

# Interpreting $f_0(600)$ and $a_0(980)$ as $\bar{q}q$ states from an $N_f = 3$ Sigma Model with (Axial-)Vectors

Nordic Conference on Nuclear Physics, Stockholm, 13-17 June 2011

**Denis Parganlija**

Institute for Theoretical Physics, Goethe University, Max-von-Laue-Str. 1, D-60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

E-mail: parganlija@th.physik.uni-frankfurt.de

**Abstract.** We address the question whether it is possible to interpret the low-lying scalar mesons  $f_0(600)$  and  $a_0(980)$  as  $\bar{q}q$  states within a  $U(3) \times U(3)$  Linear Sigma Model containing vector and axial-vector degrees of freedom.

PACS numbers: 12.39.Fe, 12.40.Yx, 14.40.Be, 14.40.Df

*Keywords:* Chiral Lagrangians, Scalar Mesons, Quarkonium

## 1. Introduction

The structure of scalar mesons has been a matter of debate for many decades. Experimental data [1] suggest the existence of at least five  $IJ^{PC} = 00^{++}$  states in the region up to 1.75 GeV:  $f_0(600)$ ,  $f_0(980)$ ,  $f_0(1370)$ ,  $f_0(1500)$  and  $f_0(1710)$ . In the scalar sector, the existence of the scalar  $K_0^*(1430)$  state has been confirmed, unlike the existence of the low-lying scalar kaon  $K_0^*(800)$  (or  $\kappa$ ). Kaons and other mesons containing strange quarks are expected to play an important role in vacuum phenomenology and also in the restoration of the  $U(N_f)_L \times U(N_f)_R$  chiral symmetry [3], a feature of the Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) broken in vacuum spontaneously [4] by the quark condensate and explicitly by non-vanishing quark masses ( $N_f$ : number of quark flavours).

Meson phenomenology has been considered in various  $\sigma$  model approaches (see [3] and references therein). In this paper, we present an Extended Linear Sigma Model (eLSM [2, 5, 6]) containing scalar, pseudoscalar, vector and axial-vector mesons both in the non-strange and strange sectors. We have addressed the issue of structure of scalar mesons  $f_0(1370)$  and  $f_0(1710)$  in [2]; the conclusion was that one could find a reasonable global fit of scalar, pseudoscalar, vector and axial-vector masses within a single model assuming that  $a_0(1450)$  and  $K_0^*(1430)$  are  $\bar{q}q$  states. A consequence of the fit was the statement that  $f_0(1370)$  and  $f_0(1710)$  correspond to scalar  $\bar{q}q$  states. However, [2] did not address a different possibility: whether such a fit could also be found assuming that  $a_0(980)$  and  $\kappa$ , rather than  $a_0(1450)$  and  $K_0^*(1430)$ , are  $\bar{q}q$  states. If a reasonable fit exists in this case, then the results of [2] are inconclusive; however, if the opposite is true, then the

suggestion is confirmed that scalars above 1 GeV are favoured to be  $\bar{q}q$  states.

The paper is organised as follows. In Sec. 2 we present the Lagrangian, the results are discussed in Sec. 3 and in Sec. 4 we provide a summary and outlook of further work.

## 2. The Model

The Lagrangian of the Extended Linear Sigma Model with  $U(3)_L \times U(3)_R$  symmetry reads [3, 5, 6]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \text{Tr}[(D^\mu \Phi)^\dagger (D^\mu \Phi)] - m_0^2 \text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) - \lambda_1 [\text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \Phi)]^2 - \lambda_2 \text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{4} \text{Tr}[(L^{\mu\nu})^2 + (R^{\mu\nu})^2] + \text{Tr} \left[ \left( \frac{m_1^2}{2} + \Delta \right) (L^\mu)^2 + (R^\mu)^2 \right] + \text{Tr}[H(\Phi + \Phi^\dagger)] \\ & + c_1 (\det \Phi - \det \Phi^\dagger)^2 + i \frac{g_2}{2} (\text{Tr}\{L_{\mu\nu}[L^\mu, L^\nu]\} + \text{Tr}\{R_{\mu\nu}[R^\mu, R^\nu]\}) \\ & + \frac{h_1}{2} \text{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger \Phi) \text{Tr}[(L^\mu)^2 + (R^\mu)^2] + h_2 \text{Tr}[(\Phi R^\mu)^2 + (L^\mu \Phi)^2] + 2h_3 \text{Tr}(\Phi R_\mu \Phi^\dagger L^\mu) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(\sigma_N + a_0^0) + i(\eta_N + \pi^0)}{\sqrt{2}} & a_0^+ + i\pi^+ & K_S^+ + iK^+ \\ a_0^- + i\pi^- & \frac{(\sigma_N - a_0^0) + i(\eta_N - \pi^0)}{\sqrt{2}} & K_S^0 + iK^0 \\ K_S^- + iK^- & \bar{K}_S^0 + i\bar{K}^0 & \sigma_S + i\eta_S \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

is a matrix containing the scalar and pseudoscalar degrees of freedom,  $L^\mu = V^\mu + A^\mu$  and  $R^\mu = V^\mu - A^\mu$  are, respectively, the left-handed and the right-handed matrices containing vector and axial-vector degrees of freedom with

$$V^\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\omega_N + \rho^0}{\sqrt{2}} & \rho^+ & K^{*+} \\ \rho^- & \frac{\omega_N - \rho^0}{\sqrt{2}} & K^{*0} \\ K^{*-} & \bar{K}^{*0} & \omega_S \end{pmatrix}^\mu, \quad A^\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{f_{1N} + a_1^0}{\sqrt{2}} & a_1^+ & K_1^+ \\ a_1^- & \frac{f_{1N} - a_1^0}{\sqrt{2}} & K_1^0 \\ K_1^- & \bar{K}_1^0 & f_{1S} \end{pmatrix}^\mu \quad (3)$$

and  $\Delta = \text{diag}(\delta_N, \delta_N, \delta_S)$  describes explicit breaking of the chiral symmetry in the (axial-)vector channel. The explicit symmetry breaking in the (pseudo)scalar sector is described by  $\text{Tr}[H(\Phi + \Phi^\dagger)]$  with  $H = 1/2 \text{diag}(h_{0N}, h_{0N}, \sqrt{2}h_{0S})$ ,  $h_{0N} = \text{const.}$ ,  $h_{0S} = \text{const.}$  Also,  $D^\mu \Phi = \partial^\mu \Phi - ig_1(L^\mu \Phi - \Phi R^\mu)$  is the covariant derivative;  $L^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu L^\nu - \partial^\nu L^\mu$ ,  $R^{\mu\nu} = \partial^\mu R^\nu - \partial^\nu R^\mu$  are, respectively, the left-handed and right-handed field strength tensors and the term  $c_1(\det \Phi - \det \Phi^\dagger)^2$  describes the  $U(1)_A$  anomaly [7].

We assign the fields  $\vec{\pi}$  and  $\eta_N$  to the pion and the  $SU(2)$  counterpart of the  $\eta$  meson,  $\eta_N \equiv (\bar{u}u + \bar{d}d)/\sqrt{2}$ . The fields  $\omega_N^\mu$ ,  $\bar{\rho}^\mu$ ,  $f_{1N}^\mu$  and  $\bar{a}_1^\mu$  are assigned to the  $\omega(782)$ ,  $\rho(770)$ ,  $f_1(1285)$  and  $a_1(1260)$  mesons, respectively [8]. We also assign the  $K$  fields to the kaons;  $\eta_S$  is the strange contribution to the  $\eta$  and  $\eta'$  fields and the  $\omega_S^\mu$ ,  $f_{1S}^\mu$ ,  $K^{*\mu}$  and  $K_1^\mu$  fields correspond to the  $\varphi(1020)$ ,  $f_1(1420)$ ,  $K^*(892)$  and  $K_1(1270)$  mesons, respectively.

The assignment of the scalar states in our model to physical resonances is ambiguous. In this work, we assign the  $\vec{a}_0$  field to  $a_0(980)$  and  $K_S$  to the physical  $K_0^*(800)$  state. We thus presuppose that these two states below 1 GeV are  $\bar{q}q$  states (as all the fields present in our model are  $\bar{q}q$  states [8]) and describe in the following section whether a global fit of masses can be found under this assumption.

The Lagrangian (1) also contains two  $IJ^{PC} = 00^{++}$  states,  $\sigma_N$  (pure  $\bar{n}n$  state with

**Table 1.** Masses from our global fit.

Mass	$m_\pi$	$m_K$	$m_\eta$	$m_{\eta'}$	$m_\rho$	$m_{K^*}$
PDG Value (MeV) [1]	139.57	493.68	547.85	957.78	775.49	891.66
Our Value (MeV)	138.04	490.84	517.13	957.78	775.49	832.53
Mass	$m_\varphi$	$m_{f_{1S}}$	$m_{a_1}$	$m_{K_1}$	$a_0$	$m_{K_S}$
PDG Value (MeV) [1]	1019.5	1426.4	1230	1272	980	676
Our Value (MeV)	870.35	1643.4	1395.5	1520	978.27	1128.7

$n \in \{u, d \text{ quarks}\}$ ) and  $\sigma_S$  (pure strange state,  $\sigma_S \equiv \bar{s}s$ ). The states  $\sigma_N$  and  $\sigma_S$  mix and two new states emerge:  $\sigma_1$  (predominantly non-strange) and  $\sigma_2$  (predominantly strange) [2]. We describe the assignment of  $\sigma_{1,2}$  to physical states in the next section.

In order to implement spontaneous symmetry breaking in the model, we shift  $\sigma_N$  and  $\sigma_S$  by their respective vacuum expectation values  $\phi_N$  and  $\phi_S$  (see [2, 6] for details).

The Lagrangian (1) contains 14 parameters:  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, c_1, h_{0N}, h_{0S}, h_1, h_2, h_3, m_0^2, g_1, g_2, m_1, \delta_N, \delta_S$ . The parameter  $g_2$  is determined from the decay width  $\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi$  [8]; we set  $h_1 = 0$  as this parameter is large- $N_c$  suppressed [8] and also  $\delta_N = 0$  because the explicit symmetry breaking is small in the non-strange sector. All other parameters are calculated from a global fit of masses including  $m_\pi, m_K, m_\eta, m_{\eta'}, m_\rho, m_{K^*}, m_{\omega_S \equiv \varphi(1020)}, m_{f_{1S} \equiv f_{1S}(1420)}, m_{a_1}, m_{K_1 \equiv K_1(1270)}, m_{a_0 \equiv a_0(980)}$  and  $m_{K_S \equiv \kappa}$ . Note, however, that the mass terms from the Lagrangian (1) used in the fit allow only for the linear combination  $m_0^2 + \lambda_1(\phi_N^2 + \phi_S^2)$  rather than the parameters  $m_0^2$  and  $\lambda_1$  by themselves to be determined.

### 3. The Global Fit and Two-Pion Decay of the Sigma Mesons

Results from our best fit are shown in Table 1. We note that  $m_\kappa, m_{a_1}, m_{K_1}, m_{\omega_S}$  and  $m_{f_{1S}}$  deviate substantially from their respective experimental values [1]. This is in particular a problem for the rather sharp resonances  $\omega_S \equiv \varphi(1020)$  and  $f_1(1420) \equiv f_{1S}$ . In the scalar sector, if we set  $m_{\sigma_1} = 705$  MeV and  $m_{\sigma_2} = 1200$  MeV then we obtain  $\Gamma_{\sigma_1 \rightarrow \pi\pi} = 305$  MeV and  $\Gamma_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow \pi\pi} = 207$  MeV as well as  $\Gamma_{\sigma_1 \rightarrow KK} = 0$  and  $\Gamma_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow KK} = 240$  MeV. These results correspond very well to experiment [1, 9]. We thus assign  $\sigma_1$  to  $f_0(600)$  and  $\sigma_2$  to  $f_0(1370)$ . Consequently,  $f_0(600)$  is interpreted as a predominantly non-strange  $\bar{q}q$  state while  $f_0(1370)$  is interpreted as a predominantly  $\bar{s}s$  state. The results also suggest, however, that  $f_0(1370)$  should predominantly decay into kaons (as  $\Gamma_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow KK} / \Gamma_{\sigma_2 \rightarrow \pi\pi} = 1.15$ ) – not surprising for a  $\bar{s}s$  state but clearly at odds with experimental data [1].

Additionally, the phenomenology in the vector and axial-vector channels is not well described. The decay width  $\Gamma_{a_1(1260) \rightarrow \rho\pi}$  depends on parameter  $g_2$ , fixed via  $\Gamma_{\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi}$  [8]. A calculation of the decay width  $\Gamma_{a_1(1260) \rightarrow \rho\pi}$  then yields values of more than 10 GeV if we set  $\Gamma_{\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi} = 149.1$  MeV (as suggested by the PDG [1]). Alternatively, if one forces

$\Gamma_{a_1(1260) \rightarrow \rho\pi} < 600$  MeV to comply with the data, then  $\Gamma_{\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi} < 38$  MeV is obtained – a value that is approximately 100 MeV less than the experimental result.

Then the fit results, and thus the assumption of scalar  $\bar{q}q$  states below 1 GeV, are problematic.

#### 4. Summary and Outlook

We have presented a  $U(3)_L \times U(3)_R$  Linear Sigma Model with (axial-)vector mesons. A global fit of all masses (except the sigma masses) has been performed to determine model parameters. The fit included masses of scalar states  $\vec{a}_0$  and  $K_S$ , assigned respectively to  $a_0(980)$  and  $\kappa$ . The fit does not yield particularly good mass values: several of the masses considered deviate for more than 100 MeV from the corresponding PDG value (see Table 1). We find very good correspondence of  $\Gamma_{\sigma_{1,2} \rightarrow \pi\pi}$  and  $\Gamma_{\sigma_{1,2} \rightarrow KK}$  to the experiment if one considers  $m_{\sigma_1} = 705$  MeV and  $m_{\sigma_2} = 1200$  MeV. We thus assign  $\sigma_1$  to  $f_0(600)$  and  $\sigma_2$  to  $f_0(1370)$ . This implies that  $f_0(1370)$  is predominantly a  $\bar{s}s$  state. Consequently, our results suggest that  $f_0(1370)$  decays predominantly into kaons – at odds with experiment [1]. Additionally, we cannot accomodate a correct (axial-)vector phenomenology into the fit: either  $a_1(1260)$  is too broad ( $\simeq 10$  GeV) or the  $\rho$  meson is too narrow ( $\simeq 40$  MeV). We thus conclude that the fit of [2], where the scalar states were assumed to be above (rather than, as in this work, below) 1 GeV, described meson phenomenology better than the fit presented here and that this work confirms the conclusion of [2] that scalar  $\bar{q}q$  states are favoured to have mass above 1 GeV.

**Acknowledgment.** I am grateful to Francesco Giacosa, Dirk Rischke, Péter Kovács and György Wolf for valuable discussions regarding my work.

#### References

- [1] K. Nakamura *et al.* (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. G **37**, 075021 (2010) and 2011 partial update for the 2012 edition.
- [2] D. Parganlija, arXiv:1105.3647 [hep-ph].
- [3] J. T. Lenaghan, D. H. Rischke and J. Schaffner-Bielich, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 085008 (2000) [arXiv:nucl-th/0004006].
- [4] J. Goldstone, Nuovo Cim. **19**, 154 (1961); J. Goldstone, A. Salam and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **127**, 965 (1962).
- [5] D. Parganlija, F. Giacosa, D. H. Rischke, P. Kovacs and G. Wolf, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **26**, 607 (2011) [arXiv:1009.2250 [hep-ph]].
- [6] D. Parganlija, F. Giacosa, P. Kovacs and G. Wolf, arXiv:1011.6104 [hep-ph].
- [7] E. Klempt, B. C. Metsch, C. R. Munz and H. R. Petry, Phys. Lett. B **361**, 160 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9507449]; V. Dmitrasinovic, Phys. Rev. C **53**, 1383 (1996); C. Ritter, B. C. Metsch, C. R. Munz and H. R. Petry, Phys. Lett. B **380**, 431 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9601246]; V. Dmitrasinovic, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 247 (1997); A. H. Fariborz, R. Jora and J. Schechter, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 094004 (2008) [arXiv:0801.2552 [hep-ph]].
- [8] D. Parganlija, F. Giacosa and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 054024 (2010) [arXiv:1003.4934 [hep-ph]].
- [9] D. V. Bugg, Eur. Phys. J. C **52**, 55 (2007) [arXiv:0706.1341 [hep-ex]].