involve an external  $W$  boson in addition to the nonleptonic weak transition. Restricting attention to those terms where the only external gauge fields are photons (or  $Z$  bosons), 22 relevant octet terms remain (Ecker et al., 1993b). A similar reduction takes place in the 27-plet sector. The octet Lagrangian can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_4^{\Delta S=1} &= G_8 F^2 \sum_i N_i W_i \\
&= G_8 F^2 \{ N_1 \langle \lambda D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U D_\nu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle + N_2 \langle \lambda D_\mu U^\dagger D^\nu U D_\nu U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle \\
&\quad + N_3 \langle \lambda D_\mu U^\dagger D_\nu U \rangle \langle D^\mu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle + N_4 \langle \lambda D_\mu U^\dagger U \rangle \langle U^\dagger D^\mu U D_\nu U^\dagger D^\nu U \rangle \\
&\quad + N_5 \langle \lambda \{ U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U, D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U \} \rangle + N_6 \langle \lambda D_\mu U^\dagger U \rangle \langle U^\dagger D^\mu U (U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U) \rangle \\
&\quad + N_7 \langle \lambda (U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U) \rangle \langle D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle + N_8 \langle \lambda D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle \langle U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U \rangle \\
&\quad + N_9 \langle \lambda [U^\dagger \chi - \chi^\dagger U, D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U] \rangle + N_{10} \langle \lambda (U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U)^2 \rangle \\
&\quad + N_{11} \langle \lambda (U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U) \rangle \langle U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U \rangle + N_{12} \langle \lambda (U^\dagger \chi - \chi^\dagger U)^2 \rangle \\
&\quad + N_{13} \langle \lambda (U^\dagger \chi - \chi^\dagger U) \rangle \langle U^\dagger \chi - \chi^\dagger U \rangle + N_{14} i \langle \lambda \{ F_L^{\mu\nu} + U^\dagger F_R^{\mu\nu} U, D_\mu U^\dagger D_\nu U \} \rangle \\
&\quad + N_{15} i \langle \lambda D_\mu U^\dagger (U F_L^{\mu\nu} U^\dagger + F_R^{\mu\nu}) D_\nu U \rangle + N_{16} i \langle \lambda \{ F_L^{\mu\nu} - U^\dagger F_R^{\mu\nu} U, D_\mu U^\dagger D_\nu U \} \rangle \\
&\quad + N_{17} i \langle \lambda D_\mu U^\dagger (U F_L^{\mu\nu} U^\dagger - F_R^{\mu\nu}) D_\nu U \rangle + 2N_{18} \langle \lambda (F_L^{\mu\nu} U^\dagger F_{R\mu\nu} U + U^\dagger F_{R\mu\nu} U F_L^{\mu\nu}) \rangle \}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +N_{28} \, i\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \langle \lambda D^\mu U^\dagger U \rangle \langle U^\dagger D^\nu U D^\rho U^\dagger D^\sigma U \rangle + 2N_{29} \, \langle \lambda [U^\dagger \tilde{F}_R^{\mu\nu} U, D_\mu U^\dagger D_\nu U] \rangle \\
& +N_{30} \, \langle \lambda U^\dagger D_\mu U \rangle \langle (\tilde{F}_L^{\mu\nu} + U^\dagger \tilde{F}_R^{\mu\nu} U) D_\nu U^\dagger U \rangle \\
& +N_{31} \, \langle \lambda U^\dagger D_\mu U \rangle \langle (\tilde{F}_L^{\mu\nu} - U^\dagger \tilde{F}_R^{\mu\nu} U) D_\nu U^\dagger U \rangle \\
& +\text{h.c.} + \dots
\end{aligned}$$

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_6 - i\lambda_7) \, , \quad \tilde{F}_{A\mu\nu} = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F_A^{\rho\sigma} \quad (A = L, R) \, ,$$

with dimensionless coupling constants  $N_i$ . Only the 22 relevant octet operators  $W_i$  are listed in (4.1).

At first sight, it would seem that the predictive power of a completely general chiral analysis using only symmetry constraints is very limited. However, especially for the radiative  $K$  decays to be discussed in Sect. 4.5, only a small subset of the terms in the Lagrangian (4.1) contribute to the amplitudes. Also for the dominant decay modes  $K \rightarrow 2\pi, 3\pi$ , only a few combinations of the  $N_i$  contribute as will be discussed in Sect. 4.3.

As in the strong sector, the weak loop amplitudes are in general divergent. Since the strong one-loop functional of  $O(p^4)$  has already been renormalized, the sum of the reducible amplitudes (items iii and iv of the previous classification) is finite and scale independent. The remaining renormalization of the irreducible weak amplitudes (i, ii) proceeds in exactly the same way as in Sect. 3.1. Corresponding to Eq. (3.4), the weak couplings  $N_i$  are decomposed as

$$N_i = N_i^r(\mu) + Z_i \Lambda(\mu) \, . \quad (4.2)$$

The constants  $Z_i$  are chosen to absorb the one-loop divergences in the amplitudes (Kambor et al., 1990; Ecker, 1990; Esposito-Farèse, 1991; Ecker et al., 1993). The renormalized coupling constants  $N_i^r(\mu)$  are measurable quantities. As in the strong sector, the scale dependences of the coupling constant and of the loop amplitude cancel in the total amplitudes. The final amplitudes of  $O(G_F p^4)$  are finite and scale independent.

## 4.2 Low-energy constants of $O(G_F p^4)$

Both from a phenomenological and from a theoretical point of view, the situation of the weak LECs of  $O(G_F p^4)$  is much less advanced than in the strong sector. The chiral duality observed for the  $L_i$  is at least motivation enough to investigate the contributions of meson resonances also to the weak nonleptonic Lagrangian.

However, it is clear from the outset that resonance exchange cannot be the whole story in this case. For instance, there are genuine weak short-distance contributions which have no equivalent in the strong sector, such as the electromagnetic penguin contribution to the weak coupling constants  $N_{14}$ ,  $N_{16}$  and  $N_{18}$  (Ecker et al., 1988; Bruno and Prades, 1993). Another important contribution to the weak constants is due to the chiral anomaly. As will be discussed in Sect. 4.4, the chiral anomaly contributes to and probably dominates the “magnetic” coupling constants  $N_{28}, \dots, N_{31}$ . Nevertheless, it is useful to compile the possible contributions of meson resonances to the  $N_i$ . Such a general investigation of resonance effects in the weak chiral Lagrangian was performed by Ecker et al. (1993b). The result is as expected: one can understand which type of resonances can in principle contribute to the different  $N_i$ , but more quantitative predictions are impossible as long as the weak resonance couplings are unknown.

A more predictive framework is based on the idea of factorization [see Pich and de Rafael (1991) and references therein]. To leading order in  $1/N_c$  and in the QCD coupling constant  $\alpha_s$ , a generic four-quark operator with  $V, A$  structure is realized as a product of chiral currents, e.g.,

$$\bar{q}_{iL} \gamma^\mu q_{kL} \bar{q}_{jL} \gamma_\mu q_{iL} \Rightarrow J_{lk}^\mu J_{\mu,ji} \quad (4.3)$$

$$J_\mu = \frac{\delta S_{\text{strong}}}{\delta l^\mu} = J_\mu^{(1)} + J_\mu^{(3)} + \dots ,$$

where  $S_{\text{strong}}$  is the chiral action for the strong interactions and  $l^\mu$  is the octet of left-chiral external gauge fields. The left-chiral current  $J_\mu$  is decomposed into pieces of chiral dimension  $D = 1, 3, \dots$  with

$$J_\mu^{(1)} = -\frac{i}{2} F^2 U^\dagger D_\mu U . \quad (4.4)$$

The current of  $O(p^3)$  has both a normal part depending on the  $L_i$  and a parameter-free anomalous part due to the Wess–Zumino–Witten functional (3.40). Here, I only keep the part with even intrinsic parity and refer to Sect. 4.4 for a treatment of the chiral anomaly in nonleptonic weak interactions.

The factorization model (Cheng, 1990; Bijmans et al., 1992; Ecker et al., 1993b) is defined by the following Lagrangian of  $O(G_F p^4)$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{4,\text{FM}}^{\Delta S=1} = 4k_f G_8 \langle \lambda_6 \{ J_\mu^{(1)}, J^{(3)\mu} \} \rangle , \quad (4.5)$$

with a fudge factor  $k_f = O(1)$  to allow for a different overall scale compared to  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$ . If factorization is to make sense, the scale factor  $k_f$  is expected to be  $O(1)$ . The basic factorization relation (4.3) contains no reference to the QCD scale  $\mu$ . Consequently, the non-leading corrections must provide the necessary  $\mu$  dependence (Pich and de Rafael, 1991) to compensate the scale dependence of the Wilson coefficients  $C_i(\mu)$  in the effective Hamiltonian (2.21). A minimal improvement of naive factorization ( $k_f = 1$ ) is to put those corrections into the fudge factor  $k_f$  in Eq. (4.5). There is of course no guarantee that all terms in (4.5) have the same scale factor. The FM as defined here assumes this to be a reasonable approximation with  $k_f$  left as a free parameter. A systematic improvement of this assumption has been performed by Bruno and Prades (1993) using the method of the effective action (Espriu et al., 1990). Another model with the same structure of the weak Lagrangian of  $O(G_F p^4)$  as in (4.5) is the weak deformation model (Ecker et al., 1990a) that predicts in addition  $k_f = 1/2$ . Although factorization is in principle independent of resonance exchange, the factorization model (4.5) can also be viewed as a special model for the contributions of resonances to the weak LECs  $N_i$ , at least to the extent that the  $L_i$  are saturated by resonance exchange (chiral duality). We come back to the factorization model in the following subsections. At present, the model can accommodate the available experimental information, but it has not really been put to a decisive test yet.

### 4.3 $K \rightarrow 2\pi, 3\pi$

Kambor et al. (1991) have calculated the dominant decay modes  $K \rightarrow 2\pi, 3\pi$  to next-to-leading order in CHPT. In addition to the two isospin amplitudes  $A_0(\Delta I = 1/2)$  and  $A_2(\Delta I = 3/2)$  for  $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ , there are 10 measurable quantities in the standard expansion of the  $K \rightarrow 3\pi$  amplitudes to fourth order in the momenta (Devlin and Dickey, 1979):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta I = \frac{1}{2} & : & \alpha_1, \beta_1, \zeta_1, \xi_1 \\ \Delta I = \frac{3}{2} & : & \alpha_3, \beta_3, \gamma_3, \zeta_3, \xi_3, \xi'_3 . \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

The current algebra analysis of  $O(G_F p^2)$  predicts 7 observable quantities in terms of the two parameters  $G_8, G_{27}$  [the quadratic slope parameters  $\zeta_i, \xi_i, \xi'_3$  vanish to  $O(G_F p^2)$ ]. It has been known for a long time that those predictions show the right qualitative trend only. There are sizable discrepancies between theory and experiment at the current algebra level.

Table 4.1: Predicted and measured values of the quadratic slope parameters in the  $K \rightarrow 3\pi$  amplitudes, all given in units of  $10^{-8}$ . The table is taken from Kambor et al. (1992) and is based on the  $O(G_F p^4)$  calculation of Kambor et al. (1991).

parameter	prediction	exp. value
$\zeta_1$	$-0.47 \pm 0.18$	$-0.47 \pm 0.15$
$\xi_1$	$-1.58 \pm 0.19$	$-1.51 \pm 0.30$
$\zeta_3$	$-0.011 \pm 0.006$	$-0.21 \pm 0.08$
$\xi_3$	$0.092 \pm 0.030$	$-0.12 \pm 0.17$
$\xi'_3$	$-0.033 \pm 0.077$	$-0.21 \pm 0.51$

The agreement between CHPT and experiment is improved substantially to  $O(G_F p^4)$  (Kambor et al., 1991). One may worry that this improvement is mainly due to the unknown LECs  $N_i$  in the amplitudes. A priori, there are 13 weak LECs ( $N_1, \dots, N_{13}$ ) that could contribute in the octet amplitudes. Taking a closer look at the corresponding operators  $W_i$  in Eq. (4.1), one finds that  $W_4$  and  $W_6$  can only contribute to transitions involving at least five pseudoscalar fields. Likewise,  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  are identical up to and including  $O(\varphi^4)$  so that only the sum  $N_1 + N_2$  appears in observable transition amplitudes. A further reduction of counterterms occurs if one neglects terms of  $O(M_\pi^2)$ . In addition to the tree-level (only for  $A_0$ ,  $\alpha_1$  and  $\beta_1$ ) and loop contributions, the octet amplitudes have the following local terms of  $O(G_F p^4)$  (Kambor et al., 1991):

$$\begin{aligned}
A_0 &= -\frac{2\sqrt{6}G_8M_K^2(M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)}{F_K}k_1 \\
\alpha_1 &= -\frac{2G_8M_K^4}{9F_KF_\pi}\{3k_1 - k_2 + 8(2L_1 + 2L_2 + L_3)\} \\
\beta_1 &= -\frac{G_8M_K^2M_\pi^2}{3F_KF_\pi}\{k_3 - 6k_1 - 8(2L_1 - L_2 + L_3 - 12L_4)\} \\
\zeta_1 &= -\frac{G_8M_K^4}{2F_KF_\pi}\{k_2 - 8(2L_1 + 2L_2 + L_3)\} \\
\xi_1 &= -\frac{G_8M_K^4}{2F_KF_\pi}\{k_3 - 8(2L_1 - L_2 + L_3)\} .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

The  $k_i$  are combinations of the  $N_i$  in (4.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
k_1 &= -N_5 + 2N_7 - 2N_8 - N_9 \\
k_2 &= N_1 + N_2 + 2N_3 \\
k_3 &= N_1 + N_2 - N_3 .
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

All LECs in Eqs. (4.7) and (4.8) are the renormalized ones, taken at a scale  $\mu$ . Treating the strong couplings  $L_i$  as known input [no errors were included for the  $L_i$  in the analysis of Kambor et al. (1991)], one can exhibit the results in a concise way by eliminating the unknown weak parameters  $k_i$  (and the corresponding 27-plet couplings). The resulting five relations can be formulated as predictions for the slope parameters (Kambor et al., 1992). The predictions are compared with the experimental values in Table 4.1. Except for  $\zeta_3$ , which is expected to be rather sensitive to isospin violating radiative corrections, the agreement is quite impressive.

One can try to understand the renormalized values of the  $k_i$  in (4.8) from the fit of Kambor et al. (1991) in terms of a model for the weak LECs. In the factorization model discussed in

the last subsection, only scalar exchange contributes to the  $k_i$  (Ecker et al., 1993b). The usually dominant  $V$  exchange drops out in the specific combinations (4.8) (Isidori and Pugliese, 1992). The factorization model predicts in particular a negative  $k_1$  and  $k_2 = k_3 > 0$ . Taking the fitted values of the  $k_i$  at the scale  $\mu = M_\rho$ , these predictions are not satisfied (Ecker et al., 1993b). However, it is probably premature to discard the factorization model on the basis of this evidence. As one sees from the amplitudes in (4.7), the strong LECs  $L_i$  enter with rather big coefficients. As already remarked, the errors for the  $k_i$  in the fit of Kambor et al. (1991) do not include errors of the  $L_i$  (see Table 3.1). Moreover, the coefficient  $k_1$  is strongly scale dependent so that it is rather ambiguous at which scale the factorization model should be compared with the  $k_i^r(\mu)$ . In conclusion, the decays  $K \rightarrow 2\pi$ ,  $3\pi$  are probably not the best place to test the factorization model, at least not at the present level of accuracy. The radiative decays of Sect. 4.5 are in principle (there is not enough experimental information at the moment) better suited for this purpose, because in that case  $V$  and  $A$  exchange contribute to the relevant weak LECs (Ecker et al., 1993b).

#### 4.4 Chiral anomaly in nonleptonic kaon decays

The contributions of the chiral anomaly to strong, electromagnetic and semileptonic weak amplitudes can be expressed in terms of the Wess–Zumino–Witten functional (3.40). However, the chiral anomaly also contributes to nonleptonic weak amplitudes starting at  $O(G_F p^4)$ . Two different manifestations of the anomaly can be distinguished.

The reducible anomalous amplitudes (type iii in the classification of Sect. 4.1) arise from the contraction of meson lines between a weak  $\Delta S = 1$  Green function and the WZW functional. At  $O(G_F p^4)$ , there can only be one such contraction and the weak vertex must be due to the lowest-order nonleptonic Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$  in Eq. (2.41). Since  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$  contains bilinear terms in the meson fields, the so-called pole contributions to anomalous nonleptonic amplitudes can be given in closed form by a simultaneous diagonalization (Ecker et al., 1987b, 1988) of the kinetic parts of the Lagrangians  $\mathcal{L}_2$  and  $\mathcal{L}_2^{\Delta S=1}$ . The corresponding local Lagrangian (octet part only) is (Ecker et al., 1992):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}^{\Delta S=1} = \frac{ieG_8}{8\pi^2 F} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \pi^0 K^+ \overleftrightarrow{D}_\nu \pi^- + \frac{\alpha G_8}{6\pi F} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \left( K^+ \pi^- \pi^0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} K^0 \pi^+ \pi^- \right) + \text{h.c.} \quad (4.9)$$

Here  $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$  is the electromagnetic field strength tensor,  $\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} F^{\rho\sigma}$  its dual and  $D_\mu \varphi^\pm = (\partial_\mu \pm ieA_\mu) \varphi^\pm$  denotes the covariant derivative with respect to electromagnetism.

There are also other reducible anomalous amplitudes. A generic example is provided by a nonleptonic Green function where an external  $\pi^0$  or  $\eta$  makes an anomalous transition to two photons. Such transitions are the dominant  $O(G_F p^4)$  contributions to the decays  $K_S \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$  (Ecker et al., 1987b) and  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$  (Dykstra et al., 1991; Funck and Kambor, 1993). All reducible anomalous amplitudes of  $O(G_F p^4)$  are proportional to  $G_8$  in the octet limit. No other unknown parameters are involved.

The second manifestation of the anomaly in nonleptonic weak amplitudes arises diagrammatically from the contraction of the  $W$  boson field between a strong Green function on one side and the WZW functional on the other side (Cheng, 1990). However, such diagrams cannot be taken literally at a typical hadronic scale because of the presence of strongly interacting fields on both sides of the  $W$  (see the corresponding discussion in Sect. 2.2 and Fig. 2.1). Instead, one must first integrate out the  $W$  together with the heavy quark fields. The operators appearing in the operator product expansion must then be realized at the bosonic level in the presence of the anomaly.

The bosonization of four-quark operators in the odd-intrinsic-parity sector was investigated by Bijmans et al. (1992). As in the even-intrinsic-parity sector, the bosonized four-quark operators



Table 4.2: A complete list of local anomalous nonleptonic weak  $K$  decay amplitudes of  $O(G_F p^4)$  in the limit of  $CP$  conservation.

Transition	$\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}^{\Delta S=1}$	$W_{28}$	$W_{29}$	$W_{30}$	$W_{31}$	exp.
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \gamma$	x		x	x		x
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$	x		x	x		
$K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$			x		x	x
$K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma \gamma$	x		x		x	
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma$			x	x		x
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$			x	x		
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma$			x		x	x
$K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^- \gamma \gamma$			x		x	
$K_L \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 \gamma$		x	x	x		
$K_S \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0 \gamma(\gamma)$			x	x	x	

contain factorizable (leading in  $1/N_c$ ) and non-factorizable parts (non-leading in  $1/N_c$ ). Due to the non-renormalization theorem (Adler and Bardeen, 1969) of the chiral anomaly, the factorizable contributions of  $O(G_F p^4)$  can be calculated exactly (Bijnens et al., 1992) in terms of the anomalous part of the left-chiral current of  $O(p^3)$ . It turns out that the factorizable contributions produce already all the possible relevant octet operators proportional to the  $\varepsilon$  tensor [ $W_{28}$ ,  $W_{29}$ ,  $W_{30}$  and  $W_{31}$  in Eq. (4.1)]. The non-factorizable parts automatically have the right octet transformation property (they do not get any contribution from the anomaly) and are therefore also of the form  $W_{28}, \dots, W_{31}$ . Altogether, the  $\Delta S = 1$  effective Lagrangian in the odd-intrinsic-parity sector of  $O(G_F p^4)$  can be characterized by the coefficients (Bijnens et al., 1992)

$$\begin{aligned}
N_{28} &= \frac{a_1}{8\pi^2} & N_{29} &= \frac{a_2}{32\pi^2} \\
N_{30} &= \frac{3a_3}{16\pi^2} & N_{31} &= \frac{a_4}{16\pi^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

where the dimensionless coefficients  $a_i$  are expected to be positive and probably (Bijnens et al., 1992) smaller than one [ $a_i = 1$  corresponds to  $k_f = 1$  in (4.5)].

In Table 4.2 all kinematically allowed nonleptonic  $K$  decays are listed that are sensitive either to the anomalous Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{an}}^{\Delta S=1}$  in (4.9) or to the direct terms of  $O(G_F p^4)$  via (4.10). The transitions with either three pions and/or two photons in the final state are in general also subject to non-local reducible anomalous contributions. In the nonleptonic weak sector, the chiral anomaly contributes only to *radiative*  $K$  decays.

## 4.5 Radiative kaon decays

Among rare  $K$  decays [for general reviews, see, e.g., Ecker et al. (1995), Ritchie and Wojcicki (1993), Littenberg and Valencia (1993), Winstein and Wolfenstein (1993), Battiston et al. (1992)], the radiative transitions are especially interesting for CHPT. Almost all radiative decays have important long-distance contributions. Moreover, they have the special property that they are “trivial” to lowest order,  $O(G_F p^2)$ , in the following sense:

Table 4.3: Decay modes to which the coupling constants  $N_i$  contribute. For the  $3\pi$  final states, only the single photon channels are listed. For the neutral modes, the letters  $L$  or  $S$  in brackets distinguish between  $K_L$  and  $K_S$  initial states in the limit of  $CP$  conservation.

$\pi$	$2\pi$	$3\pi$	$N_i$
$\pi^+\gamma^*$			$N_{14}^r - N_{15}^r$
$\pi^0\gamma^* (S)$	$\pi^0\pi^0\gamma^* (L)$		$2N_{14}^r + N_{15}^r$
$\pi^+\gamma\gamma$	$\pi^+\pi^0\gamma\gamma$		$N_{14} - N_{15} - 2N_{18}$
	$\pi^+\pi^-\gamma\gamma (S)$		$N_{14} - N_{15} - 2N_{18}$
	$\pi^+\pi^0\gamma$	$\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$	$N_{14} - N_{15} - N_{16} - N_{17}$
	$\pi^+\pi^-\gamma (S)$	$\pi^+\pi^0\pi^0\gamma$	$N_{14} - N_{15} - N_{16} - N_{17}$
		$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\gamma (L)$	$N_{14} - N_{15} - N_{16} - N_{17}$
		$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\gamma (S)$	$7(N_{14}^r - N_{16}^r) + 5(N_{15}^r + N_{17}^r)$
	$\pi^+\pi^-\gamma (L)$	$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\gamma (S)$	$N_{29} + N_{31}$
		$\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\gamma$	$N_{29} + N_{31}$
	$\pi^+\pi^0\gamma$	$\pi^+\pi^0\pi^0\gamma$	$3N_{29} - N_{30}$
		$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\gamma (S)$	$2(N_{29} + N_{31}) + 3N_{29} - N_{30}$
		$\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0\gamma (L)$	$6N_{28} - 4N_{30} + 3N_{29} - N_{30}$

1. Nonleptonic  $K$  decay amplitudes with any number of real or virtual photons and with at most one pion in the final state vanish at  $O(G_F p^2)$  (Ecker et al., 1987a, 1988):

$$A(K \rightarrow [\pi]\gamma^* \dots \gamma^*) = 0 \quad \text{at } O(G_F p^2) . \quad (4.11)$$

2. The amplitudes for two pions and any number of real or virtual photons in the final state factorize at  $O(G_F p^2)$  into the on-shell amplitude for the corresponding  $K \rightarrow \pi\pi$  decay and a generalized bremsstrahlung amplitude independent of the specific decay (de Rafael, 1989; Ecker et al., 1992, 1994b):

$$A(K \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma^* \dots \gamma^*) = A(K \rightarrow \pi\pi)A_{\text{brems}} . \quad (4.12)$$

3. A similar statement holds for the decays  $K \rightarrow 3\pi\gamma$ : the amplitude of  $O(G_F p^2)$  is completely determined by the corresponding non-radiative decay  $K \rightarrow 3\pi$  (D'Ambrosio et al., in preparation).

Therefore, the leading non-trivial aspects of radiative nonleptonic kaon decays are described by the generating functional of  $O(G_F p^4)$  discussed in Sect. 4.1. An important question is whether all the coupling constants  $N_i$  can be measured in radiative  $K$  decay experiments. We list in Table 4.3 all the nonleptonic radiative transitions to which the  $N_i$  contribute. There are other decays not sensitive to the  $N_i$  that are either given by finite one-loop amplitudes and/or anomalous contributions at  $O(G_F p^4)$  ( $K_S \rightarrow \gamma^*\gamma^*$ ,  $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ ,  $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma\gamma$ ,  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\gamma[\gamma]$ ) or which vanish even at  $O(G_F p^4)$  ( $K_L \rightarrow \gamma^*\gamma^*$ ,  $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$ ).

The information contained in Table 4.3 leads to the following conclusions:

- Read horizontally, one finds all parameter-free relations between radiative amplitudes of  $O(G_F p^4)$ . If in the last column the renormalized constants  $N_i^r$  are displayed, the corresponding decays have divergent one-loop amplitudes. The other modes have finite loop amplitudes.

- Read vertically, we infer that from decays with at most two pions in the final state only the following combinations of counterterm coupling constants can in principle be extracted:

$$N_{14}, N_{15}, N_{16} + N_{17}, N_{18}, N_{29} + N_{31}, 3N_{29} - N_{30} . \quad (4.13)$$

- Decays with three pions in the final state are needed to determine  $N_{16}$  and  $N_{17}$  separately and the combination  $3N_{28} - 2N_{30}$ .
- Whereas all “electric” constants  $N_{14}, \dots, N_{18}$  can in principle be determined phenomenologically, this is not the case for the “magnetic” constants (the corresponding operators  $W_i$  contain an  $\varepsilon$  tensor): only three combinations of the four constants  $N_{28}, \dots, N_{31}$  appear in measurable amplitudes.

Except for the radiative decays with three pions in the final state (D’Ambrosio et al., in preparation), all amplitudes appearing in Table 4.3 have been completely calculated to  $O(G_F p^4)$ . In the near future, all decays with at most two pions in the final state will be measured or remeasured at dedicated facilities like the  $\Phi$  factory DAΦNE in Frascati (Maiani et al., 1992, 1995). As long as experiments are only sensitive to the lowest-order bremsstrahlung contributions for decays of the type  $K \rightarrow 3\pi\gamma$ , but not to the interesting  $O(G_F p^4)$  parts, the phenomenological determination of the  $N_i$  will remain incomplete. Nevertheless, even without the full information available, one will be able both to check some of the parameter-free low-energy theorems of  $O(G_F p^4)$  implicitly given in Table 4.3 and to test the predictions of various models for the coupling constants such as the factorization model (4.5).

The phenomenology of radiative  $K$  decays to  $O(G_F p^4)$  has been reviewed recently by D’Ambrosio et al. (1994) for the physics program foreseen at DAΦNE. A general review of rare  $K$  decays in the Standard Model is in preparation (Ecker et al., 1995). Instead of repeating the contents of those articles here, I will describe in Sect. 5.3 attempts to go beyond  $O(G_F p^4)$  for two specific decay channels.

## 5 CHPT BEYOND NEXT-TO-LEADING ORDER

### 5.1 Generating functional of $O(p^6)$

The generating functional  $Z_6[v, a, s, p]$  consists of two parts. It contains the next-to-leading order contributions of odd intrinsic parity discussed in Sect. 3.4. Here, I want to briefly describe ongoing work (Bijnens et al., in preparation) in the even-intrinsic-parity sector beyond next-to-leading order involving in particular two-loop diagrams.

To simplify the notation, I denote in this subsection the external fields  $v_\mu, a_\mu, s, p$  collectively as  $j_i$ . The Goldstone fields will be denoted  $\varphi_i$  as before, but I disregard that they enter the chiral Lagrangian through the matrix field  $U(\varphi)$ . Thus, the effective chiral action is written

$$S[\varphi, j] = S_2[\varphi, j] + S_4[\varphi, j] + S_6[\varphi, j] + \dots \quad (5.1)$$

and the generating functional takes the form

$$Z[j] = Z_2[j] + Z_4[j] + Z_6[j] + \dots . \quad (5.2)$$

The loop expansion can be viewed as a systematic expansion in  $\hbar$  around the classical solution  $\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]$ . For the calculation of  $Z_6$ , the question arises whether the classical solution corresponds to the extremum of  $S_2$  as in the calculation of  $Z_4$ , or whether one has to evaluate the “classical”




Figure 5.1: Diagrams contributing to the generating functional of  $O(p^6)$ . The propagators and vertices carry the full tree structure associated with the lowest-order Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . Normal vertices are from  $\mathcal{L}_2$ , crossed circles denote vertices from  $\mathcal{L}_4$  and the square in diagram f stands for a vertex from  $\mathcal{L}_6$ .

solution from the effective Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2 + \mathcal{L}_4$ , i.e. including  $O(p^4)$ . There are more than one good reason to use the same classical solution for the calculation of  $Z$  to any order in the chiral expansion. In other words, we always expand around  $\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]$  that is defined by the *lowest-order* Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2$ ,

$$\left. \frac{\delta S_2[\varphi, j]}{\delta \varphi_i} \right|_{\varphi=\varphi_{\text{cl}}} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \varphi_{\text{cl}}[j] , \quad (5.3)$$

which is nothing but the equation of motion (2.61) in the present notation.

One major practical advantage of this procedure is its compatibility with chiral counting. The diagrams in Fig. 5.1 give rise to functionals of  $\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]$ . Since  $\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]$  carries the full tree structure associated with  $\mathcal{L}_2$  (see the discussion in Sect. 2.5), all vertices and propagators in Fig. 5.1 have the same full tree structure attached to them. As long as  $\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]$  is defined as in Eq. (5.3), attaching the trees to those diagrams does not modify the chiral dimension of the diagrams. This would no longer be true if  $\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]$  would be derived from the effective action  $S_2 + S_4$  because vertices and propagators in the trees would contain both  $O(p^2)$  and  $O(p^4)$  pieces. The propagators appearing in Fig. 5.1 are the full propagators (as functionals of  $\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]$ ) for the lowest-order Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . Thus, the (matrix) propagator is the inverse of

$$\left. \frac{\delta^2 S_2[\varphi, j]}{\delta \varphi_i \delta \varphi_j} \right|_{\varphi=\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]} . \quad (5.4)$$

Fig. 5.1 shows all the diagrams occurring in the calculation of  $Z_6[j]$ . They contribute with different weights to  $Z_6$  (Bijnens et al., in preparation). The normal vertices in Fig. 5.1 are from  $\mathcal{L}_2$ . For instance, the vertex in the butterfly diagram a is given by

$$\left. \frac{\delta^4 S_2}{\delta \varphi_i \delta \varphi_j \delta \varphi_k \delta \varphi_\ell} \right|_{\varphi=\varphi_{\text{cl}}[j]} . \quad (5.5)$$




Figure 5.2: Butterfly diagrams contributing to  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ . The photons must be appended on every charged meson line and on every vertex containing charged meson lines.

Expanding both this vertex and the two propagators in powers of  $j$  leads to the relevant Green functions. To give an example, the butterfly graph contains the diagrams in Fig. 5.2 contributing to  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$  to be considered in the next subsection.

The vertices denoted by crossed circles are from  $\mathcal{L}_4$ . They are given by

$$\left. \frac{\delta S_4}{\delta \varphi_i} \right|_{\varphi=\varphi_{\text{cl}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{\delta^2 S_4}{\delta \varphi_i \delta \varphi_j} \right|_{\varphi=\varphi_{\text{cl}}} \quad (5.6)$$

in diagrams d, e and g. Finally, the square vertex (diagram f) stands for tree diagrams associated with the chiral Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_6$  of  $O(p^6)$ . This Lagrangian has recently been constructed by Fearing and Scherer (1994). After a careful consideration of different relations between all possible monomials of  $O(p^6)$ , they arrive at 111 terms for  $\mathcal{L}_6$ . Unless further relations will be found,  $\mathcal{L}_6$  would therefore contain 111 independent LECs. It is rather obvious that it will not be possible to determine all of them from experiment. Nevertheless, there is no reason for putting one's head in the sand as the next subsection will demonstrate.

To carry out the renormalization program at  $O(p^6)$ , one has to calculate the divergent part of  $Z_6$  associated with the loop diagrams of Fig. 5.1. Just like  $\mathcal{L}_{4,\text{div}}^{(L=1)}$  in (3.3), the divergence functional  $Z_{6,\text{div}}$  carries direct physical information. At  $O(p^4)$ , the coefficients  $\Gamma_i$  of the simple poles in  $d-4$  in (3.3) determine the chiral logs. Similarly, the residues of the double poles in  $d-4$  in  $Z_{6,\text{div}}$  yield directly the squares of chiral logs (Bijnens et al., in preparation; Colangelo, 1994). Especially for observables where a full calculation to  $O(p^6)$  is not available, the leading (squares of) chiral logs could give an indication of the possible size of  $O(p^6)$  corrections.

Renormalization at  $O(p^6)$  is in principle straightforward. The fact that [recall Eq. (3.5)]

$$Z_4^{(L=1)}[j] + S_4[\varphi_{\text{cl}}] \quad (5.7)$$

is already finite and independent of the renormalization scale has the following consequences:

- i. The sum of the one-particle-reducible diagrams c, e, g in Fig. 5.1 is finite and scale independent.
- ii. The sum of the irreducible loop diagrams a, b, d is free of subdivergences.

Therefore, the divergent part  $Z_{6,\text{div}}$  takes the form of a local action (that has again all the symmetries of  $\mathcal{L}_2$ ) with divergent coefficients. The corresponding divergence Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{6,\text{div}}$  must then be a special case of the Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_6$  of Fearing and Scherer (1994), the most general effective chiral Lagrangian of  $O(p^6)$ . Splitting the corresponding LECs in the same way as in

Eq. (3.4) into finite renormalized and divergent parts, the total functional  $Z_6[j]$  is rendered finite and scale independent.

Setting up the loop expansion in the way described brings up an interesting question. It turns out that using the equation of motion (5.3) or (2.61) in the construction of  $\mathcal{L}_4$  (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1985a) does not commute with calculating the vertices from  $\mathcal{L}_4$  appearing in diagrams d, e, g in Fig. 5.1. Recalling once more Eq. (5.3), the most general local action  $S_{4,\text{gen}}[\varphi, j]$  is of the form (dropping the external fields  $j$  for ease of notation)

$$\begin{aligned} S_{4,\text{gen}}[\varphi] &= S_4[\varphi] + \hat{S}_4[\varphi] \\ \hat{S}_4[\varphi] &= c_{2,i}[\varphi] S_{2,i}[\varphi] + \frac{1}{2} c_{0,ij}[\varphi] S_{2,i}[\varphi] S_{2,j}[\varphi] \\ S_{2,i}[\varphi] &:= \frac{\delta S_2[\varphi, j]}{\delta \varphi_i}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

where  $c_n[\varphi]$  ( $n = 0, 2$ ) are local functionals of  $O(p^n)$ . Because of (5.3) we have

$$\hat{S}_4[\varphi_{\text{cl}}] = 0 \tag{5.9}$$

and thus the functional  $Z_4$  of  $O(p^4)$  is insensitive to  $\hat{S}_4[\varphi]$ . However,  $\hat{S}_4$  does contribute to the diagrams d, e, g because

$$\left. \frac{\delta \hat{S}_4}{\delta \varphi_i} \right|_{\varphi=\varphi_{\text{cl}}} \neq 0, \quad \left. \frac{\delta^2 \hat{S}_4}{\delta \varphi_i \delta \varphi_j} \right|_{\varphi=\varphi_{\text{cl}}} \neq 0. \tag{5.10}$$

On the other hand, there must not be any measurable influence of  $\hat{S}_4[\varphi]$  because the “couplings”  $c_{0,ij}$  and  $c_{2,i}$  are arbitrary and cannot be fixed at  $O(p^4)$ . A careful investigation of the effect of  $\hat{S}_4$  in diagrams d, e, g solves this dilemma: the difference to setting  $\hat{S}_4 \equiv 0$  from the beginning is a *local* functional of  $O(p^6)$  that can always be absorbed by redefining the coefficients in  $\mathcal{L}_6$  [LECs of  $O(p^6)$ ] because  $\mathcal{L}_6$  is by construction the most general effective chiral Lagrangian of  $O(p^6)$ .

For more details and concrete results I refer to forthcoming publications (Bijnens et al., in preparation). As a final remark of this subsection, let me address a question that has stirred up a considerable amount of dust in the literature. Can one use the equation of motion and which equation of motion for the calculation of Green functions and amplitudes in theories governed by effective Lagrangians? I have gone to some length in this subsection to make the answer self-evident: setting up the loop expansion as an expansion around the classical solution, one *must* in fact use the lowest-order equation of motion (5.3) to derive the relevant Green functions from the generating functional. I have no illusions that the dust has settled now.

## 5.2 $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$

The production of pion pairs in  $\gamma\gamma$  collisions was studied to  $O(p^4)$  by Bijnens and Cornet (1988a) and by Donoghue et al. (1988). In the case of charged pion pair production, inclusion of the amplitude of  $O(p^4)$  (Bijnens and Cornet, 1988a) brings the total amplitude into good agreement with experiment in the low-energy region. Moreover, the correction of  $O(p^4)$  to the Born term is of the expected order of magnitude.

For the reaction  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ , there is no contribution of  $O(p^2)$  and the amplitude of  $O(p^4)$  is a pure one-loop amplitude (Bijnens and Cornet, 1988a; Donoghue et al., 1988). The chiral prediction disagrees with the Crystal Ball data (Marsiske et al., 1990) even near threshold. On the other hand, dispersion theoretic calculations can reproduce the behaviour of the cross section near threshold (e.g., Morgan and Pennington, 1991; Donoghue and Holstein, 1993a; Dobado and Peláez, 1993; Truong, 1993).

Bellucci et al. (1994) have taken up the challenge to demonstrate that CHPT can explain the observed cross section by including the amplitude of  $O(p^6)$ . The matrix element for pion pair production

$$\gamma(q_1)\gamma(q_2) \rightarrow \pi^0(p_1)\pi^0(p_2) \quad (5.11)$$

is given by

$$\begin{aligned} T &= e^2 \varepsilon_1^\mu(q_1) \varepsilon_2^\nu(q_2) V_{\mu\nu} \\ V_{\mu\nu} &= A(s, t, u) T_{1\mu\nu} + B(s, t, u) T_{2\mu\nu} \\ T_{1\mu\nu} &= \frac{s}{2} g_{\mu\nu} - q_{1\nu} q_{2\mu} \\ T_{2\mu\nu} &= 2s \Delta_\mu \Delta_\nu - \nu^2 g_{\mu\nu} - 2\nu(q_{1\nu} \Delta_\mu - q_{2\mu} \Delta_\nu) \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} s &= (q_1 + q_2)^2, \quad t = (p_1 - q_1)^2, \quad u = (p_2 - q_1)^2 \\ \nu &= t - u, \quad \Delta = p_1 - p_2. \end{aligned}$$

In terms of helicity amplitudes

$$\begin{aligned} H_{++} &= A + 2(4M_\pi^2 - s)B \\ H_{+-} &= \frac{8(M_\pi^4 - tu)}{s} B, \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

the differential cross section for unpolarized photons in the center-of-mass system is

$$\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0) = \frac{e^4 s}{1024\pi^2} (1 - 4M_\pi^2/s)^{1/2} (|H_{++}|^2 + |H_{+-}|^2). \quad (5.14)$$

The helicity components  $H_{++}$  and  $H_{+-}$  correspond to photon helicity differences  $\lambda = 0, 2$ , respectively.

The leading term in the chiral expansion of  $V^{\mu\nu}$  is generated by one-loop graphs (Bijnens and Cornet, 1988a; Donoghue et al., 1988) contributing only to the amplitude  $A$ :

$$\begin{aligned} H_{++}^{(L=1)} &= \frac{(M_\pi^2 - s)F(s/M_\pi^2)}{4\pi^2 s F_\pi^2}, \quad H_{+-}^{(L=1)} = 0 \\ F(z) &= \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{4}{z} \arcsin^2(\sqrt{z}/2) & z \leq 4 \\ 1 + \frac{1}{z} \left( \ln \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4/z}}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4/z}} + i\pi \right)^2 & z \geq 4. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

The amplitude of  $O(p^6)$  is generated by the diagrams of Fig. 5.1 with two photons and two neutral pions appended to vertices and propagators in all possible ways (see Fig. 5.2 for some examples). The explicit expressions for the helicity amplitudes  $H_{+\pm}$  can be found in Bellucci et al. (1994). The amplitudes depend on the phenomenologically known LECs of  $O(p^4)$  and on three additional LECs  $h_\pm^r, h_s^r$  from  $\mathcal{L}_6$ . The latter have not yet been determined in a systematic way, but they were estimated by Bellucci et al. (1994) in the standard manner (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1984; Ecker et al., 1989a) using resonance exchange with  $J^{PC} = 1^{--}, 1^{+-}, 0^{++}, 2^{++}$ .

The cross section for  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$  is displayed in Fig. 5.3 as a function of the center-of-mass energy  $E = \sqrt{s}$  for  $|\cos\theta| \leq 0.8$  as determined in the Crystal Ball experiment (Marsiske et al., 1990). The complete result of  $O(p^6)$  (full curve) substantially improves the cross section of  $O(p^4)$




Figure 5.3: The cross section  $\sigma(|\cos \theta| \leq Z)$  as a function of the center-of-mass energy  $E$  at  $Z = 0.8$ , together with the data from the Crystal Ball experiment (Marsiske et al., 1990). The solid curve is the full two-loop result (Bellucci et al., 1994) and the dashed curve corresponds to the one-loop calculation (Bijnens and Cornet, 1988a; Donoghue et al., 1988). The band denoted by the dash-dotted curves is the result of the dispersive calculation by Pennington (1992). The figure is taken from Bellucci et al. (1994).

and is in perfect agreement with experiment even at relatively high energies. It also agrees with the dispersive calculation of Pennington (1992).

It is important to emphasize that the LECs  $h_{\pm}^r$  and  $h_s^r$  contribute very little to the cross section below  $E = 450 \text{ MeV}$ . The enhancement in the cross section is mainly due to  $\pi\pi$  rescattering and to the renormalization of the pion decay constant. Bellucci et al. (1994) also note that the two-loop corrections are not unduly large; their size is similar to the corresponding next-to-leading order correction in the isospin zero  $\pi\pi$  scattering amplitude (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1984) and in the scalar form factor of the pion (Gasser and Meißner, 1991b).

The calculation of Bellucci et al. (1994) leads also to a much more reliable determination than previously available of the neutral pion polarizabilities that govern the behaviour of the amplitude for Compton scattering  $\gamma\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0$  near threshold. Especially the sum of the electric and magnetic polarizabilities is very sensitive to the amplitude of  $O(p^6)$  because this combination vanishes at  $O(p^4)$ . In contrast to the cross section for pair production at low energies, the polarizabilities depend however in an essential way on the LECs  $h_{\pm}^r$ . For a discussion of the experimental situation I refer to the specialized literature (Gasser, 1994b; Baldini and Bellucci, 1994; Portolés and Pennington, 1994).

### 5.3 Phenomenology beyond next-to-leading order

In addition to  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ , scalar and vector form factors of the pion (Gasser and Meißner, 1991b) and vector current propagators (Golowich and Kambor, 1995) have been completely calculated to  $O(p^6)$  (even intrinsic parity). Calculations of  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  (Bürgi, work in progress) and elastic  $\pi\pi$  scattering (Bijnens et al., work in progress) are under way.



Moreover, many attempts have been undertaken to control at least the dominant effects beyond next-to-leading order. To appreciate the general strategy, one should recall that CHPT as a quantum field theory accounts both for the requirements of unitarity and analyticity and for the most general local contributions to the amplitudes. In many cases, one can set up dispersion relations for the amplitudes in question to account for the proper analytic structure and use CHPT to yield the most general set of subtraction constants (polynomials). The advantage of this approach is that one can often improve (Truong, 1988, 1991a, 1991b; Donoghue et al., 1990) upon the perturbative implementation of unitarity of CHPT, even if one does not include all terms of higher orders in the chiral expansion. At the same time, one tries to locate the dominant local contributions, usually via resonance exchange. The resulting amplitudes improve the known next-to-leading order results and have a chance to capture the main gist of higher-order effects. However, it must be emphasized that their theoretical status is not the same as that of a complete CHPT calculation to a given order in the chiral expansion.

If such a procedure may be useful for the strong interactions of mesons, it becomes almost unavoidable for the nonleptonic weak interactions of mesons. It is not clear whether it will ever be possible to determine all LECs of  $O(G_F p^4)$  (cf. Sect. 4), let alone higher-order couplings. On the other hand, there are clear experimental indications for some nonleptonic weak transitions that the amplitudes of  $O(G_F p^4)$  are not sufficient to describe the data. This is not too surprising in view of the natural magnitude of higher-order corrections (2.67) in chiral  $SU(3)$ .

I shall concentrate here on the decays  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$  and  $K_S \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$  and refer to specialized reviews (D'Ambrosio et al., 1994; de Rafael, 1995; Ecker et al., 1995) for more complete coverage. The transition  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$  shares, not surprisingly, many features with the scattering process  $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$  of the last subsection. There is no amplitude of  $O(G_F p^2)$  and there are no local contributions of  $O(G_F p^4)$  making the amplitude a pure one-loop effect at this order. More specifically, the transition

$$K_L(p) \rightarrow \pi^0(p') \gamma(q_1) \gamma(q_2)$$

is again characterized by two invariant amplitudes  $A(y, z)$ ,  $B(y, z)$  [cf. Eq. (5.12)] with

$$y = p \cdot (q_1 - q_2)/M_K^2, \quad z = (q_1 + q_2)^2/M_K^2. \quad (5.16)$$

The physical region in the variables  $y$  and  $z$  is given by the inequalities

$$|y| \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda^{1/2}(1, z, r_\pi^2), \quad 0 \leq z \leq (1 - r_\pi)^2, \quad (5.17)$$

$$r_\pi = M_\pi/M_K, \quad \lambda(x, y, z) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 2(xy + yz + zx).$$

The double differential decay rate for unpolarized photons is

$$\frac{d^2\Gamma}{dy dz} = \frac{M_K}{2^9 \pi^3} \left\{ z^2 |A + B|^2 + \left[ y^2 - \frac{1}{4} \lambda(1, z, r_\pi^2) \right]^2 |B|^2 \right\}. \quad (5.18)$$

At  $O(G_F p^4)$ , the amplitude  $B$  vanishes as in the case of  $\gamma \gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ . The one-loop diagrams give rise (Ecker et al., 1987b; Cappiello and D'Ambrosio, 1988) to an amplitude  $A$  of the form (octet part only)

$$A(z) = \frac{G_8 \alpha M_K^2}{\pi} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{r_\pi^2}{z}\right) F\left(\frac{z}{r_\pi^2}\right) - \left(1 - \frac{r_\pi^2}{z} - \frac{1}{z}\right) F(z) \right] \quad (5.19)$$

with the function  $F(z)$  defined in Eq. (5.15). The contribution proportional to  $F(z)$  is due to the kaon loop, while  $F(z/r_\pi^2)$  is generated by the pion loop and has an absorptive part because




Figure 5.4: Theoretical predictions for the  $2\gamma$ -invariant-mass distribution in  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ . The dotted curve is the  $O(G_F p^4)$  contribution, the dashed and full curves correspond to the  $O(G_F p^6)$  calculation of Cohen et al. (1993) with  $a_V = 0$  and  $a_V = -0.9$ , respectively. The spectra are normalized to the 50 unambiguous events of NA31 (cf. Fig. 5.5).

the pions can be on-shell. Except for the fact that the amplitudes in (5.15) were calculated in the framework of chiral  $SU(2)$ , the analytic structure of the amplitude  $A$  is of course the same in both transitions. The kaon-loop contribution is actually much smaller than the pion one as is the contribution of the 27-plet (Cappiello et al., 1993).

The  $z$ -spectrum for a  $y$ -independent amplitude  $A$  is given by

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dz} = \frac{M_K}{2^{10}\pi^3} z^2 \lambda^{1/2}(1, z, r_\pi^2) |A(z)|^2. \quad (5.20)$$

The predicted branching ratio is (Ecker et al., 1987b; Cappiello and D'Ambrosio, 1988)

$$BR(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma) = 6.8 \cdot 10^{-7}. \quad (5.21)$$

The  $O(G_F p^4)$  prediction for  $\frac{d\Gamma}{dz}(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma)$  is shown as the dotted curve in Fig. 5.4. The spectrum is very characteristic: a peak in the absorptive region ( $K_L \rightarrow \pi\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\gamma\gamma$ ) and a negligible contribution at low  $z$  ( $M_{\gamma\gamma} = M_K\sqrt{z}$ ). Moreover, the prediction agrees well with the experimental spectrum (Barr et al., 1992) shown in Fig. 5.5. On the other hand, the experimental value for the rate is at least a factor two bigger than (5.21):

$$BR(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma) = \begin{cases} (1.7 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.2) \cdot 10^{-6} & [\text{Barr et al. (NA31), 1990, 1992}] \\ (1.86 \pm 0.60 \pm 0.60) \cdot 10^{-6} & [\text{Papadimitriou et al. (E731), 1991}] \end{cases} \quad (5.22)$$

Here, there is a difference to  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ . For  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ , the shape of the spectrum is in good agreement with experiment, but the total number of events predicted is definitely too low. Is there




Figure 5.5:  $2\gamma$ -invariant-mass distribution (Barr et al., 1992) for unambiguous  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$  candidates (solid histogram). The crosses indicate the acceptance.

a way to understand this discrepancy without ruining the agreement in the spectrum? Short of a complete calculation to  $O(G_F p^6)$ , many efforts have been made to grasp at least the main features of the underlying physics. For rather obvious reasons, I describe here the approach of Cohen et al. (1993) and refer to the already mentioned specialized reviews (D'Ambrosio et al., 1994; de Rafael, 1995; Ecker et al., 1995) for a more complete list of relevant papers.

Since we expect the major contribution to the amplitude to come from the two-pion intermediate states (as clearly indicated by the experimental spectrum), we should try to get a more realistic answer for this contribution. One indication in the right direction is the observation (Donoghue, 1991) that the octet coupling  $G_8$  appearing in (5.19) has been extracted from  $K_S \rightarrow 2\pi$  underestimating the  $K_L \rightarrow 3\pi$  amplitudes by  $20\% \div 30\%$ . Therefore, one expects an increase of the rate for  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$  if one includes the  $O(G_F p^4)$  corrections to  $K_L \rightarrow 3\pi$  for the weak vertex in the loop diagrams. The explicit calculation (Cappiello et al., 1993; Cohen et al., 1993) shows indeed an increase of the decay rate by some 25%, but also a modification of the spectrum. In fact, the resulting spectrum (dashed curve in Fig. 5.4) is even more strongly peaked at large  $z$  than found experimentally (see Fig. 5.5). This statement must be made more precise because the loop amplitude is actually divergent now. Thus, there are certainly local contributions of  $O(G_F p^6)$  (and higher) that must be considered. Cohen et al. (1993) adopted the successful recipe from the strongly interacting sector: take the scale dependent loop amplitude at a scale of the order of  $M_\rho$  and saturate the LECs of  $O(G_F p^6)$  with resonance exchange. As discussed in Sect. 4.2, there is however a problem with resonance exchange in the weak sector that does not occur for purely strong interactions: the weak couplings of resonances are essentially unknown. Nevertheless, one can parametrize the  $O(G_F p^6)$  contributions to  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$  by an effective vector coupling  $a_V$  (Ecker et al., 1990a):

$$A = \frac{G_8 M_K^2 \alpha}{\pi} a_V (3 - z + r_\pi^2), \quad B = -\frac{2G_8 M_K^2 \alpha}{\pi} a_V. \quad (5.23)$$

Thus,  $V$  exchange generates a  $B$  amplitude changing the  $O(G_F p^4)$  spectrum, particularly in the region of small  $z$ . Even if one accepts our ignorance about the size of  $a_V$  related to vector meson exchange, one can confront the corrected amplitudes  $A$  and  $B$  with the experimental data. Since there is now a single free parameter  $a_V$ , one can at least check if both rate and spectrum can be described by this one-parameter amplitude. Choosing for instance  $a_V \simeq -0.9$  to reproduce the experimental spectrum, one obtains (Cohen et al., 1993) indeed good agreement with the experimental branching ratios (5.22). A more complete unitarization of the  $\pi\pi$  intermediate states and inclusion of the experimental  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$  amplitudes increases the  $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma\gamma$  width by another 10% (Kambor and Holstein, 1994a).

There are additional checks whether the above approach really captures the main physics. One argument in favour is provided by the factorization model discussed in Sect. 4.2 that actually predicts a negative value for the parameter  $a_V$  of the right magnitude. However, there is a more crucial test. The same mechanism applied to the decay  $K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  predicts that the branching ratio of  $O(G_F p^4)$  (D'Ambrosio and Esprui, 1986; Goity, 1987) should be essentially unchanged:

$$BR(K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 2.1 \cdot 10^{-6} . \quad (5.24)$$

The “unitarity corrections” are in this case already absorbed in the coupling constant  $G_8$  determined from  $K \rightarrow 2\pi$  decays and there are no  $V$  or  $A$  exchange contributions. The present experimental value

$$BR(K_S \rightarrow 2\gamma) = (2.4 \pm 1.2) \cdot 10^{-6} \quad (5.25)$$

is in agreement with the prediction (5.24), but better precision is clearly needed to corroborate this agreement. The  $\Phi$  factory DAΦNE at Frascati is expected to detect about 4000 events per year (D'Ambrosio et al., 1994) and will improve the precision of the experimental rate considerably.

## 6 MESONS AND VIRTUAL PHOTONS

### 6.1 Generating functional of $O(e^2 p^2)$

As outlined in Sect. 2.2, the photon can be introduced as a dynamical degree of freedom into the CHPT framework. The relevant lowest-order Lagrangian has the form (Ecker et al., 1989a)

$$\mathcal{L}_2^Q = \frac{F^2}{4} \langle D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger + \chi U^\dagger + \chi^\dagger U \rangle + e^2 C \langle Q U Q U^\dagger \rangle - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{g.f.}} . \quad (6.1)$$

The covariant derivative

$$D_\mu U = \partial_\mu U - i(r_\mu - eQ A_\mu)U + iU(l_\mu - eQ A_\mu) \quad (6.2)$$

now includes the dynamical photon field.  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{g.f.}}$  is the gauge-fixing term for the photon.

The one-loop functional for the Lagrangian (6.1) was recently analysed by Urech (1995) who calculated in particular its divergent part. Here, we are interested in the terms of  $O(e^2 p^2)$  that must be added to the lowest-order functional of  $O(e^2 p^0)$  [corresponding to taking the Lagrangian (2.43) at tree level]. The most general effective chiral Lagrangian of  $O(e^2 p^2)$  can be constructed in a straightforward way using the spurion formalism described in Sect. 2.2. It can be cast into the following form (Urech, 1995; Neufeld and Rupertsberger, 1994):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{(e^2 p^2)} = & F^2 e^2 \{ K_1 \langle Q^2 \rangle \langle D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger \rangle + K_2 \langle U Q U^\dagger Q \rangle \langle D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger \rangle \\ & + K_3 [\langle Q U^\dagger D_\mu U \rangle \langle Q U^\dagger D^\mu U \rangle + \langle Q U D_\mu U^\dagger \rangle \langle Q U D^\mu U^\dagger \rangle] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + K_4 \langle D_\mu U Q U^\dagger \rangle \langle D^\mu U^\dagger Q U \rangle + K_5 \langle Q^2 (D_\mu U^\dagger D^\mu U + D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger) \rangle \\
& + K_6 \langle U Q U^\dagger Q D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger + Q U Q U^\dagger D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger \rangle \\
& + K_7 \langle Q^2 \rangle \langle \chi U^\dagger + \chi^\dagger U \rangle + K_8 \langle U Q U^\dagger Q \rangle \langle \chi U^\dagger + \chi^\dagger U \rangle \\
& + K_9 \langle Q^2 (U^\dagger \chi + \chi^\dagger U + \chi U^\dagger + U \chi^\dagger) \rangle \\
& + K_{10} \langle Q U^\dagger Q \chi + U Q U^\dagger Q U \chi^\dagger + U^\dagger Q U Q U^\dagger \chi + Q U Q \chi^\dagger \rangle \\
& - K_{11} \langle Q U^\dagger Q \chi - U Q U^\dagger Q U \chi^\dagger - U^\dagger Q U Q U^\dagger \chi + Q U Q \chi^\dagger \rangle \\
& + K_{12} \langle D_\mu U^\dagger [D^\mu Q_R, Q] U + D_\mu U [D^\mu Q_L, Q] U^\dagger \rangle \\
& + K_{13} \langle U D_\mu Q_L U^\dagger D^\mu Q_R \rangle + K_{14} \langle D_\mu Q_L D^\mu Q_L + D_\mu Q_R D^\mu Q_R \rangle \} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

with 14 dimensionless LECs  $K_i$  and with

$$D_\mu Q_L = -i[l_\mu, Q] , \quad D_\mu Q_R = -i[r_\mu, Q] . \tag{6.4}$$

In the usual way, renormalization at  $O(e^2 p^2)$  is performed through the decomposition

$$K_i = K_i^r(\mu) + \Sigma_i \Lambda(\mu) , \tag{6.5}$$

with  $\Lambda(\mu)$  given in Eq. (3.3). The coefficients  $\Sigma_i$  are chosen to cancel the divergent part of the one-loop functional of  $O(e^2 p^2)$  (Urech, 1995):

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_1 &= \frac{3}{4} & \Sigma_2 &= Z & \Sigma_3 &= -\frac{3}{4} \\
\Sigma_4 &= 2Z & \Sigma_5 &= -\frac{9}{4} & \Sigma_6 &= \frac{3}{2}Z \\
\Sigma_7 &= 0 & \Sigma_8 &= Z & \Sigma_9 &= -\frac{1}{4} \\
\Sigma_{10} &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{3}{2}Z & \Sigma_{11} &= \frac{1}{8} & \Sigma_{12} &= \frac{1}{4} \\
\Sigma_{13} &= 0 & \Sigma_{14} &= 0 & Z &:= \frac{C}{F^4} .
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

The renormalized coupling constants  $K_i^r(\mu)$  are measurable LECs.

The divergence and renormalization structure has partly been calculated in a different and independent manner by Neufeld and Rupertsberger (1994). They concentrate on corrections of  $O(e^2 p^2)$  to meson masses, meson decay constants and  $P_{\ell 3}$  form factors that depend on eight linear combinations of the  $K_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &= K_1 + K_2 , & S_2 &= K_5 + K_6 , & S_3 &= -2K_3 + K_4 , & S_4 &= K_7 + K_8 , \\
S_5 &= K_9 + 2K_{10} + K_{11} , & S_6 &= K_8 , & S_7 &= K_{10} + K_{11} , & S_8 &= -K_{12} .
\end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

By requiring finiteness of the considered observables, they determine the divergent parts of the  $S_i$ . Their results agree with those of Urech (1995) in Eqs. (6.6).

At the moment, essentially nothing is known about the values of the renormalized LECs of  $O(e^2 p^2)$ . Extracting the  $K_i^r(\mu)$  or  $S_i^r(\mu)$  from experimental data is in general difficult, both because of lack of precise data and because of competition from the isospin violating quark mass difference  $m_u - m_d$ . To get some idea about the values of these LECs, one will have to resort to specific models, e.g., including meson resonance exchange. For the time being, one has to content oneself in most cases with naive chiral dimensional analysis that suggests  $(4\pi)^{-2} = 6 \cdot 10^{-3}$  as a reasonable upper limit for the LECs. Since there is no a priori argument whether this upper

limit applies to the  $|K_i^r(\mu)|$  or  $|S_i^r(\mu)|$  or to some other linear combinations, there is of course some arbitrariness involved. Nevertheless, the next subsection will show that one can obtain some understanding of the relevance of  $O(e^2 p^2)$  effects even with such a crude approach. It is an important achievement to determine the structure of effects of  $O(e^2 p^2)$  as predicted by the Standard Model. Theoretical advances in understanding the corresponding LECs will in time lead to more quantitative predictions.

## 6.2 Applications

### 6.2.1 Meson masses

In general, electromagnetic corrections compete with isospin violation induced by  $m_u \neq m_d$ . As discussed in Sect. 3.3, the electromagnetic corrections to meson masses are needed to obtain more reliable estimates for the quark mass ratios, in particular for  $m_u/m_d$ . Thus, we concentrate here on the corrections of  $O(e^2 p^2)$  and keep  $m_u = m_d$ .

Up to very small corrections of  $O[(m_u - m_d)^2]$ , the pion mass difference is purely electromagnetic. Neglecting also terms of  $O(e^2 M_\pi^2)$ , one finds (Neufeld and Rupertsberger, 1994; Urech, 1995)

$$M_{\pi^+}^2 - M_{\pi^0}^2 = \frac{2e^2 C}{F^2} + 2e^2 M_K^2 \left[ 4S_6^2(\mu) - \frac{16C}{F^4} L_4^r(\mu) - \frac{C}{(4\pi)^2 F^4} \ln \frac{M_K^2}{\mu^2} \right]. \quad (6.8)$$

As it stands, the formula is of little use. Estimating  $C$  with resonance exchange (Das et al., 1967; Ecker et al., 1989a) reproduces the experimental mass difference already with the lowest-order result in the chiral limit. However, one can check the consistency of this prediction by setting the correction of  $O(e^2 M_K^2)$  to zero. The corresponding value (Neufeld and Rupertsberger, 1994)  $S_6^r(M_\rho) = (-2.1 \pm 1.6) \cdot 10^{-3}$  is compatible with naive dimensional analysis.

The poorly known, Zweig suppressed LEC  $L_4$  drops out in the more interesting quantity (always for  $m_u = m_d$ )

$$\Delta_{\text{EM}} = M_{K^+}^2 - M_{K^0}^2 - M_{\pi^+}^2 + M_{\pi^0}^2. \quad (6.9)$$

The result of the one-loop calculation is (Urech, 1995; Neufeld and Rupertsberger, 1994)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\text{EM}} = & -e^2 M_K^2 \left[ \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \left( 3 \ln \frac{M_K^2}{\mu^2} - 4 + \frac{2C}{F^4} \ln \frac{M_K^2}{\mu^2} \right) + \frac{4}{3} S_2^r(\mu) - 8S_7^r(\mu) + \frac{16C}{F^4} L_5^r(\mu) \right] \\ & + O(e^2 M_\pi^2) \end{aligned} \quad (6.10)$$

or

$$\Delta_{\text{EM}} = (-0.26; 0.52; 0.99 \pm 0.13) \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2 + \Delta M_{\text{ct}}^2(\mu), \quad (6.11)$$

where the entries in brackets contain both the loop contributions and  $L_5^r(\mu)$  for  $\mu = 0.5, 0.77$  and  $1 \text{ GeV}$ , respectively. The  $\mu$  dependence of the first term is of course cancelled by the scale dependence of  $\Delta M_{\text{ct}}^2(\mu)$  containing the LECs  $S_2^r(\mu)$ ,  $S_7^r(\mu)$ . To appreciate the strong scale dependence of the two terms, one should recall

$$M_{\pi^+}^2 - M_{\pi^0}^2 \Big|_{\text{exp}} = 1.26 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2. \quad (6.12)$$

Turning to chiral dimensional analysis for an estimate of  $\Delta M_{\text{ct}}^2$ , one finds

$$|\Delta M_{\text{ct}}^2| \lesssim 2.6 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (\text{Urech, 1995}) \quad (6.13)$$

$$-0.6 \lesssim \Delta_{\text{EM}} \cdot 10^3 \text{ GeV}^{-2} \lesssim 2.0 \quad (\text{Neufeld and Rupertsberger, 1994}). \quad (6.14)$$

The conclusion is that corrections to Dashen's theorem *could* be sizable. Moreover, a comparison with Sect. 3.3 shows that a positive  $\Delta_{\text{EM}}$  decreases the ratio  $Q^2$  of quark masses defined in (3.28). For example,  $\Delta_{\text{EM}} = 2 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2$  lowers  $Q$  by 15% compared to the Dashen limit value of  $Q \simeq 24$ .

More quantitative estimates of  $\Delta_{\text{EM}}$  require additional assumptions. Two approaches have been pursued to estimate  $\Delta_{\text{EM}}$ . Although both models are not restricted to  $O(e^2 p^2)$  they amount essentially to estimates of the combination  $S_2^T(\mu) - 6S_7^T(\mu)$ . Donoghue et al. (1993b) argue that the electromagnetic mass differences are dominated by long-distance contributions. They extend the chiral amplitude for meson Compton scattering entering the Cottingham formula to intermediate distances using resonance saturation. For the electromagnetic mass differences, the model is identical to the one used by Ecker et al. (1989a) to calculate  $C$  in the chiral limit. With the physical masses for the pseudoscalar and the  $V, A$  mesons, Donoghue et al. (1993b) find

$$\Delta_{\text{EM}} = 1.2 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2, \quad (6.15)$$

where the effect is mainly due to  $M_K^2$  vs.  $M_\pi^2$  in the meson propagators. The uncertainty of the prediction (6.15) can be estimated by noting that their model gives a value for  $M_{\pi^+}^2 - M_{\pi^0}^2$  that is 20% too high.

With a different approach, Bijmens (1993c) estimates both short- and long-distance contributions to  $(M_{K^+}^2 - M_{K^0}^2)_{\text{em}}$  to leading order in  $1/N_c$ . The same approach gave a satisfactory result for the pion mass difference (Bardeen et al., 1989) in the chiral limit. Matching the short- and long-distance contributions at the point of minimal sensitivity to the matching scale ( $600 \div 800 \text{ MeV}$ ), Bijmens finds

$$\Delta_{\text{EM}} = (1.3 \pm 0.4) \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^2 \quad (6.16)$$

in agreement with (6.15). The overall conclusion is that  $\Delta_{\text{EM}}$  is most probably positive. The model estimates suggest that  $Q$  is about 10% smaller than the value based on Dashen's theorem. This goes in the right direction to reconcile the chiral prediction for  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi$  with experiment (see Sect. 3.5).

## 6.2.2 $P_{l3}$ form factors

The relatively large corrections of  $O(e^2 p^2)$  to Dashen's theorem are motivation enough to investigate other isospin violating observables. Neufeld and Rupertsberger (1994) have performed a study of electromagnetic corrections to  $K_{l3}$  and  $\eta_{l3}$  form factors.

For the ratio  $r_{K\pi}$  of  $K_{l3}$  form factors they find the following expression:

$$r_{K\pi} = \frac{f_+^{K^+\pi^0}(0)}{f_+^{K^0\pi^-}(0)} = 1 + \sqrt{3} \left( \varepsilon - \frac{M_{\pi^0\eta}^2}{M_\eta^2 - M_\pi^2} \right) + \frac{3e^2}{4(4\pi)^2} \ln \frac{M_K^2}{M_\pi^2}. \quad (6.17)$$

Here,  $\varepsilon$  is the  $\pi^0 - \eta$  mixing angle and  $M_{\pi^0\eta}^2$  is the off-diagonal element of the  $\pi^0 - \eta$  mass matrix in the basis of the tree-level mass eigenfields. It contains both the QCD contribution proportional to  $\varepsilon$  and the electromagnetic contributions of  $O(e^2 p^2)$ . In the limit  $e = 0$ , the formula for  $r_{K\pi}$  coincides with the previous result of Leutwyler and Roos (1984). The data on the decays  $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ \nu_e$  and  $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^- e^+ \nu_e$  show clear evidence for the presence of isospin breaking (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1985b):

$$\left| \frac{f_+^{K^+\pi^0}(0)}{f_+^{K^0\pi^-}(0)} \right|^2 = 1.057 \pm 0.019, \quad (6.18)$$

which implies

$$(r_{K\pi} - 1)_{\text{exp}} = (2.8 \pm 0.9) \cdot 10^{-2}. \quad (6.19)$$

With the values for the low-energy constants  $L_7, L_8^r$  in Table 3.1, the QCD contribution to  $r_{K\pi} - 1$  is given by

$$(r_{K\pi} - 1)_{\text{QCD}} = 2.1 \cdot 10^{-2} . \quad (6.20)$$

On the basis of naive chiral dimensional analysis, the electromagnetic contributions are expected to be small (Neufeld and Rupertsberger, 1994) compared to the QCD part,

$$0 \lesssim (r_{K\pi} - 1)_{\text{em}} \lesssim 0.2 \cdot 10^{-2} . \quad (6.21)$$

Neufeld and Rupertsberger (1994) have also calculated the  $\eta_{l3}$  form factors  $f_{\pm}^{\eta\pi}(t)$  at the one-loop level including the electromagnetic contributions of  $O(e^2 p^2)$ . In this case, there is no lowest-order contribution because the two form factors vanish for  $e = 0$  in the chiral limit. There is an interesting low-energy theorem relating  $f_+^{\eta\pi}(0)$  to the ratio of  $K_{l3}$  form factors (Neufeld and Rupertsberger, 1994):

$$f_+^{\eta\pi}(0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} [r_{K\pi} - 1 - \frac{3 e^2}{4(4\pi)^2} \ln \frac{M_K^2}{M_\pi^2}] . \quad (6.22)$$

Inserting the experimental value for  $r_{K\pi} - 1$  given in (6.19), one obtains the prediction

$$f_+^{\eta\pi}(0) = (1.6 \pm 0.5) \cdot 10^{-2} . \quad (6.23)$$

In view of the large error in (6.23), a more promising strategy is to employ the same input parameters as before. For the QCD contribution, one gets

$$f_+^{\eta\pi}(0)|_{\text{QCD}} = 1.21 \cdot 10^{-2} \quad (6.24)$$

and the electromagnetic contributions are again expected to be rather small,

$$0.02 \cdot 10^{-2} \lesssim f_+^{\eta\pi}(0)|_{\text{em}} \lesssim 0.15 \cdot 10^{-2} . \quad (6.25)$$

With the full expressions for the form factors  $f_{\pm}^{\eta\pi}(t)$ , the branching ratios for the decays  $\eta \rightarrow \pi \ell \nu$  ( $\ell = e, \mu$ ) can be computed. Adding all channels, Neufeld and Rupertsberger (1994) obtain

$$1.6 \cdot 10^{-13} \lesssim \sum_{\ell=e,\mu} BR(\eta \rightarrow \pi^\pm \ell^\mp \bar{\nu}_\ell^-) \lesssim 2.0 \cdot 10^{-13} . \quad (6.26)$$

Thus, the decays  $\eta \rightarrow \pi l \nu$  are still out of reach for present experimental facilities. On the other hand, the observation of a decay rate considerably larger than the upper bound in (6.26) would be a clear signal for a deviation from the Standard Model.

The decay  $\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu$  is governed by the same hadronic form factors as  $\eta \rightarrow \pi l \nu$ . However, most of the Dalitz plot is outside the domain of applicability of CHPT. In order to obtain reasonable theoretical results also in this intermediate energy range, the dominant contributions of the lowest-lying resonance states [ $\rho(770)$  and  $a_0(980)$  in this case] have to be taken into account. Taking the vector decay constant  $|F_{a_0}| = 1.28 \text{ MeV}$  from a QCD sum rule analysis (Narison, 1987), Neufeld and Rupertsberger arrive at the prediction

$$BR(\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu) \simeq 1.2 \cdot 10^{-5} , \quad (6.27)$$

to be compared with the present experimental bound (Artuso et al., 1992)

$$BR(\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu)|_{\text{exp}} < 3.4 \cdot 10^{-4} . \quad (6.28)$$



## 7 CHPT WITH BARYONS

### 7.1 Relativistic formulation

In most of this section, I will restrict the discussion to chiral  $SU(2)$ . More precisely, the local chiral symmetry considered will be  $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_V$ . At the QCD level, the starting Lagrangian is [compare with Eq. (2.15)]

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}}^0 + \bar{q}\gamma^\mu \left( v_\mu + \frac{1}{3}v_\mu^{(s)} + a_\mu\gamma_5 \right) q - \bar{q}(s - i\gamma_5 p)q, \quad q = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7.1)$$

The isotriplet vector and axial–vector fields  $v_\mu, a_\mu$  are traceless. The isosinglet vector field  $v_\mu^{(s)}$  is included to generate the electromagnetic current. At the effective level of pions and nucleons,  $v^{(s)}$  couples directly only to nucleons because the pions have zero baryon number. The normalization of the vector fields in (7.1) implies

$$\begin{aligned} v_\mu &= -\frac{e}{2}A_\mu^{\text{ext}} \tau_3 + \dots \\ v_\mu^{(s)} &= -\frac{e}{2}A_\mu^{\text{ext}} \mathbf{1} \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

for external photons.

As discussed in Sect. 2, the nucleon doublet  $\Psi$  transforms as

$$\Psi = \begin{pmatrix} p \\ n \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{G} \Psi' = h(g, \varphi)\Psi \quad (7.3)$$

under chiral transformations. The covariant derivative

$$\nabla_\mu \Psi = (\partial_\mu + \Gamma_\mu - iv_\mu^{(s)})\Psi \quad (7.4)$$

is defined in terms of the connection (2.38) and of the isosinglet field  $v^{(s)}$ . The effective Lagrangian for the pion–nucleon system

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{L}_M + \mathcal{L}_{\pi N} \quad (7.5)$$

contains the purely mesonic Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_M$  of Sect. 3 for chiral  $SU(2)$ . Although we shall consider the general meson–baryon Lagrangian in the following subsection for setting up the chiral power counting, only the part of  $\mathcal{L}_{\pi N}$  that is bilinear in the nucleon fields will be needed here. Because of the different Lorentz structure of meson and baryon fields, the chiral expansion of  $\mathcal{L}_{\pi N}$  contains terms of  $O(p^n)$  for each positive integer  $n$  (Gasser et al., 1988):

$$\mathcal{L}_{\pi N} = \mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(1)} + \mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(2)} + \mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(3)} + \dots, \quad (7.6)$$

with  $\mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(1)}$  given in (2.36). The higher–order pion–nucleon Lagrangians will be considered in the following subsections in the framework of heavy baryon CHPT. In the construction of those Lagrangians, one encounters a basic difference between Goldstone and non–Goldstone fields. Since the nucleon mass remains finite in the chiral limit, the four–momentum of a nucleon can never be “soft”. This complicates the chiral counting considerably. For instance, both  $\Psi$  and  $\nabla_\mu \Psi$  count as fields of  $O(1)$ , whereas  $(i \not{\nabla} - m)\Psi$  is  $O(p)$  (Gasser et al., 1988; Krause, 1990).

The generating functional of Green functions  $Z[j, \eta, \bar{\eta}]$  can be defined by the path integral (Gasser et al., 1988)

$$e^{iZ[j, \eta, \bar{\eta}]} = \int [dud\Psi d\bar{\Psi}] \exp[i\{S_M + S_{\pi N} + \int d^4x(\bar{\eta}\Psi + \bar{\Psi}\eta)\}]. \quad (7.7)$$

The action  $S_M + S_{\pi N}$  corresponds to the effective Lagrangian (7.5), the external fields  $v, a, s, p$  are denoted collectively as  $j$  and  $\eta, \bar{\eta}$  are fermionic sources. Since the generating functional (7.7) contains closed nucleon loops, the question of anomalies arises. On the other hand, the anomalous Ward identity (3.39) for  $Z$  is already saturated by the Wess–Zumino–Witten functional (3.40). Thus, any addition to the generating functional coming from the meson–baryon sector must be chiral invariant. This is indeed the case. The nucleon determinant is chiral invariant and therefore free of chiral anomalies (Leutwyler, 1988, unpublished notes). The reason is very simple: in the non-linear realization of chiral symmetry, the left- and right-chiral components of the nucleon field transform in the same way. The transformation (7.3) for  $\Psi$  is vector-like. As is well known, the situation is different for the linear sigma model (Steinberger, 1949; Bell and Jackiw, 1969).

The presence of the nucleon mass  $m$ , which stays finite in the chiral limit, complicates the chiral power counting. In the relativistic formulation of the pion–nucleon system (more generally, the meson–baryon system), the correspondence between the loop and the chiral expansion valid in the meson sector is lost. An amplitude with given chiral dimension may receive contributions from diagrams with an arbitrary number of loops (Gasser et al., 1988). In particular, the coupling constants in the pion–nucleon Lagrangian (2.36) get renormalized in every order of the loop expansion. In contrast, the LECs  $F$ ,  $B$  of the lowest-order mesonic Lagrangian (2.30) are not renormalized in a mass-independent regularization scheme. Likewise, the degree of homogeneity of the baryonic amplitude is no more related to its chiral dimension as in the mesonic case [cf. Eq. (3.7)]. The nucleon mass is comparable to the intrinsic scale  $4\pi F \simeq 1.2$  GeV of CHPT. This suggests to set up baryon CHPT in such a way as to expand in

$$\frac{p}{4\pi F} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{p}{m}$$

simultaneously, where  $p$  is a small momentum. In the relativistic formulation of CHPT, there is a basic difference between  $F$  and  $m$  in a generic loop amplitude:  $F$  appears only in the vertices, whereas the nucleon mass is contained in the propagator.

## 7.2 Heavy baryon CHPT

Heavy baryon CHPT (HBCHPT) (Jenkins and Manohar, 1991a, 1992c) can be viewed as a clever choice of variables for performing the fermionic path integral in (7.7). By shifting the dependence on the nucleon mass  $m$  from the nucleon propagator to the vertices of the effective Lagrangian, the integration over the new fermionic variables produces a systematic low-energy expansion.

In terms of velocity dependent fields  $N_v, H_v$  (Georgi, 1990) defined as <sup>2</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} N_v(x) &= \exp[imv \cdot x] P_v^+ \Psi(x) \\ H_v(x) &= \exp[imv \cdot x] P_v^- \Psi(x) \\ P_v^\pm &= \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm \not{v}), \quad v^2 = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

the pion–nucleon action  $S_{\pi N}$  takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\pi N} &= \int d^4x \{ \bar{N}_v A N_v + \bar{H}_v B N_v + \bar{N}_v \gamma^0 B^\dagger \gamma^0 H_v - \bar{H}_v C H_v \} \\ A &= iv \cdot \nabla + g_A S \cdot u + A_{(2)} + A_{(3)} + \dots \\ B &= i \not{\nabla}^\perp - \frac{g_A}{2} v \cdot u \gamma_5 + B_{(2)} + B_{(3)} + \dots \end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Following standard nomenclature, both the external isotriplet vector matrix field and the four-velocity are denoted by the same symbol  $v_\mu$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
C &= 2m + iv \cdot \nabla + g_A S \cdot u + C_{(2)} + C_{(3)} + \dots \\
\nabla_\mu^\perp &= \nabla_\mu - v_\mu v \cdot \nabla, \quad [\not{v}, A] = [\not{v}, C] = 0, \quad \{\not{v}, B\} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The operators  $A_{(n)}$ ,  $B_{(n)}$ ,  $C_{(n)}$  are the corresponding projections of the pion–nucleon Lagrangians  $\mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(n)}$ . In  $A$  and  $C$ , the only dependence on Dirac matrices is through the spin matrix

$$S^\mu = \frac{i}{2} \gamma_5 \sigma^{\mu\nu} v_\nu, \quad S \cdot v = 0, \quad S^2 = -\frac{3}{4} \mathbf{1}. \quad (7.10)$$

Rewriting also the source term in (7.7) in terms of  $N_v, H_v$ , one can now integrate out the “heavy” components  $H_v$  to obtain a non–local action in the “light” fields  $N_v$  (Bernard et al., 1992f; Ecker, 1994c; see also Mannel et al., 1992). At this point, the crucial approximation of HBCHPT is made: the action is written as a series of local actions with increasing chiral dimensions by expanding  $C^{-1}$  in a power series in  $1/m$ :

$$C^{-1} = \frac{1}{2m} - \frac{iv \cdot \nabla + g_A S \cdot u}{(2m)^2} + O(p^2). \quad (7.11)$$

The relevant pion–nucleon Lagrangian is then (Jenkins and Manohar, 1991a; Bernard et al., 1992f)

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\pi N} = \bar{N}_v (A + \gamma^0 B^\dagger \gamma^0 C^{-1} B) N_v = \bar{N}_v \left( A_{(1)} + A_{(2)} + \frac{1}{2m} \gamma^0 B_{(1)}^\dagger \gamma^0 B_{(1)} \right) N_v + O(p^3) \quad (7.12)$$

$$A_{(1)} = iv \cdot \nabla + g_A S \cdot u, \quad B_{(1)} = i \not{v}^\perp - \frac{g_A}{2} v \cdot u \gamma_5.$$

By construction, the propagator of the field  $N_v$

$$S_v(k) = \frac{i P_v^+}{v \cdot k + i\varepsilon} \quad (7.13)$$

is independent of the nucleon mass.

The formula (2.63) for chiral power counting can now be generalized to the meson–baryon system (Weinberg, 1990, 1991). In HBCHPT, the chiral dimension  $D$  of a connected  $L$ –loop amplitude with  $I_M(I_B)$  internal meson (baryon) lines and  $N_d$  vertices of  $O(p^d)$  is given by

$$D = 4L - 2I_M - I_B + \sum_d d N_d. \quad (7.14)$$

We now distinguish between vertices with different numbers  $n_B$  of baryon lines:

$$N_d = \sum_{n_B=0,2,\dots} N_{d,n_B}. \quad (7.15)$$

Using the general relations ( $E_B$  is the number of external baryon lines)

$$L = I_M + I_B - \sum_d N_d + 1 \quad (7.16)$$

$$2I_B + E_B = \sum_{d,n_B} n_B N_{d,n_B}, \quad (7.17)$$

one arrives at the final result

$$D = 2L + 2 - \frac{E_B}{2} + \sum_{d,n_B} \left\{ d - 2 + \frac{n_B}{2} \right\} N_{d,n_B}. \quad (7.18)$$

Since the quantity in curly brackets is non-negative, this formula is the starting point for a systematic chiral expansion.

However, the formula (7.18) is misleading for  $E_B \geq 4$  (Weinberg, 1990, 1991). For instance, there is an obvious conflict with the existence of nuclear binding. Although the formula (7.18) suggests that higher-order diagrams are suppressed, nuclear binding is a clear manifestation of the breakdown of the perturbation expansion. The solution of this conflict is provided by seeming infrared divergences related to the massless baryon propagator (7.13). Of course, those infrared divergences do not really exist because the baryons are certainly not massless. However, they invalidate the simple formula (7.18) for  $E_B \geq 4$ . Weinberg (1990, 1991) has suggested to use non-relativistic perturbation theory instead where the problem with chiral power counting is related to small energy denominators. Those small denominators occur for intermediate states with baryons only. If one considers instead of the S-matrix an effective potential defined as the sum of connected,  $N$ -baryon-irreducible diagrams, the simple power counting formula (7.18) is applicable for the effective potential (Weinberg, 1990, 1991). This formalism has been applied to various problems of nuclear physics like the nucleon-nucleon force, the chiral suppression of three-nucleon forces, meson-exchange currents, pion-nucleus scattering, etc. [for recent reviews, see Park et al. (1993), Bernard et al. (1995)].

For  $E_B \leq 2$ , the problem of infrared divergences in HBCHPT does not arise and the formula (7.18) for chiral power counting applies directly to S-matrix elements. For  $n_B = E_B = 0$ , one recovers of course the formula (2.63) for the mesonic sector. In the remainder of this section, I consider only processes with a single incoming and outgoing baryon line ( $E_B = 2$ ,  $n_B \leq 2$ ). Using the notation

$$N_{d,0} = N_d^M, \quad N_{d,2} = N_d^{MB},$$

we obtain the relevant formula

$$D = 2L + 1 + \sum_d (d-2)N_d^M + \sum_d (d-1)N_d^{MB} \geq 2L + 1. \quad (7.19)$$

Only tree diagrams contribute to  $O(p)$  and  $O(p^2)$ . Loops are suppressed by powers of  $p^{2L}$ .

Except at lowest order, the effective chiral Lagrangian of a given  $O(p^d)$  in HBCHPT consists of two parts. The first part  $A_{(d)}$  arises from the projection of the relativistic Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(d)}$  on the subspace of the light components  $N_v$  defined by the projector  $P_v^+$ . The second part is due to the expansion of  $C^{-1}$  in a power series in  $1/m$ . For chiral  $SU(2)$  one finds <sup>3</sup> at  $O(p^2)$  (Bernard et al., 1992f, 1994f; Meißner, 1994c)

$$\begin{aligned} A_{(2)} = & \frac{c_1}{m} \langle \chi_+ \rangle + \frac{c_2}{m} (v \cdot u)^2 + \frac{c_3}{m} u \cdot u + \frac{c_5}{m} \left( \chi_+ - \frac{1}{2} \langle \chi_+ \rangle \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{m} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} v_\rho S_\sigma [i c_4 u_\mu u_\nu + c_6 f_{+\mu\nu} + c_7 (\partial_\mu v_\nu^{(s)} - \partial_\nu v_\mu^{(s)})] \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2m} \gamma^0 B_{(1)}^\dagger \gamma^0 B_{(1)} = & \frac{1}{2m} \{ (v \cdot \nabla)^2 - \nabla \cdot \nabla - i g_A \{ S \cdot \nabla, v \cdot u \} \\ & - \frac{g_A^2}{4} (v \cdot u)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} v_\rho S_\sigma [i u_\mu u_\nu + f_{+\mu\nu} + 2(\partial_\mu v_\nu^{(s)} - \partial_\nu v_\mu^{(s)})] \}. \end{aligned} \quad (7.21)$$

The  $c_i$  are dimensionless LECs of  $O(p^2)$ . At first sight, it may seem surprising that there are terms in (7.21) that have no counterparts in the general Lagrangian  $A_{(2)}$ . After all, the procedure

---

<sup>3</sup>Except for a scale factor  $1/m$  and for a different normalization of external gauge fields, I have followed the conventions of Meißner (1994c) for the  $c_i$ .

Table 7.1: Numerical values of the LECs of  $O(p^2)$  in the pion–nucleon system (except  $c_5$ ). The values are adapted from a recent compilation of Meißner (1994c). Note that the conventions for the external vector fields are different from those of Meißner. Here,  $c_6 = \overset{\circ}{\kappa}_v/4$ ,  $c_7 = \overset{\circ}{\kappa}_s/2$ , where  $\overset{\circ}{\kappa}_v$  ( $\overset{\circ}{\kappa}_s$ ) is the isovector (isoscalar) anomalous magnetic moment of the nucleon in the chiral limit. The errors do not account for higher–order chiral corrections.

LEC	value	source
$c_1$	$-0.8 \pm 0.1$	$\sigma_{\pi N}$
$c_2$	$3.1 \pm 0.2$	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
$c_3$	$-4.9 \pm 0.2$	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
$c_4$	$3.9 \pm 0.1$	$\pi N \rightarrow \pi N$
$c_6$	$1.4 \pm 0.1$	$\kappa_{p,n}$
$c_7$	$-0.06 \pm 0.0$	$\kappa_{p,n}$

leading to (7.21) respects chiral and Lorentz invariance. But if  $A_{(2)}$  is the most general structure respecting these symmetries, why are there terms in (7.21) that do not also appear in (7.20)? On the other hand, there are good reasons why the first three terms in (7.21) have fixed coefficients in the complete Lagrangian of  $O(p^2)$ . For instance, the first two terms in (7.21) determine the Compton scattering amplitude in the Thomson limit (Bernard et al., 1992f; Ecker and Meißner, 1994d). Obviously, those coefficients are fixed by gauge invariance. The solution of this seeming puzzle has to do with the difference between covariance and invariance. The four–vector  $v^\mu$  singles out a special reference frame. The projection of the general Lorentz invariant Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_{\pi N}^{(d)}$  onto this reference frame will not produce all possible covariant local terms with  $v^\mu$  transforming like a Lorentz four–vector. On the other hand, such terms can and do occur in the expansion of the non–local part  $\gamma^0 B^\dagger \gamma^0 C^{-1} B$  in powers of  $1/m$ . The two different structures (7.20) and (7.21) are a manifestation of this difference that is not always respected in the literature.

Except for the constant  $c_5$  that would appear for instance in isospin violating amplitudes <sup>4</sup> for  $m_u \neq m_d$ , all LECs of  $O(p^2)$  in the pion–nucleon system are now known phenomenologically. In Table 7.1 that is adapted from recent lecture notes by Meißner (1994c), the phenomenological values of these LECs are collected. The LECs  $c_1$ ,  $c_3$  and  $c_4$  have also been determined in a fit to deuteron properties and  $NN$  phase shifts at low energies in an investigation of the  $NN$  interaction to one–loop accuracy (Ordóñez et al., 1994; van Kolck, 1994). The fitted values disagree with those in Table 7.1. I refer to the lecture notes of Meißner (1994c) for a discussion of this discrepancy.

Can one understand the values of the LECs in Table 7.1? Naive chiral dimensional analysis suggests  $c_i = O(1)$  in rough agreement with the phenomenological values. A more ambitious approach is to extend the successful notion of resonance saturation in the mesonic sector (cf. Sect. 3.2) to the meson–baryon system. An instructive example is the case of  $c_3$  with the biggest absolute value in Table 7.1. This LEC receives contributions from  $\Delta(1232)$  and  $N^*(1440)$  exchange, but also from scalar meson exchange. Within the uncertainties of the corresponding resonance couplings,  $c_3^R$  due to resonance exchange is compatible with its phenomenological value (Meißner, 1994a,c). A more detailed discussion of resonance contributions to the  $c_i$  can be found in the review of Bernard et al. (1995).

The dominant contribution to  $c_3$  is due to  $\Delta$  exchange. This is partly due to the proximity of the  $\Delta$ , but also to its strong coupling to the pion–nucleon system ( $g_{\pi\Delta N} \simeq 2g_{\pi NN}$ ). It is a much

<sup>4</sup>In a different notation, the term with coupling constant  $c_5$  has recently been considered by Weinberg (1994).

debated issue in HBCHPT how to properly account for the  $\Delta$  resonance [or the whole decuplet in the  $SU(3)$  case]. While there is no controversy about the importance of  $\Delta$  exchange for the LECs  $c_i$  of  $O(p^2)$ , the main question is whether one should view the  $\Delta$  as having been integrated out so that its remnants appear in the appropriate LECs only, or whether one should include the decuplet fields as dynamical fields in the effective Lagrangian. To some extent, the two approaches correspond in the meson sector to considering on one side chiral  $SU(2)$  where kaons and the  $\eta$  meson appear only in LECs, while they are dynamical degrees of freedom in chiral  $SU(3)$ . The difference between the meson and the meson–baryon sectors is that  $K, \eta$  become degenerate with the pions in the chiral limit, whereas the nucleons and the  $\Delta$  (octet and decuplet baryons) become degenerate in the large- $N_c$  limit (Witten, 1979).

A small drawback of the scenario with dynamical  $\Delta$  fields is its incompatibility with the chiral counting formula (7.19). This is due to the decuplet propagator in HBCHPT,

$$\frac{iP_{\mu\nu}}{v \cdot k - \Delta + i\varepsilon}, \quad (7.22)$$

where  $P_{\mu\nu}$  is an appropriate projector and  $\Delta \simeq \frac{5}{2}F_\pi$  is the octet–decuplet mass splitting in the chiral limit. The situation is similar to the relativistic formulation of meson–baryon interactions of the previous subsection. In addition to modifications in the renormalization program, a term of  $O(p^d)$  in the standard counting will look schematically like (no external gauge fields in this example)

$$M^d F(p/M; M/\Delta) \quad (7.23)$$

with  $p$  a generic (small) momentum and  $M$  a pseudoscalar meson mass. The chiral counting is spoiled because  $M/\Delta$  has chiral dimension one. Although the chiral and the large- $N_c$  limits do not commute, there is no problem of principle (Jenkins and Manohar, 1991a, 1992c). Consider as an instructive example the octet baryon mass splittings. Taking the chiral limit first, only the octet intermediate states contribute to the leading non-analytic corrections (Gasser, 1981). On the other hand, taking the large- $N_c$  limit first, an entire tower of states (degenerate for  $N_c \rightarrow \infty$ ) contributes (Jenkins and Manohar, 1991a, 1992c; Dashen et al., 1994a,b).

Of course, neither of the two limits corresponds to the real world. Since CHPT is applicable as long as  $M$  and  $\Delta$  are both much smaller than  $4\pi F_\pi$ , irrespective of the size of  $M/\Delta$ , the treatment of the decuplet baryons becomes mainly a question of effectiveness. In most of the work with two light flavours (where  $M/\Delta < 1$ ), the baryon resonances have been taken into account through their contributions to LECs (Bernard et al., any paper). For chiral  $SU(3)$  (where  $M/\Delta > 1$  for  $M = M_K, M_\eta$ ), most authors have followed Jenkins and Manohar (1991a, 1992c) incorporating the decuplet baryons as dynamical fields. We shall come back to the three-flavour case in Sect. 7.6.

### 7.3 Renormalization to $O(p^3)$

With the effective pion–nucleon Lagrangian (7.12) of the last subsection, all Green functions and amplitudes with a single incoming and outgoing nucleon can be calculated in a systematic chiral expansion: nucleon form factors,  $\pi N \rightarrow \pi \dots \pi N$ ,  $\gamma^* N \rightarrow \pi \dots \pi N$ ,  $W^* N \rightarrow \pi \dots \pi N$ .

Up to and including  $O(p^2)$ , only tree-level amplitudes contribute. At  $O(p^3)$ , loop diagrams of the type shown in Fig. 7.1 must be taken into account. Those diagrams are in general divergent requiring regularization and renormalization. The divergences will be cancelled by counterterms of  $O(p^3)$  which are part of the general chiral invariant pion–nucleon Lagrangian (7.12). The sum of the reducible diagrams c, d is automatically finite because the mesonic one-loop functional <sup>5</sup> has already been rendered finite in Sect. 3.1.

---

<sup>5</sup>For diagrams c and d, the mesonic one-loop functional for chiral  $SU(2)$  (Gasser and Leutwyler, 1984) is needed.




Figure 7.1: One-loop diagrams for pion-nucleon Green functions (a,b: irreducible diagrams; c,d: reducible diagrams). The full (dashed) lines denote the nucleon (meson) propagators. The propagators and the vertices have the full tree-level structure attached to them as functionals of the external fields. The crossed circle denotes a vertex from the meson Lagrangian  $\mathcal{L}_4$  of  $O(p^4)$  [for chiral  $SU(2)$ ].

The divergent part of the one-loop functional of  $O(p^3)$  can be calculated in closed form (Ecker, 1994c) by using the heat kernel method [for a general review, see Ball (1989)] for the meson and nucleon propagators in the presence of external fields. In this way, one can not only renormalize all single-nucleon Green functions in a compact way, but one also obtains the chiral logs for all of them. In a more precise formulation, one obtains the scale dependence of the renormalized LECs of  $O(p^3)$ . The details of the calculation can be found in Ecker (1994c). A non-trivial part of that calculation consists in finding a heat kernel representation for the inverse of the differential operator

$$iv \cdot \nabla + g_A S \cdot u , \quad (7.24)$$

the nucleon propagator in the presence of external fields appearing in diagram b of Fig. 7.1.

The renormalization program at  $O(p^3)$  can be summarized in the following way, in complete analogy to the mesonic case at  $O(p^4)$  (Sect. 3.1). The decomposition of the one-loop functional into a divergent and a finite part introduces an arbitrary scale  $\mu$ : although the total one-loop functional is independent of  $\mu$ , the two separate parts are not. The divergent part is then cancelled by a corresponding piece in the general effective Lagrangian of  $O(p^3)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\pi N}^{(3)} &= \bar{N}_v \left( A_{(3)} + \gamma^0 B^\dagger \gamma^0 C^{-1} B \right) N_v \\ A_{(3)} &= \frac{1}{(4\pi F)^2} \sum_i b_i O_i , \end{aligned} \quad (7.25)$$

through the decomposition

$$b_i = b_i^r(\mu) + (4\pi)^2 \beta_i \Lambda(\mu) \quad (7.26)$$

of the dimensionless LECs  $b_i$ . The quantity  $\Lambda(\mu)$  is defined in Eq. (3.3). The coefficients  $\beta_i$  [analogous to the  $\Gamma_i$  in (3.3)] are chosen such that the divergent part of (7.25) cancels the divergent

Table 7.2: All counterterms of  $O(p^3)$  with non-vanishing  $\beta$ -functions in a suitably defined basis. Compared to the list of counterterms in Ecker (1994c), a field transformation has been applied to the nucleon field to eliminate some of the original terms.

i	$O_i$	$\beta_i$
1	$i[u_\mu, v \cdot \nabla u^\mu]$	$-g_A^4/6$
2	$i[u_\mu, \nabla^\mu v \cdot u]$	$-(1 + 5g_A^2)/12$
3	$i[v \cdot u, v \cdot \nabla v \cdot u]$	$(3 + g_A^4)/6$
4	$S \cdot u \langle u \cdot u \rangle$	$g_A(1 + 5g_A^2 + 4g_A^4)/2$
5	$u_\mu \langle u^\mu S \cdot u \rangle$	$g_A(3 - 9g_A^2 + 4g_A^4)/6$
6	$S \cdot u \langle (v \cdot u)^2 \rangle$	$-g_A(2 + g_A^2 + 2g_A^4)$
7	$v \cdot u \langle S \cdot uv \cdot u \rangle$	$g_A^3 + 2g_A^5/3$
8	$[\chi_-, v \cdot u]$	$(1 + 5g_A^2)/24$
9	$S \cdot u \langle \chi_+ \rangle$	$g_A/2 + g_A^3$
10	$\nabla^\mu f_{+\mu\nu} v^\nu$	$-(1 + 5g_A^2)/6$
11	$iS^\mu v^\nu [f_{+\mu\nu}, v \cdot u]$	$g_A + g_A^3$
12	$iS^\mu [f_{+\mu\nu}, u^\nu]$	$-g_A^3$
13	$v_\lambda \varepsilon^{\lambda\mu\nu\rho} S_\rho \langle (v \cdot \nabla u_\mu) u_\nu \rangle$	$g_A^4/3$

piece of the one-loop functional. The generating functional of  $O(p^3)$  then contains both the finite part of the one-loop functional and a tree-level functional due to (7.25), with the couplings  $b_i$  replaced by the renormalized coupling constants  $b_i^r(\mu)$ . The complete functional of  $O(p^3)$  is finite and independent of  $\mu$  by construction.

The list of operators  $O_i$  in (7.25) with non-zero  $\beta_i$  can be found in Ecker (1994c). Some of those terms ( $O_{15}, \dots, O_{22}$ ) contain the differential operator  $v \cdot \nabla$  acting on the nucleon field. By making a field transformation on the nucleon field, those terms in (7.25) can be transformed away. This transformation reduces the number of monomials of  $O(p^3)$  with non-vanishing  $\beta$ -functions to 13. Of course, the  $\beta_i$  of the original basis are in general modified. Moreover, the transformation will also affect the higher-order Lagrangians. At  $O(p^4)$ , the new terms with (in general) divergent coefficients are generated by applying the field transformation to the  $O(p^2)$  Lagrangian

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{\pi N}^{(2)} = \bar{N}_v \left( A_{(2)} + \frac{1}{2m} \gamma^0 B_{(1)}^\dagger \gamma^0 B_{(1)} \right) N_v \quad (7.27)$$

with  $A_{(2)}$  and  $\gamma^0 B_{(1)}^\dagger \gamma^0 B_{(1)}/2m$  given in (7.20) and (7.21). The explicit form of the field transformation and the induced terms of  $O(p^4)$  will be given elsewhere. Here, I will confine myself to the complete renormalization at  $O(p^3)$  for chiral  $SU(2)$ . In Table 7.2, the complete list of operators  $O_i$  with non-vanishing coefficients  $\beta_i$  in the new basis of nucleon fields is given.

The renormalized low-energy constants  $b_i^r(\mu)$  are measurable quantities satisfying the renormalization group equations

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} b_i^r(\mu) = -\beta_i \quad (7.28)$$

implying

$$b_i^r(\mu) = b_i^r(\mu_0) - \beta_i \ln \frac{\mu}{\mu_0} . \quad (7.29)$$



It remains to extract the LECs  $b_i^r(\mu)$  in a systematic way from pion–nucleon data, together with the other scale independent LECs of  $O(p^3)$ . Another important task will be to understand the actual values of these parameters, in particular to investigate systematically the effect of meson and baryon resonances.

## 7.4 Pion–nucleon scattering

The pion–nucleon system was investigated in the relativistic formulation of baryon CHPT by Gasser et al. (1988). Recent years have witnessed the solution of the long–standing puzzle of the  $\pi N$  sigma term. Following recent summaries (Sainio, 1994; Höhler, 1994), I briefly review the present status of the  $\sigma$ –term.

The  $\sigma$ –term is related to the scalar form factor of the nucleon:

$$\sigma(t)\bar{u}(p')u(p) = \langle p' | \hat{m}(\bar{u}u + \bar{d}d) | p \rangle \quad (7.30)$$

$$\sigma := \sigma(0), \quad t = (p - p')^2.$$

It can be rewritten in the form [with the normalization  $\bar{u}(p)u(p) = 2m$ ]

$$\sigma = \frac{\hat{\sigma}}{1 - y} \quad (7.31)$$

$$\hat{\sigma} = \frac{\hat{m}}{2m} \langle p | \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d - 2\bar{s}s | p \rangle \quad (7.32)$$

$$y = \frac{2\langle p | \bar{s}s | p \rangle}{\langle p | \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d | p \rangle}, \quad (7.33)$$

with  $y$  measuring the strange quark contribution to the nucleon mass. Since  $\hat{\sigma}$  involves the octet breaking piece in the QCD Hamiltonian, one finds to first order in  $SU(3)$  breaking

$$\hat{\sigma} \simeq \frac{\hat{m}}{m_s - \hat{m}} (m_\Xi + m_\Sigma - 2m_N) \simeq 26 \text{ MeV} \quad (7.34)$$

with the standard values of quark mass ratios (cf. Sect. 3.3). There are however significant corrections to  $\hat{\sigma}$  of  $O(p^3) = O(m_q^{3/2})$  (Gasser, 1981; Gasser and Leutwyler, 1982),

$$\hat{\sigma} = 35 \pm 5 \text{ MeV}, \quad (7.35)$$

based on the original calculation of Gasser (1981) employing an ultraviolet cutoff. Recent one–loop calculations in CHPT (Dentin, 1990; Bürgi, 1993) suggest somewhat bigger values:  $\hat{\sigma} = 40 \div 50 \text{ MeV}$ . The leading  $m_s^{3/2}$  corrections from the meson octet and from both octet and decuplet baryons (Jenkins 1992a; Jenkins and Manohar, 1992b) yield  $\hat{\sigma} \simeq 50 \text{ MeV}$ , if one calculates to leading order in the octet–decuplet mass splitting  $\Delta$ . This procedure was criticized by Bernard et al. (1993b) who claim that it does not lead to a consistent picture of the scalar sector if one considers also the  $KN$   $\sigma$ –terms (cf. Sect. 7.6). Almost everybody agrees that a full  $O(p^4)$  calculation is necessary, including estimates of the relevant LECs, to obtain a trustworthy value for  $\hat{\sigma}$ .

Before one can extract a value for the ratio  $y$  or, equivalently, for the strange quark contribution to the nucleon mass,

$$\Delta m(m_s) = \frac{m_s}{2\hat{m}} (\sigma - \hat{\sigma}) \simeq 13(\sigma - \hat{\sigma}), \quad (7.36)$$

one has to relate  $\sigma$  to the  $\pi N$  scattering amplitude at the unphysical Cheng–Dashen (1971) point  $s = u$ ,  $t = 2M_\pi^2$ . The corresponding quantity  $\Sigma$  has been extracted from  $\pi N$  phase shifts by the Karlsruhe group (Koch, 1982; Höhler, 1994) and by Gasser et al. (1991c) to give (Sainio, 1994)

$$\Sigma = 60 \pm 7 \text{ MeV} . \quad (7.37)$$

The final step consists in relating  $\sigma$  to  $\Sigma$ :

$$\Sigma = \sigma + \Delta_\sigma + \Delta_R, \quad \Delta_\sigma = \sigma(2M_\pi^2) - \sigma(0) , \quad (7.38)$$

where the residual correction  $\Delta_R \simeq 0.35 \text{ MeV}$  (Gasser et al., 1988) is small. A main ingredient for the solution of the  $\sigma$ -term puzzle is the dispersion theory result (Gasser et al., 1991c)

$$\Delta_\sigma = 15.2 \pm 0.4 \text{ MeV} , \quad (7.39)$$

much bigger than the one-loop result of about 5 MeV in the relativistic formulation (Gasser et al., 1988) and about 7.5 MeV in HBCHPT (Bernard et al., 1992f). This large increase is due to the strong  $S$ -wave  $\pi N$  amplitude in the  $t$ -channel. In HBCHPT, the difference between (7.39) and the leading-order value can be attributed to  $\Delta$  exchange, with  $K$ - and  $\eta$ -loop contributions being small (Bernard et al., 1993b). An interesting alternative method to determine  $\Delta_\sigma$  has been suggested by Bernard et al. (1994a). At  $O(p^3)$ , the scalar nucleon form factor  $\sigma(t)$  appears in one of the  $S$ -wave multipole amplitudes for neutrino-induced pion production. Although an unknown counterterm enters at the same order, chiral dimensional analysis suggests that  $\sigma(t)$  dominates the multipole in question in the threshold region. It remains to be seen whether this multipole can be separated experimentally and whether higher-order corrections are under control.

Putting everything together, one obtains

$$\sigma = 45 \pm 7 \text{ MeV} . \quad (7.40)$$

Looking at Eq. (7.36), one observes that the strange quark contribution to  $m$  is extremely sensitive to the error of  $\sigma - \hat{\sigma}$ . Taking the mean values of  $\hat{\sigma}$ ,  $\sigma$  from (7.35) and (7.40) yields

$$y \simeq 0.2 , \quad \Delta m(m_s) \simeq 130 \text{ MeV} . \quad (7.41)$$

In view of the considerable uncertainty of  $\hat{\sigma}$  [probably underestimated by the error in (7.35)],  $y$  and  $\Delta m(m_s)$  are consistent with zero. Whatever their precise values may finally turn out to be, the  $\sigma$ -term problem has been put to rest once and for all. From this observable, there is no evidence for a large strange-quark component in the nucleon.

The  $\pi N$  scattering amplitude in the forward direction is governed by two invariant amplitudes  $T^\pm(\omega)$  as a function of  $\omega = v \cdot q$ , with  $q$  the pion momentum. At threshold ( $\omega = M_\pi$ ), the amplitudes can be expressed in terms of the  $S$ -wave scattering lengths  $a^\pm$ :

$$a^\pm = \frac{1}{4\pi(1 + M_\pi/m)} T^\pm(M_\pi) . \quad (7.42)$$

The scattering lengths  $a_{1/2}$ ,  $a_{3/2}$  of definite isospin  $I = 1/2, 3/2$  are related to  $a^\pm$ :

$$a_{1/2} = a^+ + 2a^-, \quad a_{3/2} = a^+ - a^- . \quad (7.43)$$

The old current algebra predictions (Weinberg, 1966; Tomozawa, 1966)

$$a^- = \frac{M_\pi}{8\pi F_\pi^2} = 8.8 \cdot 10^{-2}/M_\pi , \quad a^+ = 0 \quad (7.44)$$

are remarkably close to the experimental values (Koch, 1986)

$$a^- = 9.2 \pm 0.2, \quad a^+ = -0.4 \pm 0.4 \quad (7.45)$$

in units  $10^{-2}/M_\pi$ . It is then interesting to check whether this agreement survives higher-order chiral corrections. Bernard et al. (1993c) have calculated the  $S$ -wave scattering lengths to  $O(p^3)$  in HBCHPT. It turns out that  $T^-(M_\pi)$  does not receive any corrections of order  $M_\pi^2$  and  $M_\pi^4$ . The loop contribution is divergent entailing a scale dependent counterterm contribution. Fortunately, the factor of  $O(M_\pi^3)$  multiplying the LECs of  $O(p^3)$  is comparatively small. Estimating this contribution with  $\Delta$  exchange and setting the renormalization scale  $\mu = m_\Delta$ , Bernard et al. (1993c) find to  $O(p^3)$

$$a^- = (\underbrace{8.76}_{O(M_\pi)} + 0.40) \cdot 10^{-2}/M_\pi = 9.16 \cdot 10^{-2}/M_\pi \quad (7.46)$$

in impressive agreement with experiment. The situation is much less favourable for  $a^+$ . There are contributions of both  $O(M_\pi^2)$  and  $O(M_\pi^3)$  to  $T^+(M_\pi)$ . In particular, the contribution  $c_2 + c_3 - 2c_1$  of the  $O(p^2)$  LECs defined in (7.20) enters the leading contribution of  $O(M_\pi^2)$ . There is no real prediction, but resonance exchange for the LECs yields a value of  $a^+$  compatible with the experimental result (7.45). The convergence of the chiral expansion appears to be much slower for  $a^+$  than for  $a^-$ .

One can turn the argument around and use  $a^+$  to fix the combination  $c_2 + c_3 - 2c_1$  (Bernard et al., 1993c). In fact,  $a^+$  has been used as one of three observables to obtain the values of  $c_1, c_2, c_3$  in Table 7.1 (Meißner, 1994c; Bernard et al., 1995). The LEC  $c_3$  determines the  $O(p^2)$  contribution to the so-called axial polarizability  $\alpha_A$  entering the crossing-even amplitude  $T^+$  away from the forward region. The chiral prediction to  $O(p^3)$  (Bernard et al., 1995)

$$\alpha_A = -\frac{2c_3}{mF_\pi^2} - \frac{g_A^2 M_\pi}{8\pi F_\pi^4} \left( \frac{77}{48} + g_A^2 \right) \quad (7.47)$$

can be confronted with the experimental result <sup>6</sup> (Höhler, 1983)  $\alpha_A = (2.28 \pm 0.10) \cdot M_\pi^{-3}$  to extract the value for  $c_3$  given in Table 7.1. Finally, the  $\pi N$   $\sigma$ -term is given to  $O(p^3)$  in HBCHPT by (Bernard et al., 1992f)

$$\sigma = -\frac{4M_\pi^2}{m} c_1 - \frac{9g_A^2 M_\pi^3}{64\pi F_\pi^2}. \quad (7.48)$$

The present best value (7.40) for  $\sigma$  implies the value for  $c_1$  shown in Table 7.1. Thus, the quantities  $\sigma$ ,  $a^+$  and  $\alpha_A$  determine the phenomenological values of the LECs  $c_1, c_2, c_3$ .

Traditionally, the reactions  $\pi N \rightarrow \pi\pi N$  have been studied to get information on  $\pi\pi$  scattering by extrapolating to the pion pole in the  $t$ -channel. However, there is now a large sample of data in the threshold region that should be analysed on their own merits [see Bernard et al. (1994b) for the relevant references]. At threshold, the processes  $\pi^a N \rightarrow \pi^b \pi^c N$  are described by the S-matrix element

$$T_{a,bc} = i\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{k} [D_1(\tau^b \delta^{ac} + \tau^c \delta^{ab}) + D_2 \tau^a \delta^{bc}] \quad (7.49)$$

where  $k$  is the momentum of the incoming pion. The invariant amplitudes  $D_1, D_2$  are related to the more commonly used amplitudes  $A_{2I, I\pi\pi}$ , where  $I$  is the isospin of the initial state and  $I_{\pi\pi}$  the isospin of the produced two-pion system:

$$A_{32} = \sqrt{10} D_1 \quad (7.50)$$

$$A_{10} = -2D_1 - 3D_2. \quad (7.51)$$

---

<sup>6</sup>Following a suggestion of Sainio, the error of  $\alpha_A$  has been scaled up (Meißner, 1994a).

The experimental values for these amplitudes are (Burkhardt and Lowe, 1991)

$$A_{32} = 2.07 \pm 0.10 \, M_\pi^{-3}, \quad A_{10} = 6.55 \pm 0.16 \, M_\pi^{-3} . \quad (7.52)$$

A more recent fit of near-threshold data only by Bernard et al. (N. Kaiser, private communication) gives instead

$$A_{32} = 2.53 \pm 0.14 \, M_\pi^{-3}, \quad A_{10} = 8.01 \pm 0.64 \, M_\pi^{-3} . \quad (7.53)$$

In the relativistic formulation, the amplitudes for two-pion production were calculated by Beringer (1993) at tree level. Within HBCHPT, the amplitudes  $A_{32}, A_{10}$  were recently calculated to  $O(p^2)$  by Bernard et al. (1994b):

$$A_{32} = \frac{g_A \sqrt{10}}{8F_\pi^3} \left( 1 + \frac{7M_\pi}{2m} \right) + O(M_\pi^2) \quad (7.54)$$

$$A_{10} = \frac{7g_A}{8F_\pi^3} \left( 1 + \frac{37M_\pi}{14m} \right) + O(M_\pi^2) . \quad (7.55)$$

Only the kinematical part (7.21) of the  $O(p^2)$  Lagrangian contributes. In other words, none of the LECs  $c_i$  in (7.20) appears in the amplitudes (7.54), (7.55). The numerical values

$$A_{32} = 2.7 \, M_\pi^{-3}, \quad A_{10} = 5.5 \, M_\pi^{-3} \quad (7.56)$$

compare reasonably well with the experimental results (7.52) or (7.53). Note that the corrections of  $O(p^2)$  amount to about 50 and 40% for the amplitudes  $A_{32}$  and  $A_{10}$ , respectively. One therefore has to worry about the corrections of  $O(p^3)$  corresponding to  $O(M_\pi^2)$  in (7.54), (7.55). At that order, both loop and counterterm amplitudes enter. The full  $O(p^3)$  calculation is not yet available, but Bernard et al. (1994b) have estimated the size of  $O(p^3)$  corrections by calculating the unambiguous absorptive parts of the one-loop diagrams. Provided the absorptive parts are representative for the size of  $O(p^3)$  corrections, Bernard et al. (1994b) expect  $A_{32}$  to change only little and  $A_{10}$  by some 30%. The physics behind these estimates is related to the properties of the  $\pi\pi$  final states: small corrections for  $I = 2$ , but sizable ones for  $I = 0$ .

## 7.5 Photo-nucleon reactions

As in the meson sector, reactions with real or virtual photons are a fertile field for CHPT, with both chiral symmetry and electromagnetic gauge invariance playing an important role. There are many experimental and theoretical developments in this field, bringing together nuclear and particle physicists. For an up-to-date account of these activities, I refer to the Proceedings of a recent Workshop at MIT (Bernstein and Holstein, 1995). Here, I want to review recent work on nucleon Compton scattering and on single and double pion production by real or virtual photons off nucleons.

The spin-averaged Compton amplitude <sup>7</sup> in the forward direction (in the Coulomb gauge  $\varepsilon \cdot v = 0$ ) is given by

$$e^2 \varepsilon^\mu \varepsilon^\nu \frac{1}{4} \text{tr} [(1 + \not{v}) T_{\mu\nu}(v, k)] = e^2 [\varepsilon^2 U(\omega) + (\varepsilon \cdot k)^2 V(\omega)] \quad (7.57)$$

with  $\omega = v \cdot k$  ( $k$  is the photon momentum) and

$$T_{\mu\nu}(v, k) = \int d^4k \, e^{ikx} \langle N(v) | T j_\mu^{\text{em}}(x) j_\nu^{\text{em}}(0) | N(v) \rangle . \quad (7.58)$$

---

<sup>7</sup>The spin-flip amplitude was calculated to  $O(p^3)$  in HBCHPT by Bernard et al. (1992f).

The invariant amplitude  $V(\omega)$  does not contribute for on-shell photons, but it determines the magnetic polarizability  $\bar{\beta}$  via

$$\bar{\beta} = -\frac{e^2}{4\pi} V(0) . \quad (7.59)$$

The electric polarizability  $\bar{\alpha}$  is obtained from  $U(\omega)$ :

$$\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\beta} = -\frac{e^2}{8\pi} \frac{d^2 U}{d\omega^2} \Big|_{\omega=0} . \quad (7.60)$$

Let me concentrate on the actual Compton amplitude  $U(\omega)$ . With  $D_F = 2$  external photons, the degree of homogeneity  $D_L$  defined in (3.7) is obtained from (7.19) as

$$D_L = 2L - 1 + \sum_d (d-2) N_d^M + \sum_d (d-1) N_d^{MB} \geq -1 . \quad (7.61)$$

Inserting the explicit dependence on  $M_\pi$ , the chiral expansion of  $U(\omega, M_\pi)$  takes the general form (Ecker and Meißner, 1994d)

$$U(\omega, M_\pi) = \frac{1}{\omega} f_{-1}(\omega/M_\pi) + f_0(\omega/M_\pi) + \sum_{D_L \geq 1} \omega^{D_L} f_{D_L}(\omega/M_\pi) . \quad (7.62)$$

Only tree diagrams can contribute to the first two terms. Since the relevant tree diagrams do not contain pion lines,  $f_{-1}$  and  $f_0$  must actually be constants. Explicit calculation (Bernard et al., 1992f) reproduces the Thomson limit ( $Z$  is the nucleon charge in units of  $e$ )

$$f_{-1} = 0 , \quad f_0 = U(0, M_\pi) = \frac{Z^2}{m} \quad (7.63)$$

since (Ecker and Meißner, 1994d)

$$\lim_{\omega \rightarrow 0} \omega^{n-1} f_n(\omega/M_\pi) = 0 \quad (n \geq 1) . \quad (7.64)$$

The amplitude  $U(\omega)$  has been calculated to  $O(p^4)$  corresponding to  $D_L = 2$  (Bernard et al., 1992f, 1994d) and was found to agree well with experiment for  $\omega \leq 110$  MeV.

Here, I concentrate on the polarizabilities  $\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}$ . From the representation (7.62) and the corresponding one for  $V(\omega)$  one concludes that the contribution of  $O(p^n)$  ( $D_L = n-2$ ) to the polarizabilities is of the form  $c_n M_\pi^{n-4}$  ( $n \geq 3$ ) with constant  $c_n$ . At leading order,  $O(p^3)$ , the polarizabilities are given by (Bernard et al., 1991a, 1992f)

$$\bar{\alpha}_p = \bar{\alpha}_n = \frac{5e^2 g_A^2}{384\pi^2 F_\pi^2 M_\pi} = 12 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3 \quad (7.65)$$

$$\bar{\beta}_p = \bar{\beta}_n = \frac{\bar{\alpha}_p}{10} = 1.2 \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3 . \quad (7.66)$$

Comparison with the experimental values in Table 7.3 shows that the long-ranged pion cloud clearly accounts for the main features of the data. The corresponding calculation in the three-flavour case (Bernard et al., 1992g; Butler and Savage, 1992) generates in particular a small positive contribution  $\bar{\alpha}_p - \bar{\alpha}_n$  due to the kaon cloud around the nucleons. The decuplet contribution that comes in at  $O(p^4)$  interferes destructively with the kaon contribution, but the overall result (with a sizable error) for  $\bar{\alpha}_p - \bar{\alpha}_n$  still comes out positive (Butler and Savage, 1992).

Following their general philosophy of including the  $\Delta$  via its contribution to LECs, Bernard et al. (1993d, 1994d) have performed a full calculation to  $O(p^4)$  in chiral  $SU(2)$ . In this case, both

Table 7.3: Comparison between theory (Bernard et al., 1993d, 1994d) and experiment (Nathan, 1994) for the electromagnetic polarizabilities of the nucleons in units of  $10^{-4} \text{ fm}^3$ . The experimental errors are anticorrelated because in the analysis a model independent dispersion sum rule (Baldin, 1960; Damashek and Gilman, 1970) is used that determines  $\bar{\alpha} + \bar{\beta}$  with a relatively small error.

polarizability	CHPT to $O(p^4)$	data
$\bar{\alpha}_p$	$10.5 \pm 2.0$	$12.0 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.4$
$\bar{\beta}_p$	$3.5 \pm 3.6$	$2.2 \mp 0.8 \mp 0.4$
$\bar{\alpha}_n$	$13.4 \pm 1.5$	$12.5 \pm 1.5 \pm 2.0$
$\bar{\beta}_n$	$7.8 \pm 3.6$	$3.5 \mp 1.8 \mp 2.0$

the kaons and the decuplet baryons generate effects of  $O(p^4)$ , but there are additional ones. The one-loop diagrams with a single vertex from (7.20) or (7.21) are well under control as far as the couplings  $c_1, c_2, c_3$  are concerned that appear in the amplitudes (cf. Sect. 7.2). The difficulty is to estimate the LECs of  $O(p^4)$  that also renormalize the divergent loop contributions with a vertex of  $O(p^2)$ . At this stage, both the  $\Delta$  resonance and the kaons enter the game and their effect can be estimated as in the  $SU(3)$  calculation (Butler and Savage, 1992; Bernard et al., 1992g). Estimating the uncertainties arising to  $O(p^4)$  (but not accounting for higher-order corrections), Bernard et al. (1993d, 1994d) arrive at the polarizabilities displayed in Table 7.3. With the possible exception of  $\bar{\beta}_n$ , the agreement between theory and experiment is very good. The influence of other than  $\Delta$  and  $K$  contributions can for instance be seen in the difference  $\bar{\alpha}_p - \bar{\alpha}_n$  which, albeit with a big error, turns out to be negative in the calculation of Bernard et al. Calculations have also been performed for the electromagnetic polarizabilities of hyperons (Bernard et al., 1992g).

Single pion photo- and electroproduction off nucleons has been the focus of intensive experimental and theoretical work. For recent summaries of the experimental situation, see Walcher (1994) and Meißner and Schoch (1994b). I will first summarize recent theoretical developments for  $\pi^0$  production, following the talk of Bernard (1994g) at the MIT Workshop on Chiral Dynamics.

Near threshold, the photoproduction amplitude in the center-of-mass system can be described by the leading multipoles, the  $S$ -wave  $E_{0+}$  and three  $P$ -waves  $E_{1+}$ ,  $M_{1+}$ ,  $M_{1-}$ :

$$\frac{m}{4\pi\sqrt{s}} T \cdot \varepsilon = i\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{\varepsilon} (E_{0+} + \hat{k} \cdot \hat{q} P_1) + i\vec{\sigma} \cdot \hat{k} \vec{\varepsilon} \cdot \hat{q} P_2 + (\hat{q} \times \hat{k}) \cdot \vec{\varepsilon} P_3 \quad (7.67)$$

$$\gamma(k) + N(p_1) \rightarrow \pi^0(q) + N(p_2) .$$

The  $P_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) are linear combinations of the  $P$ -wave multipoles and  $\hat{k}$ ,  $\hat{q}$  are 3-dimensional unit vectors. Much of the excitement in  $\pi^0$  photoproduction has concentrated on the  $S$ -wave  $E_{0+}$ . After a reanalysis of the new data (Mazzucato et al., 1986; Beck et al., 1990), the experimentally extracted value for  $E_{0+}$  seemed to agree with an old prediction of Vainshtein and Zakharov (1970, 1972) and de Baenst (1970). It therefore came as a surprise when Bernard et al. (1991b) showed that the old prediction was in conflict with the Standard Model to  $O(p^3)$  in the chiral expansion [corresponding to  $O(M_\pi^2)$  for  $E_{0+}$  at threshold]. This calculation in the relativistic formulation also indicated that the chiral expansion of  $E_{0+}$  seems to converge very slowly. The recent calculation of  $E_{0+}$  to  $O(p^4)$  (Bernard et al., 1994h) confirms this indication making  $E_{0+}$  rather unsuitable for testing the Standard Model.

On the other hand, as shown in Fig. 7.2, CHPT accounts very well for the total cross section for  $\gamma p \rightarrow \pi^0 p$  for small photon energies. The reason is that, except very close to threshold where  $E_{0+}$  must dominate on kinematical grounds, the cross section is mainly sensitive to the  $P$ -waves.




Figure 7.2: Total cross section for  $\gamma p \rightarrow \pi^0 p$  as function of the photon energy  $E_\gamma$  in the lab frame. The two curves correspond to different treatments of LECs (Bernard et al., 1994h). The data are from Mazzucato et al. (1986, squares) and Beck et al. (1990, diamonds).

It turns out that the chiral expansion, to  $O(p^3)$  at least, is much better behaved for the  $P$ -waves than for  $E_{0+}$ . Up to and including  $O(p^3)$ ,  $E_{0+}$ ,  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  depend only on the anomalous magnetic moments  $\kappa_p, \kappa_n$  (related to  $c_6, c_7$ ), but neither on the other LECs of  $O(p^2)$  in (7.20) nor on any LECs of  $O(p^3)$ . On the other hand,  $P_3$  depends on a LEC of  $O(p^3)$  that can be estimated with resonance exchange (Bernard et al., 1994h). It is actually completely dominated by this LEC because the Born term contribution is very small and loops do not contribute at this order. On the other hand, loops do contribute to  $E_{0+}$ ,  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ . Since no LECs of  $O(p^3)$  appear in the loop amplitudes, those amplitudes are necessarily finite. Referring to Bernard et al. (1994h) for the complete multipoles as functions of  $\omega$  (the center-of-mass energy of the  $\pi^0$ ), I reproduce here the expansions of  $P_i/\sqrt{\omega^2 - M_{\pi^0}^2}$  at threshold in powers of  $M_\pi/m$  (for the proton case only):

$$\left. \frac{P_1}{|\vec{q}|} \right|_{\text{thresh}} = \frac{eg_A}{8\pi F_\pi m} \left\{ 1 + \kappa_p + \frac{M_\pi}{m} \left[ -1 - \frac{\kappa_p}{2} + \frac{g_A^2 m^2 (10 - 3\pi)}{48\pi F_\pi^2} \right] + O(M_\pi^2) \right\} \quad (7.68)$$

$$\left. \frac{P_2}{|\vec{q}|} \right|_{\text{thresh}} = \frac{eg_A}{8\pi F_\pi m} \left\{ -1 - \kappa_p + \frac{M_\pi}{2m} \left[ 3 + \kappa_p - \frac{g_A^2 m^2}{12\pi F_\pi^2} \right] + O(M_\pi^2) \right\}. \quad (7.69)$$

Unlike for  $E_{0+}$ , the corrections of  $O(M_\pi)$  are quite small for the  $P_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) at threshold: 6% for  $P_1$  and less than 0.1% for  $P_2$ . Up to unknown higher-order corrections, the  $P$ -wave multipoles  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  seem therefore much better suited than  $E_{0+}$  for testing chiral dynamics. In addition to their intrinsic interest, the CHPT predictions for  $P_1, P_2$  can be used to constrain the data when trying to extract the elusive  $E_{0+}$ . For instance, the non-vanishing combination  $P_1 + P_2$  at next-to-leading order implies that the multipole  $E_{1+}$  is non-zero at this order. However, this multipole has commonly been set to zero for analysing the threshold data.

New data are also forthcoming for electroproduction of pions. In Fig. 7.3, preliminary data




Figure 7.3: Differential cross section for  $\pi^0$  electroproduction on protons for  $k^2 = -0.1 \text{ GeV}^2$  (Walcher, 1994; Blomqvist et al., 1995; Distler, 1995) in comparison with the CHPT prediction (Bernard et al., 1993a, 1994e).

for  $\pi^0$  electroproduction on protons for  $k^2 = -0.1 \text{ GeV}^2$  (Walcher, 1994; Blomqvist et al., 1995; Distler, 1995) are compared with a CHPT calculation of  $O(p^3)$  (Bernard et al., 1993a, 1994e). The angular distribution in Fig. 7.3 clearly favours CHPT over a pseudovector Born term model.

Another example of a successful explanation of experimental data by CHPT is charged pion electroproduction. A measurement of both  $\gamma^* p \rightarrow \pi^+ n$  and  $\gamma^* n \rightarrow \pi^- p$  allows to extract the isospin-odd dipole amplitude  $E_{0+}^{(-)}$ . According to a low-energy theorem (Nambu and Lurié, 1962a; Nambu and Shrauner, 1962b), this amplitude depends on the axial radius of the nucleon,  $r_A$ :

$$E_{0+}^{(-)}(M_\pi = 0, k^2) = \frac{eg_A}{8\pi F_\pi} \left\{ 1 + \frac{k^2}{6} r_A^2 + \frac{k^2}{4m^2} \left( \kappa_v + \frac{1}{2} \right) + O(k^4) \right\}. \quad (7.70)$$

It turns out that the axial radius extracted from electroproduction ( $r_A = 0.59 \pm 0.04 \text{ fm}$ ) is a little smaller than the value found in neutrino nucleon reactions ( $r_A = 0.65 \pm 0.03 \text{ fm}$ ). Although the values differ only by about one standard deviation, it is comforting that chiral corrections for  $E_{0+}^{(-)}$  go in the right direction to bring them into agreement. The leading chiral correction due to pion loops (Bernard et al., 1992e) amounts to a shift of  $r_A^2$  in (7.70),

$$r_A^2 \rightarrow r_A^2 + \frac{3}{64F_\pi^2} \left( 1 - \frac{12}{\pi^2} \right) = r_A^2 - 0.046 \text{ fm}^2, \quad (7.71)$$

closing the gap between electro- and neutrino-production.

Finally, Bernard et al. (1994f) have started an investigation of two-pion photoproduction at threshold. The scattering amplitude at threshold can be expressed in terms of three multipoles  $M_1, M_2, M_3$ . As usual, CHPT gives rise to an expansion in  $M_\pi$  for these multipoles. At leading order,  $O(p^2)$ , one finds (Bernard et al., 1994f)

$$M_2 = -2M_3 = \frac{e}{4mF_\pi^2} (2g_A^2 - 1 - \kappa_v), \quad M_1 = 0. \quad (7.72)$$



The contribution proportional to the isovector magnetic moment  $\kappa_v$  was overlooked in earlier treatments. The leading-order results imply that the amplitude for  $\pi^0\pi^0$  production vanishes at this order for both proton and neutron targets ( $A_p \sim M_1 + M_2 + 2M_3$ ,  $A_n \sim M_1 - M_2 - 2M_3$ ). At  $O(p^3)$ , Bernard et al. (1994f) obtain a simple result for  $M_1$ ,

$$M_1 = \frac{eg_A^2 M_\pi}{4m^2 F_\pi^2}, \quad (7.73)$$

while  $M_2, M_3$  receive both loop and counterterm contributions, in particular due to  $\Delta$  exchange. However,  $2\pi^0$  production is not affected by  $\Delta$  exchange at this order. Using the correct phase-space and approximating the amplitudes near threshold essentially by their threshold values, one finds a surprisingly big cross section for the  $2\pi^0$  case. It is not only the biggest cross section of all  $2\pi$  channels (both for  $p$  and  $n$  targets), but there is in addition a kinematic window of  $10 \div 12$  MeV above threshold where practically only  $2\pi^0$  should be produced. There is preliminary evidence from an experiment at Mainz (Walcher, 1994) for  $2\pi^0$  events close to threshold.

## 7.6 Chiral $SU(3)$

The mesonic chiral Lagrangian of lowest order (2.30) has the same form for  $N_f = 2$  and 3. In the meson-baryon sector, the lowest-order Lagrangians (2.36) and (2.37) are different. There is a group theoretical reason for this difference: whereas the mesons are always in the adjoint representation of  $SU(N_f)$ , the nucleons are in the fundamental representation of  $SU(2)$ , but the baryons are in the adjoint representation of  $SU(3)$ .

Most of the work in the three-flavour case has concentrated on the so-called non-analytic chiral corrections. In other words, there is in general no systematic discussion of the LECs of a given chiral order. Since it would be totally misleading to disregard the LECs completely, most authors have followed Jenkins and Manohar (1991a) by including the decuplet baryons as dynamical fields in the effective Lagrangian. The motivation is at least two-fold: the octet-decuplet mass difference  $\Delta$  is smaller than  $M_K, M_\eta$  and it vanishes in the large- $N_c$  limit (Witten, 1979). As shown by Dashen et al. (1994a,b, and references therein), many approximate relations in the baryon system can be understood by a systematic expansion in  $1/N_c$ . For that purpose, one must include the whole tower of states that become degenerate for  $N_c \rightarrow \infty$ , in particular the octet and decuplet of baryons.

A good example for this mechanism is provided by the baryon axial-vector currents. In the original CHPT calculation of Jenkins and Manohar (1991b), large cancellations between the octet and decuplet contributions to the leading non-analytic corrections of  $O(M^2 \ln M^2)$  were found. A priori, the octet contributions alone grow with  $N_c$  because the pion-baryon couplings diverge like  $\sqrt{N_c}$ . However, the total  $M^2 \ln M^2$  correction is of  $O(1/N_c)$  (Dashen et al., 1994a) as in the meson sector. The level of accuracy of such large- $N_c$  relations can be estimated from a comparison of the  $f/d$  ratio of the baryon axial currents (Dashen et al., 1994a) [cf. Eq. (2.37)],

$$\frac{f}{d} = \frac{2}{3} + O(1/N_c^2), \quad (7.74)$$

with the experimental value  $f/d = 0.58 \pm 0.04$  (Jaffe and Manohar, 1990). The same large- $N_c$  relation applies for the  $f/d$  ratio of the baryon magnetic moments (Dashen et al., 1994a; Jenkins and Manohar, 1994), where the experimental value is 0.72.

The large- $N_c$  expansion is a very useful tool that should be combined with the chiral expansion but it is certainly not a substitute for it. In the original calculation of Jenkins and Manohar (1991b) for the baryon axial-vector form factors, only the leading terms in  $\Delta/M_K$  and  $\Delta/M_\eta$  were kept.

Keeping all terms, Luty and White (1993b) confirm the cancellation between octet and decuplet contributions, but they find that the  $SU(6)$  values of the axial couplings such as (7.74) are strongly disfavoured when  $M^2 \ln M^2$  corrections are included. The conclusion is that one cannot reliably calculate  $f$  and  $d$  from the data with the non-analytic corrections only. The corrections of  $O(M^2)$ , in particular due to LECs, cannot be neglected.

The situation is similar for the baryon masses. Here, the leading non-analytic corrections are of  $O(M^3) = O(m_q^{3/2})$ . In the large- $N_c$  counting (Dashen et al., 1994a), the terms of  $O(N_c)$  are pure  $SU(3)$  singlet,  $O(1)$  is octet, so that the first “non-trivial” corrections are  $O(1/N_c)$ . Thus, corrections to Gell-Mann–Okubo relations and other mass relations derived from broken  $SU(3)$  are actually of order  $m_s^{3/2}/N_c$ . Consequently, the baryon masses can be strongly non-linear functions of  $m_s$  and still satisfy the Gell-Mann–Okubo formula. One can give a list of baryon mass relations that hold up to corrections of  $O(1/N_c^2)$  (Dashen et al., 1994a; Manohar, 1994). Those relations that can also be obtained from broken  $SU(3)$  (octet symmetry breaking) work extremely well because effects violating those relations must break both symmetries.

As for the axial currents, the non-analytic corrections to the baryon masses are not the whole story, however. Bernard et al. (1993b) have reexamined the issue by including pion- and kaon-nucleon sigma terms in their analysis. In her calculation, Jenkins (1992a) had included the decuplet contributions to the baryon masses to leading order in  $\Delta$  and found a consistent picture, albeit for rather small values of  $f$  and  $d$ . Although taking into account all orders in  $\Delta$  does not change the picture drastically, Bernard et al. (1993b) argue that the small values of  $f$  and  $d$  in the fit of Jenkins (1992a) indicate that other contributions to the masses of  $O(p^4)$  and higher are not negligible. Chiral corrections for baryon masses have also been calculated by Mallik (1994) and by Banerjee and Milana (1994).

Recently, Lebed and Luty (1994) have considered corrections of  $O(m_s^2)$  and  $O(e^2)$  to the baryon masses. As discussed in Sect. 3.3, a calculation of baryon mass differences to  $O(m_q^{3/2})$  leads to the value (3.35) for the quark mass ratio  $R$ . In principle, terms of  $O(e^2 p^0)$  in the meson-baryon Lagrangian of the form (Lebed and Luty, 1994)

$$\mathcal{L}_{B(e^2 p^0)} = d_1 \frac{e^2 \Lambda_\chi}{(4\pi)^2} \langle \bar{B} Q_+^2 B \rangle + d_2 \frac{e^2 \Lambda_\chi}{(4\pi)^2} \langle \bar{B} B Q_+^2 \rangle + \dots \quad (7.75)$$

$$Q_+ = \frac{1}{2}(uQu^\dagger + u^\dagger Qu), \quad \Lambda_\chi \simeq 1 \text{ GeV}$$

induce a shift in the value of  $R$ . An estimate of  $d_1, d_2$  is necessary for a more quantitative statement. Lebed and Luty (1994) also show that there are no local contributions of  $O(e^2)$  and  $O(m_q^2)$  to the Coleman–Glashow relation (Coleman and Glashow, 1961):

$$\Delta_{CG} := \Sigma^+ - \Sigma^- + n - p + \Xi^- - \Xi^0 = O(\hat{m}m_s^2) + O(e^2 m_s). \quad (7.76)$$

The particle names denote the corresponding masses and the corrections refer to local contributions from LECs only. Loop diagrams give calculable contributions to  $\Delta_{CG}$  of  $O[(m_u - m_d)m_s]$ . Including decuplet intermediate states in the loops (there is again a substantial cancellation between octet and decuplet contributions), Lebed and Luty (1994) obtain from the loops  $\Delta_{CG}^{(\text{theory})} = 0.2 \pm 0.7 \text{ MeV}$ , in agreement with the experimental value  $\Delta_{CG}^{(\text{exp})} = -0.3 \pm 0.6 \text{ MeV}$ . On the other hand, the loop corrections to the  $\Sigma$  equal-spacing rule (Coleman and Glashow, 1961)

$$\Delta_\Sigma := \Sigma^+ - \Sigma^0 - (\Sigma^0 - \Sigma^-) = 0 \quad (7.77)$$

are of  $O(\hat{m}^2)$  and numerically negligible compared to the experimental value  $\Delta_\Sigma = 1.7 \pm 0.2 \text{ MeV}$ . Here, local terms of  $O(e^2)$  contribute and give at least the right order of magnitude.

A CHPT analysis of baryon magnetic moments was performed by Jenkins et al. (1993a). Seven of the octet moments and the transition moment  $\Sigma^0 \rightarrow \Lambda \gamma$  have been measured. To lowest order,  $O(p^2)$ , those moments depend on two couplings  $\mu_d, \mu_f$ . Without the large- $N_c$  relation (7.74), there are six linear relations among the measured moments (Coleman and Glashow, 1961). Altogether, they are not too well satisfied. The leading corrections of  $O(p^3)$  contain non-analytic corrections of  $O(m_q^{1/2})$  for the moments. Including again the decuplet contributions, one obtains three linear relations independent of the coupling constants (Jenkins et al., 1993a), first written down by Caldi and Pagels (1974) (the experimental values are in units of nuclear magnetons):

$$\begin{aligned} 2.42 \pm 0.05 &= \mu_{\Sigma^+} = -2\mu_{\Lambda} - \mu_{\Sigma^-} &= 2.39 \pm 0.03 \\ -3.81 \pm 0.01 &= \mu_{\Xi^0} + \mu_{\Xi^-} + \mu_n = 2\mu_{\Lambda} - \mu_p &= -4.02 \pm 0.01 \\ -3.40 \pm 0.14 &= \mu_{\Lambda} - \sqrt{3} \mu_{\Lambda\Sigma^0} = \mu_{\Xi^0} + \mu_n &= -3.16 \pm 0.01 . \end{aligned} \quad (7.78)$$

These relations are in good agreement with experiment and they work much better than the tree-level relations. The remaining three relations depend on the axial meson-baryon couplings. There is no cancellation between octet and decuplet contributions in this case and the three additional relations are not fulfilled experimentally. The baryon magnetic moments are a rather clean case where the leading non-analytic chiral corrections are not sufficient to describe all the data. The static electromagnetic moments of the decuplet have also been computed in CHPT (Butler et al., 1994).

The kaon-nucleon scattering lengths have recently been calculated by various groups (Lee et al., 1994a, 1994b; Savage, 1994). The off-shell  $KN$  scattering amplitude is of interest for kaonic atoms and kaon condensation in dense nuclear matter (e.g., Brown et al., 1994; Lee et al., 1994c).

The nonleptonic weak decays of hyperons are another interesting area of application for CHPT with three light flavours. Both the non-radiative decays  $B_i \rightarrow B_f \pi$  and the radiative decays  $B_i \rightarrow B_f \gamma$  have been studied in the CHPT framework.

The seven measurable nonleptonic hyperon decays  $B_i \rightarrow B_f \pi$  are described by matrix elements

$$M(B_i \rightarrow B_f \pi) = G_F M_{\pi^+}^2 \bar{u}_f (S_{if} + P_{if} \gamma_5) u_i \quad (7.79)$$

with  $S$  ( $P$ )-wave amplitudes  $S_{if}$  ( $P_{if}$ ). Neglecting the 27-plet part of the nonleptonic weak Hamiltonian (2.21), the lowest-order  $|\Delta S| = 1$  Lagrangian bilinear in the baryon fields contains two terms (Georgi, 1984; Manohar and Georgi, 1984):

$$\mathcal{L}_{B,0}^{|\Delta S|=1} = w_+ \langle \bar{B} \{ u \lambda u^\dagger, B \} \rangle + w_- \langle \bar{B} [ u \lambda u^\dagger, B ] \rangle + \text{h.c.} , \quad \lambda = \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_6 - i \lambda_7) . \quad (7.80)$$

There are three isospin relations among the amplitudes  $S$ ,  $P$  and thus four independent amplitudes (separately for  $S$  and  $P$ ). The  $S$ -wave amplitudes of lowest order are tree-level amplitudes from (7.80). Eliminating the couplings  $w_+, w_-$  in the four independent  $S$ -waves leads to  $S(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow n \pi^+) = 0$  and to the Lee-Sugawara relation (Lee, 1964; Sugawara, 1964)

$$S(\Lambda \rightarrow p \pi^-) + 2S(\Xi^- \rightarrow \Lambda \pi^-) + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} S(\Sigma^- \rightarrow n \pi^-) = 0 . \quad (7.81)$$

Both relations agree reasonably well with experiment. The  $P$ -wave amplitudes are given by pole diagrams to lowest order and involve in addition to  $w_+, w_-$  the strong meson-baryon couplings  $f, d$  in (2.37) and octet baryon mass differences. It is a long-standing problem that the  $P$ -waves disagree strongly with experiment if one uses the values of  $w_+, w_-$  extracted from the  $S$ -waves (Georgi, 1984; Manohar and Georgi, 1984).

The leading non-analytic corrections to these amplitudes were calculated by Jenkins (1992d) within HBCHPT including the decuplet contributions. For the  $S$ -wave amplitudes, the decuplet contributions are bigger than the octet ones in all cases and the results are in good agreement with experiment. Looking more closely, one finds that the experimentally observed deviation from the Lee–Sugawara relation (7.81) seems to require a big decuplet contribution because the octet part alone gives the wrong sign. The situation is less obvious for  $S(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow n\pi^+)$ , but the amplitude is small anyway.

The non-analytic corrections do not improve the situation for the  $P$ -waves. Since the tree-level amplitudes consist in all seven cases of two terms that interfere destructively, the one-loop corrections are of the same magnitude as the leading terms (Jenkins, 1992d). In addition to the non-analytic corrections of  $O(m_s \ln m_s)$ , the terms of  $O(m_s)$  coming from both loops and counterterms must be taken into account. There are eight possible terms of  $O(p)$  with unknown LECs (Neufeld, 1993). To get an idea of the order of magnitude of those LECs, Neufeld employed the “weak deformation model” (Ecker et al., 1990a) mentioned in Sect. 4.2. He finds that the resulting contributions to the  $S$ -wave amplitudes are about 30% of the measured values, but of the same size as the experimental values for the  $P$ -waves. Without progress towards understanding the LECs of  $O(p)$ , the amplitudes  $P_{if}$  are not predictable in CHPT.

The weak radiative baryon decays  $B_i(p_i) \rightarrow B_f(p_f) + \gamma(q)$  are described by matrix elements

$$M(B_i \rightarrow B_f \gamma) = i \bar{u}(p_f) \sigma^{\mu\nu} (A_{if} + B_{if} \gamma_5) u(p_i) \varepsilon_\mu^*(q) q_\nu \quad (7.82)$$

with parity conserving (violating) amplitudes  $A_{if}$  ( $B_{if}$ ). They were calculated by Neufeld (1993) in the relativistic formulation and by Jenkins et al. (1993c) in HBCHPT to one-loop accuracy. All loop amplitudes turn out to be finite. However, at the same order in the chiral expansion, there are a number of local couplings of  $O(p^2)$ . From the most general such Lagrangian, one finds two relations for  $A_{if}$  and five relations for  $B_{if}$  that had been derived before under stronger assumptions (Hara, 1964; Lo, 1965).

There are six measurable radiative decays, five of which have been observed:  $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ ,  $\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$ ,  $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Sigma^-\gamma$ ,  $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$  and  $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$ . In addition to the decay rates, the asymmetry parameter

$$\alpha = \frac{2 \operatorname{Re}(AB^*)}{|A|^2 + |B|^2} \quad (7.83)$$

has been measured for  $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ ,  $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$  and  $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$ . The one-loop diagrams for the radiative decay amplitudes contain vertices that describe the previously discussed non-radiative decays at tree level. The parity violating amplitudes  $B_{if}$  are related to the  $S$ -wave amplitudes  $S_{if}$ , while the parity conserving  $A_{if}$  are sensitive to  $P_{if}$ . Since the tree-level amplitudes for  $P_{if}$  are nowhere near the data, it clearly does not make much sense to use the corresponding vertices to calculate the  $A_{if}$  at the one-loop level. Therefore, the following strategy was employed (Neufeld, 1993; Jenkins et al., 1993c): calculate  $B_{if}^{(\text{loop})}$  with the couplings  $w_+, w_-$  in (7.80), but use the measured  $P$ -waves  $P_{if}$  for the calculation of  $\Im m A_{if}^{(\text{loop})}$ . Leaving  $\Re e A_{if}$  and  $B_{if}^{(\text{counter})}$  as free parameters, one can establish allowed domains for the rates and asymmetry parameters.

For  $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Sigma^0\gamma$  and  $\Xi^0 \rightarrow \Lambda\gamma$ , the theoretical constraints are compatible with experiment. On the other hand, even such a general analysis cannot explain the data for  $\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma$ : the asymmetry parameter  $\alpha$  is constrained in theory to be small while experiments find  $\alpha = -0.76 \pm 0.08$  (Review Part. Prop., 1994). It turns out that the unambiguously calculable absorptive parts are much smaller than the experimental amplitudes so that the most important contributions must come from other than the one-loop diagrams. It has been suggested [cf. Neufeld (1993) and Jenkins et al. (1993c) for the relevant literature] that  $\frac{1}{2}^-$  intermediate hyperon states are mostly responsible

for  $B(\Sigma^+ \rightarrow p\gamma)$ . Finally, predictions can be made for the asymmetry parameters in the decays  $\Xi^- \rightarrow \Sigma^- \gamma$ ,  $\Lambda \rightarrow n\gamma$ . For an update of those predictions, taking into account new experimental information, I refer to a forthcoming article by Neufeld (1995).

## Acknowledgements

For general instruction and helpful comments and/or for providing me with partly unpublished material including some of the figures, I am especially grateful to V. Bernard, J. Bijnens, G. Colangelo, G. D'Ambrosio, J. Gasser, G. Höhler, G. Isidori, J. Kambor, H. Leutwyler, U.-G. Meißner, A.M. Nathan, H. Neufeld, A. Pich, E. de Rafael, M. Sainio, J. Stern and T. Walcher. I am also indebted to M. Moiziš for checking some of the calculations in Sect. 7.3. Finally, I want to thank N. Kaiser, U.-G. Meißner, M. Moiziš and H. Neufeld for suggesting improvements of the manuscript.

## References

- Adami, C., E.G. Drukarev and B.L. Ioffe (1993). *Phys. Rev.*, **D48**, 2304.
- Adler, S.L. (1969a). *Phys. Rev.*, **177**, 2426.
- Adler, S.L. and W.A. Bardeen (1969b). *Phys. Rev.*, **182**, 1517.
- Akagi, T. et al. (KEK-137) (1991). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **67**, 2618.
- Akhouri, R. and A. Alfakih (1991). *Ann. Phys.*, **210**, 81.
- Alkofer, R., H. Reinhardt and H. Weigel (1994). Baryons as chiral solitons in the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model. Preprint UNITU-THEP-25/1994; hep-ph/9501213.
- Altmeyer, R., K.D. Born, M. Göckeler, R. Horsley, E. Laermann and G. Schierholz (1993). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B389**, 445.
- Ametller, L., J. Bijnens, A. Bramon and F. Cornet (1992). *Phys. Lett.*, **B276**, 185.
- Ametller, L., J. Bijnens, A. Bramon and F. Cornet (1993). *Phys. Lett.*, **B303**, 140.
- Anderson, J. and M.A. Luty (1993). *Phys. Rev.*, **D47**, 4975.
- Anisovich, A.V. (1993). Dispersion relation technique for three-pion system and the  $P$ -wave interaction in  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi$  decay. Preprint Gatchina TH-62-1993/1931.
- Artuso, M. et al. (1992). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **69**, 3278.
- de Baenst, P. (1970). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B24**, 633.
- Balaban, T. (1987). *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **109**, 249.
- Balaban, T. (1988). *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **119**, 243.
- Balaban, T. (1989). *Comm. Math. Phys.*, **122**, 175, 355.
- Baldin, A.M. (1960). *Nucl. Phys.*, **18**, 318.
- Baldini, R. and S. Bellucci (1994). Pion, kaon and Sigma polarizabilities. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).

- Ball, R.D. (1989). *Phys. Reports*, **182**, 1.
- Banerjee, M.K. and J. Milana (1994). Baryon mass splittings in chiral perturbation theory. Preprint UMPP 95-058; hep-ph/9410398.
- Bardeen, W.A. (1969). *Phys. Rev.*, **184**, 1848.
- Bardeen, W.A., J. Bijnens and J.-M. Gérard (1989). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **62**, 1343.
- Barr, G.D. et al. (NA31 Coll.) (1990). *Phys. Lett.*, **B242**, 523.
- Barr, G.D. et al. (NA31 Coll.) (1992). *Phys. Lett.*, **B284**, 440.
- Battiston, R., D. Cocolicchio, G.L. Fogli and N. Paver (1992). Status and perspectives of  $K$  decay physics. *Phys. Reports*, **214**, 293.
- Beck, R. et al. (1990). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **65**, 1841.
- Bélanger, G. and C.Q. Geng (1991). *Phys. Rev.*, **D43**, 140.
- Bell, J.S. and R. Jackiw (1969). *Nuovo Cim.*, **60A**, 47.
- Bellucci, S., J. Gasser and M.E. Sainio (1994). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B423**, 80.
- Bergström, L., E. Massó and P. Singer (1983). *Phys. Lett.*, **131B**, 229.
- Bergström, L., E. Massó and P. Singer (1990). *Phys. Lett.*, **B249**, 141.
- Beringer, J. (1993).  *$\pi N$  Newsletter*, **7**, 33.
- Bernard, C., T. Draper, A. Soni, H. Politzer and M. Wise (1985). *Phys. Rev.*, **D32**, 2343.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1991a). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **67**, 1515.
- Bernard, V., J. Gasser, N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1991b). *Phys. Lett.*, **B268**, 291.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1992a). *Phys. Lett.*, **B282**, 448.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1992b). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B373**, 346.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1992c). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B383**, 442.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1992d).  *$\pi N$  Newsletter*, **7**, 62.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1992e). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **69**, 1877.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser, J. Kambor and U.-G. Meißner (1992f). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B388**, 315.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser, J. Kambor and U.-G. Meißner (1992g). *Phys. Rev.*, **D46**, 2756.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser, T.S.H. Lee and U.-G. Meißner (1993a). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **70**, 387.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1993b). *Z. Phys.*, **C60**, 111.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1993c). *Phys. Lett.*, **B309**, 421.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser, U.-G. Meißner and A. Schmidt (1993d). *Phys. Lett.*, **B319**, 269.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1994a). *Phys. Lett.*, **B331**, 137.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1994b). *Phys. Lett.*, **B332**, 415.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1994c). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **72**, 2810.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser, U.-G. Meißner and A. Schmidt (1994d). *Z. Phys.*, **A348**, 317.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser, T.S.H. Lee and U.-G. Meißner (1994e). *Phys. Reports*, **246**, 315.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser, U.-G. Meißner and A. Schmidt (1994f). Threshold two-pion photo- and electroproduction: more neutrals than expected. Preprint CRN-94-14; nucl-th/9403013.
- Bernard, V. (1994g). Threshold pion photo- and electroproduction in chiral perturbation theory. Preprint CRN 94/45; hep-ph/9408323. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1994h). Neutral pion photoproduction off nucleons revisited. Preprint CRN-94-62; hep-ph/9411287.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1994i). Novel pion electroproduction low-energy theorems. Preprint CRN 94-66, TK 94 19; hep-ph/9412282.
- Bernard, V., N. Kaiser and U.-G. Meißner (1995). Chiral symmetry in nuclear physics.

In preparation.

Bernstein, A. and B.R. Holstein, eds. (1995). *Proc. of the MIT Workshop on Chiral Dynamics*,

Cambridge, July 1994. Springer, Heidelberg.

Bijnens, J. and F. Cornet (1988a). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B296**, 557.

Bijnens, J., A. Bramon and F. Cornet (1988b). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **61**, 1453.

Bijnens, J. (1990a). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B337**, 635.

Bijnens, J., A. Bramon and F. Cornet (1990b). *Z. Phys.*, **C46**, 599; *Phys. Lett.*, **B237**, 488.

Bijnens, J. (1991). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B367**, 709.

Bijnens, J., G. Ecker and A. Pich (1992). *Phys. Lett.*, **B286**, 341.

Bijnens, J. (1993a). Chiral perturbation theory and anomalous processes. *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, **A8**, 3045.

Bijnens, J., G. Ecker and J. Gasser (1993b). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B396**, 81.

Bijnens, J. (1993c). *Phys. Lett.*, **B306**, 343.

Bijnens, J., G. Colangelo and J. Gasser (1994a).  $K_{l4}$  decays beyond one loop. Preprint BUTP-94/4;

hep-ph/9403390. *Nucl. Phys. B*, in print.

Bijnens, J. (1994b). Introduction to extended Nambu–Jona-Lasinio models. Preprint NORDITA-94/27 N,P; hep-ph/9406425. In: Maiani et al. (1995).

Bijnens, J., J. Prades and E. de Rafael (1994c). Light quark masses in QCD. Preprint CPT-94/PE.3097, NORDITA-94/62 N,P ; hep-ph/9411285.

Bijnens, J., G. Colangelo, G. Ecker and J. Gasser (1994d). Semileptonic kaon decays. hep-ph/9411311. In: Maiani et al. (1995).

Bijnens, J., G. Ecker and J. Gasser (1994e). Chiral perturbation theory. hep-ph/9411232. In: Maiani et al. (1995).

Binon, F. et al. (1982). *Nuovo Cim.*, **71A**, 497; *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.*, **36**, 391.

Blaser, S. (1994).  $K_{e5}$  decays in chiral perturbation theory. hep-ph/9410368.

Blomqvist, I. et al. (MAMI A1–Coll.) (1995). In preparation.

Bramon, A. and E. Shabalin (1994). Standard Model predictions for weak decays of  $\eta$  mesons. Preprint UAB-FT-352/94; hep-ph/9411271. In: Maiani et al. (1995).

Brown, G.E., C.-H. Lee, M. Rho and V. Thorsson (1994). *Nucl. Phys.*, **A567**, 937.

Bruno, C. and J. Prades (1993). *Z. Phys.*, **C57**, 585.

Bürgi, U. (1993). Diploma Thesis, Univ. Bern.

Burkhardt, H. and J. Lowe (1991). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **67**, 2622.

Butler, M.N. and M.J. Savage (1992). *Phys. Lett.*, **B294**, 369.

Butler, M.N., M.J. Savage and R.P. Springer (1994). *Phys. Rev.*, **D49**, 3459.

Caldi, D.G. and H. Pagels (1974). *Phys. Rev.*, **D10**, 3739.

Callan, C.G., S. Coleman, J. Wess and B. Zumino (1969). *Phys. Rev.*, **177**, 2247.

Callan, C.G., R.F. Dashen and D.J. Gross (1976). *Phys. Lett.*, **36B**, 334.

Cappiello, L. and G. D’Ambrosio (1988). *Nuovo Cim.*, **99A**, 153.

Cappiello, L., G. D’Ambrosio and M. Miragliuolo (1993). *Phys. Lett.*, **B298**, 423.

Cheng, T.P. (1967). *Phys. Rev.*, **162**, 1734.

Cheng, T.P. and R. Dashen (1971). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **26**, 594.

Cheng, H.-Y. (1990). *Phys. Rev.*, **D42**, 72.

Chetyrkin, K.G., C.A. Dominguez, D. Pirjol and K. Schilcher (1994). Mass singularities in light

quark correlators: the strange quark case. Preprint MZ-TH/94-21; hep-ph/9409371.

Chivukula, R.S., M.J. Dugan and M. Golden (1993). *Phys. Rev.*, **D47**, 2930.

- Choi, K. (1992). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B383**, 58; *Phys. Lett.*, **B292**, 159.
- Cohen, A.G., G. Ecker and A. Pich (1993). *Phys. Lett.*, **B304**, 347.
- Colangelo, G. (1994). Doctorate Thesis, Universita di Roma II.
- Coleman, S. and S.L. Glashow (1961). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **6**, 423.
- Coleman, S., J. Wess and B. Zumino (1969). *Phys. Rev.*, **177**, 2239.
- Crewther, R.J. (1977). *Phys. Lett.*, **70B**, 349.
- Crewther, R.J. (1986). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B264**, 277.
- Cronin, J.A. (1967). *Phys. Rev.*, **161**, 1483.
- Czapek, G. et al. (1992). Letter of intent: Lifetime measurement of  $\pi^+\pi^-$  atoms to test low-energy QCD predictions. Preprint CERN-SPSLC-92-44.
- Damashek, M. and F.J. Gilman (1970). *Phys. Rev.*, **D1**, 1319.
- D'Ambrosio, G. and D. Espriu (1986). *Phys. Lett.*, **B175**, 237.
- D'Ambrosio, G., G. Ecker, G. Isidori and H. Neufeld (1994). Radiative nonleptonic kaon decays. Preprint CERN-TH.7503/94; hep-ph/9411439. In: Maiani et al. (1995).
- Daniel, D., R. Gupta, G.W. Kilcup, A. Patel and S.R. Sharpe (1992). *Phys. Rev.*, **D46**, 3130.
- Das, T. et al. (1967). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **18**, 759.
- Dashen, R. (1969). *Phys. Rev.*, **183**, 1245.
- Dashen, R. and A.V. Manohar (1993). *Phys. Lett.*, **B315**, 425, 438.
- Dashen, R., E. Jenkins and A.V. Manohar (1994a). *Phys. Rev.*, **D49**, 4713.
- Dashen, R., E. Jenkins and A.V. Manohar (1994b). Spin-flavor structure of large  $N_c$  baryons. Preprint PUPT-1505; hep-ph/9411234.
- Dentin, S. (1990). Doctorate Thesis, Univ. Marseille II.
- Devlin, T.J. and J.O. Dickey (1979). *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **51**, 237.
- D'Hoker, E. and S. Weinberg (1994). General effective actions. Preprint UCLA/94/TEP/25, UTTG-12-94; hep-ph/9409402. *Phys. Rev. D*, in print.
- Distler, M. (1995). Doctorate Thesis, Univ. Mainz.
- Dobado, A. and J.R. Peláez (1993). *Z. Phys.*, **C57**, 501.
- Dominguez, C.A. and E. de Rafael (1986). *Ann. Phys.*, **174**, 372.
- Dominguez, C.A., C. Van Gend and N. Paver (1991). *Phys. Lett.*, **B253**, 241.
- Donoghue, J.F., B.R. Holstein and Y.C. Lin (1988). *Phys. Rev.*, **D37**, 2423.
- Donoghue, J.F., C. Ramirez and G. Valencia (1989a). *Phys. Rev.*, **D39**, 1947.
- Donoghue, J.F. and D. Wyler (1989b). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B316**, 289.
- Donoghue, J.F., J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler (1990). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B343**, 341.
- Donoghue, J.F. (1991). Introduction to non-linear field theory. In: Meißner (1992).
- Donoghue, J.F., E. Golowich and B.R. Holstein (1992a). *Dynamics of the Standard Model*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- Donoghue, J.F. and D. Wyler (1992b). *Phys. Rev.*, **D45**, 892.
- Donoghue, J.F. and B.R. Holstein (1993a). *Phys. Rev.*, **D48**, 137.
- Donoghue, J.F., B.R. Holstein and D. Wyler (1993b). *Phys. Rev.*, **D47**, 2089.
- Dykstra, H., J.M. Flynn and L. Randall (1991). *Phys. Lett.*, **B270**, 45.
- Ecker, G., A. Pich and E. de Rafael (1987a). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B291**, 692.
- Ecker, G., A. Pich and E. de Rafael (1987b). *Phys. Lett.*, **B189**, 363.
- Ecker, G., A. Pich and E. de Rafael (1988). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B303**, 665.
- Ecker, G., J. Gasser, A. Pich and E. de Rafael (1989a). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B321**, 311.
- Ecker, G., J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler, A. Pich and E. de Rafael (1989b). *Phys. Lett.*, **B223**, 425.
- Ecker, G. (1989c). *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)*, **7A**, 78.



- Ecker, G. (1989d). Vector mesons and chiral symmetry. In: *Proc. of the 12<sup>th</sup> Warsaw Symposium on Elementary Particle Physics*, Kazimierz (Z. Ajduk et al., eds.). World Scientific, Singapore.
- Ecker, G., A. Pich and E. de Rafael (1990a). *Phys. Lett.*, **B237**, 481.
- Ecker, G. (1990b). Geometrical aspects of the nonleptonic weak interactions of mesons. In: *Proc. of the 9<sup>th</sup> Int. Conference on the Problems of Quantum Field Theory*, Dubna (M.K. Volkov, ed.). Dubna.
- Ecker, G. and A. Pich (1991). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B366**, 189.
- Ecker, G., H. Neufeld and A. Pich (1992). *Phys. Lett.*, **B278**, 337.
- Ecker, G. (1993a). Chiral perturbation theory. In: *Quantitative Particle Physics: Cargèse 1992* (M. Lévy et al., eds.). Plenum Press, New York.
- Ecker, G., J. Kambor and D. Wyler (1993b). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B394**, 101.
- Ecker, G. (1994a). The Standard Model at low energies. *Czech. J. Phys.*, **44**, 405.
- Ecker, G., H. Neufeld and A. Pich (1994b). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B413**, 321.
- Ecker, G. (1994c). *Phys. Lett.*, **B336**, 508.
- Ecker, G. and U.-G. Meißner (1994d). What is a low-energy theorem ? Preprint CRN-94/52, UWThPh-1994-33; hep-ph/9409442. *Comments Nucl. Part. Phys.*, in print.
- Ecker, G., A. Pich and E. de Rafael (1995). Chiral perturbation theory and rare kaon decays. In preparation.
- Eletsky, V.L. and B.L. Ioffe (1993). *Phys. Rev.*, **D48**, 1441.
- Esposito-Farèse, G. (1991). *Z. Phys.*, **C50**, 255.
- Espriu, D., E. de Rafael and J. Taron (1990). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B345**, 22; Err. *ibid.*, **B355**, 278.
- Euler, H. (1936). *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)*, **26**, 398.
- Fearing, H.W. and S. Scherer (1994). Extension of the chiral perturbation theory meson Lagrangian to order  $p^6$ . Preprint TRI-PP-94-68; hep-ph/9408346.
- Fradkin, E. (1991). *Field Theories of Condensed Matter Systems*. Frontiers in Physics, Vol. 82. Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Fuchs, N.H., H. Sazdjian and J. Stern (1991). *Phys. Lett.*, **B269**, 183.
- Fukugita, M., N. Ishizuka, H. Mino, M. Okawa and A. Ukawa (1993). *Phys. Rev.*, **D47**, 4739.
- Funck, R. and J. Kambor (1993). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B396**, 53.
- Gaillard, M.K. and B.W. Lee (1974). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **33**, 108.
- Gasser, J. (1981). *Ann. Phys.*, **136**, 62.
- Gasser, J. and H. Leutwyler (1982). *Phys. Reports*, **87C**, 77.
- Gasser, J. and H. Leutwyler (1983). *Phys. Lett.*, **125B**, 325.
- Gasser, J. and H. Leutwyler (1984). *Ann. Phys.*, **158**, 142.
- Gasser, J. and H. Leutwyler (1985a). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B250**, 465.
- Gasser, J. and H. Leutwyler (1985b). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B250**, 517.
- Gasser, J. and H. Leutwyler (1985c). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B250**, 539.
- Gasser, J., M.E. Sainio and A. Švarc (1988). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B307**, 779.
- Gasser, J. (1990). The QCD vacuum and chiral symmetry. In: *Hadrons and Hadronic Matter* (D. Vautherin et al., eds.). Plenum Press, New York.
- Gasser, J. and U.-G. Meißner (1991a). *Phys. Lett.*, **B258**, 219.
- Gasser, J. and U.-G. Meißner (1991b). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B357**, 90.
- Gasser, J., H. Leutwyler and M. Sainio (1991c). *Phys. Lett.*, **B253**, 252, 260.

- Gasser, J. (1994a). The  $\pi\pi$  scattering amplitude in chiral perturbation theory. In: Maiani et al. (1995).
- Gasser, J. (1994b). Low-energy photon-photon collisions to two-loop order. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Gell-Mann, M. (1957). *Phys. Rev.*, **106**, 1296.
- Gell-Mann, M. and M. Lévy (1960). *Nuovo Cim.*, **16**, 705.
- Gell-Mann, M., R.J. Oakes and B. Renner (1968). *Phys. Rev.*, **175**, 2195.
- Georgi, H. (1984). *Weak Interactions and Modern Particle Theory*. Benjamin/Cummings, Menlo Park.
- Georgi, H. (1990). *Phys. Lett.*, **B240**, 447.
- Georgi, H. (1994). Effective field theory. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Science*, **43**, 209.
- Gilman, F.J. and M.B. Wise (1979). *Phys. Rev.*, **D20**, 2392.
- Glashow, S.L. (1961). *Nucl. Phys.*, **22**, 579.
- Goity, J.L. (1987). *Z. Phys.*, **C34**, 341.
- Goldberger, M. and S.B. Treiman (1958). *Phys. Rev.*, **110**, 1178.
- Goldstone, J. (1961). *Nuovo Cim.*, **19**, 154.
- Golowich, E. and J. Kambor (1995). Two-loop analysis of vector current propagators in chiral perturbation theory. Preprint UMHEP-414; hep-ph/9501318.
- Hara, Y. (1964). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **12**, 378.
- Hatsuda, T. and T. Kunihiro (1994). QCD phenomenology based on a chiral effective Lagrangian. *Phys. Reports*, **247**, 221.
- Heinson, A.P. et al. (BNL-E791) (1991). *Phys. Rev.*, **D44**, R1.
- Heisenberg, W. and H. Euler (1936). *Z. Phys.*, **98**, 714.
- 't Hooft, G. (1976). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **37**, 8.
- Höhler, G. (1983). Pion-nucleon scattering. *Landolt-Börnstein* (H. Schopper, ed.), Vol. **I/9b**. Springer, Heidelberg.
- Höhler, G. (1994). Tests of predictions from chiral perturbation theory for  $\pi N$  scattering. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Isidori, G. and A. Pugliese (1992). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B385**, 437.
- Issler, D. (1989). Nonrenormalization of the chiral anomaly in chiral perturbation theory. Preprint SLAC-PUB-4943, unpublished.
- Jaffe, R.L. and A.V. Manohar (1990). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B337**, 509.
- Jamin, M. and M. Münz (1994). The strange quark mass from QCD sum rules. Preprint CERN-TH.7435/94, TUM-T31-78/94; hep-ph/9409335.
- Jenkins, E. and A.V. Manohar (1991a). *Phys. Lett.*, **B255**, 558.
- Jenkins, E. and A.V. Manohar (1991b). *Phys. Lett.*, **B259**, 353.
- Jenkins, E. (1992a). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B368**, 190.
- Jenkins, E. and A.V. Manohar (1992b). *Phys. Lett.*, **B281**, 336.
- Jenkins, E. and A.V. Manohar (1992c). Baryon chiral perturbation theory. In: Meißner (1992).
- Jenkins, E. (1992d). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B375**, 561.
- Jenkins, E., M. Luke, A.V. Manohar and M.J. Savage (1993a). *Phys. Lett.*, **B302**, 482.
- Jenkins, E. (1993b). *Phys. Lett.*, **B315**, 431, 441, 447.
- Jenkins, E., M. Luke, A.V. Manohar and M.J. Savage (1993c). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B397**, 84.
- Jenkins, E. and A.V. Manohar (1994). Baryon magnetic moments in the  $1/N_c$  expansion.

Preprint UCSD-PTH-94-10; hep-ph/9405431.

Kambor, J., J. Missimer and D. Wyler (1990). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B346**, 17.

Kambor, J., J. Missimer and D. Wyler (1991). *Phys. Lett.*, **B261**, 496.

Kambor, J., J.F. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein, J. Missimer and D. Wyler (1992). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **68**, 1818.

Kambor, J. and B.R. Holstein (1994a). *Phys. Rev.*, **D49**, 2346.

Kambor, J., C. Wiesendanger and D. Wyler (1994b). Final state interactions and Khuri-Treiman equations in  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi$  decays. Preprint ZU-TH 41/94, IPNO/TH 94-93.

Kaplan, D. and A.V. Manohar (1986). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **56**, 1994.

Kessler, R.S. et al. (1993). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **70**, 892.

Knecht, M., H. Sazdjian, J. Stern and N.H. Fuchs (1993). *Phys. Lett.*, **B313**, 229.

Knecht, M., B. Moussallam and J. Stern (1994a). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B429**, 125.

Knecht, M. and J. Stern (1994b). Generalized chiral perturbation theory. Preprint IPNO/TH 94-53; hep-ph/9411253. In: Maiani et al. (1995).

Knecht, M., B. Moussallam and J. Stern (1994c). The  $\pi\pi$  amplitude in generalized chiral perturbation theory. Preprint IPNO/TH 94-54; hep-ph/9411259. In: Maiani et al. (1995).

Ko, P. (1992). *Phys. Rev.*, **D45**, 174.

Ko, P. (1993a). *Phys. Rev.*, **D47**, 3933.

Ko, P. (1993b). Some rare decays of  $\eta$  meson at the Saturne facility. Preprint UMN-TH-1133/93, TPI-MINN-93/25-T.

Koch, R. (1982). *Z. Phys.*, **C15**, 161.

Koch, R. (1986). *Nucl. Phys.*, **A448**, 707.

van Kolck, U. (1994). *Phys. Rev.*, **C49**, 2932.

Krause, A. (1990). *Helvetica Phys. Acta*, **63**, 3.

LATTICE 93 (1994). *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)*, **34**.

Lebed, R.F. and M.A. Luty (1994). *Phys. Lett.*, **B329**, 479.

Lee, B.W. (1964). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **12**, 83.

Lee, C.-H., H. Jung, D.-P. Min and M. Rho (1994a). *Phys. Lett.*, **B326**, 14.

Lee, C.-H., G.E. Brown and M. Rho (1994b). Kaon condensation in “nuclear star” matter. Preprint SNUTP-94-28; hep-ph/9403339.

Lee, C.-H., G.E. Brown and M. Rho (1994c). An effective chiral Lagrangian approach to kaon-nuclear interactions: kaonic atom and kaon condensation. Preprint SNUTP-94-50; hep-ph/9406311.

Leurer, M. (1988). *Phys. Lett.*, **B201**, 128.

Leutwyler, H. and M. Roos (1984). *Z. Phys.*, **C25**, 91.

Leutwyler, H. (1990). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B337**, 108.

Leutwyler, H. (1991). Chiral effective Lagrangians. In: *Lecture Notes in Physics* (H. Mitter and H. Gausterer, eds.), Vol. 396. Springer, Berlin.

Leutwyler, H. (1993). Nonperturbative methods. In: *Proc. of the XXVI Int. Conference on High*

- Energy Physics*, Dallas (J.R. Sanford, ed.). American Inst. Phys., New York.
- Leutwyler, H. (1994a). *Ann. Phys.*, **235**, 165.
- Leutwyler, H. (1994b). *Phys. Rev.*, **D49**, 3033.
- Leutwyler, H. (1994c). Masses of the light quarks. Preprint BUTP-94/8; hep-ph/9405330.
- Leutwyler, H. (1994d). Principles of chiral perturbation theory. Lectures given at the *Workshop*
- Hadron 94*, Gramado, RS, Brasil. Univ. Bern preprint BUTP-94/13; hep-ph/9406283.
- Littenberg, L. and G. Valencia (1993). Rare and radiative kaon decays. *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.*, **43**, 729.
- Lo, S.Y. (1965). *Nuovo Cim.*, **37**, 753.
- Luty, M.A. and R. Sundrum (1993a). *Phys. Lett.*, **B312**, 205.
- Luty, M.A. and M. White (1993b). *Phys. Lett.*, **B319**, 261.
- Luty, M.A., J. March-Russell and M. White (1994). Baryon magnetic moments in a simultaneous expansion in  $1/N$  and  $m_s$ . Preprint LBL-35598; hep-ph/9405272.
- Lvov, A.I. (1993). *Phys. Lett.*, **B304**, 29.
- Maiani, L., G. Pancheri and N. Paver, eds. (1992). *The DAΦNE Physics Handbook*. INFN, Frascati.
- Maiani, L., G. Pancheri and N. Paver, eds. (1995). *The Second DAΦNE Physics Handbook*. INFN, Frascati.
- Mallik, S. (1994). Massive states in chiral perturbation theory. Preprint Saha Inst.
- Mannel, T., W. Roberts and Z. Ryzak (1992). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B368**, 204.
- Manohar, A.V. and H. Georgi (1984). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B234**, 189.
- Manohar, A.V. (1994). Baryons in the large  $N$  limit. Preprint UCSD/PTH 94-01; hep-ph/9406209.
- Marsiske, H. et al. (Crystal Ball Coll.) (1990). *Phys. Rev.*, **D41**, 3324.
- Mazzucato, E. et al. (1986). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **57**, 3144.
- Meißner, U.-G., ed. (1992). Proc. of the *Workshop on Effective Field Theories of the Standard Model*, Dobogókő, Hungary, 1991. World Scientific, Singapore.
- Meißner, U.-G. (1993). Recent developments in chiral perturbation theory. *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, **56**, 903.
- Meißner, U.-G. (1994a). Aspects of nucleon chiral perturbation theory. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Meißner, U.-G. and B. Schoch (1994b). Threshold photo/electro pion production – Working Group summary. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Meißner, U.-G. (1994c). Baryon chiral perturbation theory a.d. 1994. Lectures given at the *Indian–Summer School on Electron Scattering off Nucleons and Nuclei*, Prague. Preprint TK 94 17; hep-ph/9411300.
- Miskimen, R. (1994). Study of the chiral anomaly in the  $\gamma\pi^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0$  reaction near threshold. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Moinester, M.A. (1994). Chiral anomaly tests. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Morgan, D. and M.R. Pennington (1991). *Phys. Lett.*, **B272**, 134.

- Moussallam, B. (1994). Chiral sum rules for  $\mathcal{L}_{(6)}^{WZ}$  parameters and application to  $\pi^0$ ,  $\eta$ ,  $\eta'$  decays.
- Preprint IPNO/TH 94-64; hep-ph/9407402.
- Myint, S. and C. Rebbi (1994). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B421**, 241.
- Nagels, M.M. et al. (1979). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B147**, 189.
- Nambu, Y. and G. Jona-Lasinio (1961). *Phys. Rev.*, **122**, 345; *ibid.*, **124**, 246.
- Nambu, Y. and D. Lurié (1962a). *Phys. Rev.*, **125**, 1429.
- Nambu, Y. and E. Shrauner (1962b). *Phys. Rev.*, **128**, 862.
- Narison, S. (1987). *Rivista del Nuovo Cimento*, **10**, 1.
- Narison, S. (1989). *Phys. Lett.*, **B216**, 191.
- Nathan, A.M. (1994). Nucleon polarizabilities. Preprint NPL-94-007. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Negele, J.W. (1995). Light hadron physics from the lattice. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Neufeld, H. (1993). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B402**, 166.
- Neufeld, H. and H. Rupertsberger (1994). Isospin breaking in chiral perturbation theory and the decays  $\eta \rightarrow \pi \ell \nu$  and  $\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu$ . Preprint UWThPh-1994-15.
- Okubo, S. (1962). *Prog. Theor. Phys.*, **27**, 949.
- Ordóñez, C., L. Ray and U. van Kolck (1994). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **72**, 1982.
- Pallante, E. and R. Petronzio (1993). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B396**, 205.
- Papadimitriou, V. et al. (E731 Coll.) (1991). *Phys. Rev.*, **D44**, 573.
- Park, T.-S., D.-P. Min and M. Rho (1993). Chiral dynamics and heavy-fermion formalism in nuclei: exchange axial currents. *Phys. Reports*, **233**, 341.
- Peccei, R.D. (1989). The strong  $CP$  problem. In: *CP Violation* (C. Jarlskog, ed.). World Scientific, Singapore.
- Pennington, M.R. (1992). Predictions for  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$  : what photons at DAΦNE will see. In: Maiani et al. (1992).
- Picciotto, C. and S. Richardson (1993). *Phys. Rev.*, **D48**, 3395.
- Pich, A. (1990).  $\eta$  decays and chiral Lagrangians, In: Proc. of the *Workshop on Rare Decays of Light Mesons*, Gif-sur-Yvette.
- Pich, A. and E. de Rafael (1991). *Nucl. Phys.*, **B358**, 311.
- Pich, A. (1993). Introduction to chiral perturbation theory. Lectures given at the *5th Mexican School of Particles and Fields*, Guanajuato, Mexico. Preprint CERN-TH.6978/93; hep-ph/9308351.
- Portolés, J. and M.R. Pennington (1994). Theoretical predictions for pion polarizabilities. Preprint DTP-94/52; hep-ph/9407295. In: Maiani et al. (1995).
- de Rafael, E. (1989). *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)*, **7A**, 1.
- de Rafael, E. (1995). Chiral Lagrangians and CP violation. TASI-Lectures 1994. In: *CP Violation and the Limits of the Standard Model* (J.F. Donoghue, ed.). World Scientific, Singapore. Preprint CPT-95/PE.3161.
- Review of Particle Properties (L. Montanet et al.) (1994). *Phys. Rev.*, **D50**, 1173.
- Riggenbach, C., J. Gasser, J.F. Donoghue and B.R. Holstein (1991). *Phys. Rev.*, **D43**, 127.
- Ritchie, J.L. and S.G. Wojcicki (1993). Rare  $K$  decays. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **65**, 1149.
- Rosset, L. et al. (1977). *Phys. Rev.*, **D15**, 574.

- Sainio, M. (1994). Pion–nucleon sigma term. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Salam, A. (1968). In: Proc. of the 8<sup>th</sup> *Nobel Symposium*, Aspenäs garden (N. Svartholm, ed.). Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm.
- Savage, M.J., M. Luke and M.B. Wise (1992). *Phys. Lett.*, B291, 481.
- Savage, M.J. (1994). *Phys. Lett.*, B331, 411.
- Schwinger, J. (1957). *Ann. Phys.*, 2, 407.
- Soldate, M. and R. Sundrum (1990). *Nucl. Phys.*, B340, 1.
- Steinberger, J. (1949). *Phys. Rev.*, 76, 1180.
- Stern, J., H. Sazdjian and N.H. Fuchs (1993). *Phys. Rev.*, D47, 3814.
- Stern, J., N.H. Fuchs and M. Knecht (1994). Light quark masses from exclusive  $\tau$  decays: an experimental proposal. In: Proc. of the *Third Workshop on the Tau–Charm Factory*, Marbella (J. Kirkby and R. Kirkby, eds.). Editions Frontières, Gif-sur-Yvette.
- Sugawara, H. (1964). *Progr. Theor. Phys.*, 31, 213.
- Sutherland, D.G. (1966). *Phys. Lett.*, 23, 384.
- Tomoza, Y. (1966). *Nuovo Cim.*, 46A, 707.
- Truong, T.N. (1988). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 61, 2526.
- Truong, T.N. (1991a). *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)*, 24A, 93.
- Truong, T.N. (1991b). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 67, 2260.
- Truong, T.N. (1993). *Phys. Lett.*, B313, 221.
- Urech, R. (1995). *Nucl. Phys.*, B433, 234.
- Vainshtein, A.I. and V.I. Zakharov (1970). *Yad. Fiz.*, 12, 610 [*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.*, 12, 333].
- Vainshtein, A.I. and V.I. Zakharov (1972). *Nucl. Phys.*, B36, 589.
- Volkov, M.K. (1993). Effective chiral Lagrangians and Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model. *Phys. Part. Nucl.*, 24, 35 [*Fiz. Elem. Chastits At. Yadra*, 24, 81].
- Walcher, T. (1994). Experiments at the electron accelerator MAMI. In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Weinberg, S. (1960). *Phys. Rev.*, 118, 838.
- Weinberg, S. (1966). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 17, 616.
- Weinberg, S. (1967). *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 19, 1264.
- Weinberg, S. (1977). In: *A Festschrift for I.I. Rabi* (L. Motz, ed.). New York Acad. of Sciences, New York.
- Weinberg, S. (1979). *Physica*, 96A, 327.
- Weinberg, S. (1990). *Phys. Lett.*, B251, 288.
- Weinberg, S. (1991). *Nucl. Phys.*, B363, 3.
- Weinberg, S. (1994). Strong interactions at low energies. Preprint UTTG-16-94; hep-ph/9412326.
- In: Bernstein and Holstein (1995).
- Weingarten, D. (1994). *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.)*, 34, 29.
- Wess, J. and B. Zumino (1971). *Phys. Lett.*, 37B, 95.
- Winstein, B. and L. Wolfenstein (1993). The search for direct  $CP$  violation. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 65, 1113.
- Witten, E. (1979). *Nucl. Phys.*, B160, 57.
- Witten, E. (1983). *Nucl. Phys.*, B223, 422.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501357v1>

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501357v1>



This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501357v1>

This figure "fig1-4.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501357v1>

This figure "fig1-5.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501357v1>

This figure "fig1-6.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9501357v1>