

Facets of chiral perturbation theory*

Gerhard Ecker

University of Vienna, Faculty of Physics
Boltzmanngasse 5, A-1090 Wien, Austria

Abstract

Chiral perturbation theory is the effective field theory of the Standard Model at low energies. After a short introduction and overview, I discuss three topics where the chiral approach leads to a deeper understanding of low-energy hadron physics: radiative kaon decays, carbogenesis in stellar nucleosynthesis and the interplay of chiral perturbation theory and lattice QCD.

*To appear in the Proceedings of Hadron Structure '13, July 2013, Tatranske Matliare, Slovakia

1 Motivation and overview

For a systematic and quantitative treatment of the Standard Model (SM) at low energies ($E < 1$ GeV), two approaches have survived the scrutiny of time:

- Effective Field Theory (EFT)
- Lattice Field Theory

The main objectives are to understand the physics of the SM in the hadron sector at low energies and to look for evidence of new physics.

The low-energy region is not accessible in standard perturbation theory because it is the strong-coupling regime of QCD. The key concept for the EFT approach is the approximate chiral symmetry of QCD:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{QCD}} = -\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(G_{\mu\nu}G^{\mu\nu}) + \sum_{f=1}^6 \bar{q}_f (i\gamma^\mu D_\mu - m_f \mathbb{1}_c) q_f . \quad (1)$$

For massless quarks ($m_f = 0$), the chiral components q_{fL}, q_{fR} can be rotated independently, leading to the chiral symmetry of QCD with n_F massless quarks $SU(n_F)_L \times SU(n_F)_R \times U(1)_V$.

Although $m_f = 0$ is a very good approximation for $n_F = 2$ (u, d quarks) and a reasonable one for $n_F = 3$ (u, d, s), there is no sign of chiral symmetry in the hadron spectrum. There are many additional arguments pointing to the spontaneous breakdown of chiral symmetry,

$$SU(n_F)_L \times SU(n_F)_R \times U(1)_V \longrightarrow SU(n_F)_V \times U(1)_V , \quad (2)$$

where the diagonal subgroup $SU(n_F)_V$ is either isospin ($n_F = 2$) or flavour $SU(3)$ ($n_F = 3$). As a consequence, the spectrum of the theory contains $n_F^2 - 1$ massless Goldstone bosons. The associated fields parametrize the coset space $SU(n_F)_L \times SU(n_F)_R / SU(n_F)_V$:

n_F	$n_F^2 - 1$	Goldstone bosons
2	3	π
3	8	π, K, η

Even in the real world with nonvanishing quark masses, pseudoscalar meson exchange dominates amplitudes at low energies. For an EFT of pseudo-Goldstone bosons only, chiral symmetry is realized nonlinearly and the associated effective Lagrangian is necessarily nonpolynomial. The EFT of the SM at low energies is called Chiral Perturbation Theory (CHPT) [1, 2, 3] and it is a nonrenormalizable quantum field theory. Nevertheless, CHPT

is a fully renormalized QFT (in practice up to NNLO) and therefore independent of the regularization procedure.

Another important consequence of Goldstone’s theorem is at the basis of the systematic low-energy expansion of CHPT: pseudo-Goldstone bosons decouple for vanishing meson momenta and masses. The systematic CHPT approach for low-energy hadron physics (for reviews, see Refs. [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]) is

- most advanced in the meson sector (up to two loops, Table 1);
- it is also well developed for single-baryon and few-nucleon systems;
- electroweak interactions can be and have been included.

For this talk, I have chosen three topics where the main emphasis is on obtaining a better understanding of hadronic interactions at low energies rather than on high-precision studies with the potential to look for evidence of new physics (e.g., in semileptonic kaon decays). Theoretical and experimental investigations of the radiative kaon decays $K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ span a period of more than a quarter century, from the second half of the 80s of last century where CHPT was just one of many “hadronic models” to fairly recent times where CHPT predictions have been verified experimentally. An interesting application of chiral EFTs in nuclear physics is the recent attempt to quantify the sensitivity of the so-called Hoyle state to fundamental parameters of the SM, the light quark mass and the electromagnetic fine-structure constant. The results add a new touch to the understanding of the abundance of carbon and oxygen in the universe in terms of the anthropic principle. Finally, to illustrate the fruitful collaboration between the two main players in low-energy hadron physics, CHPT and lattice QCD, I discuss ongoing attempts to extract information on some low-energy constants (LECs) from lattice simulations. I present preliminary results of an approach making use of an analytic approximation of two-loop amplitudes in chiral $SU(3)$.

2 Nonleptonic kaon decays

Kaon decays are a fertile field for CHPT (for a general review, see Ref. [9]) . While in some semileptonic decays the precision provided by CHPT allows to search for evidence of new physics, the situation is much more complicated in nonleptonic decays. Nevertheless, a comprehensive picture has emerged over the years through the collaboration between theory and experiment. In this section, I briefly review the status of a specific subclass of radiative kaon decays.

The two basic couplings of the leading-order nonleptonic chiral Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{G_F p^2}^{\Delta S=1}(2)$, usually called G_8, G_{27} , are by now well established from studies of the dominant nonleptonic

$\mathcal{L}_{\text{chiral order}}$ (# of LECs)	loop order
$\mathcal{L}_{p^2}(2) + \mathcal{L}_{p^4}^{\text{odd}}(0) + \mathcal{L}_{G_F p^2}^{\Delta S=1}(2) + \mathcal{L}_{G_8 e^2 p^0}^{\text{emweak}}(1)$ $+ \mathcal{L}_{e^2 p^0}^{\text{em}}(1) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}^{\text{leptons}}(0)$	$L = 0$
$+ \mathcal{L}_{p^4}(10) + \mathcal{L}_{p^6}^{\text{odd}}(23) + \mathcal{L}_{G_8 p^4}^{\Delta S=1}(22) + \mathcal{L}_{G_{27} p^4}^{\Delta S=1}(28)$ $+ \mathcal{L}_{G_8 e^2 p^2}^{\text{emweak}}(14) + \mathcal{L}_{e^2 p^2}^{\text{em}}(13) + \mathcal{L}_{e^2 p^2}^{\text{leptons}}(5)$	$L \leq 1$
$+ \mathcal{L}_{p^6}(90)$	$L \leq 2$

Table 1: Effective chiral Lagrangian in the meson sector for chiral $SU(3)$. In brackets, the number of coupling constants (LECs) of CHPT.

kaon decays $K \rightarrow 2\pi, 3\pi$ up to NLO, including isospin-violating and radiative corrections [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15].




Figure 1: One-loop diagrams for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$ [16, 17]. For $K_S \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$, replace K_L by K_S and drop the π^0 line [18, 19].

All other nonleptonic kaon decays start at NLO, $O(G_F p^4)$, only. As indicated in Table 1, there are 22 (octet) plus 28 (27-plet) new LECs entering at NLO. Therefore, the radiative

decays $K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ and $K_S \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma\gamma$ have been especially popular among CHPT theorists: none of the 22 + 28 NLO LECs contributes! Therefore, at NLO the decay amplitudes are given by finite one-loop contributions in terms of the known LO couplings G_8, G_{27} only. The channel $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ is not only interesting in its own right because it generates a CP-conserving contribution via the two-photon cut to the dominantly CP-violating decays $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 l^+ l^-$ [20, 21, 22].

In the remainder of this section, I review the status of the decays $K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ (the decay $K_S \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma\gamma$ [23] has not been observed yet). At $O(G_F p^4)$, the relevant diagrams are shown in Fig. 1. Note that each one of the diagrams is quadratically divergent: chiral symmetry ensures that the sum is finite.

As predicted by CHPT, already the first observation of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ [24] demonstrated that the two-photon spectrum is dominated by the pion-loop contribution, in contrast to the previously assumed vector meson dominance. However, it also became clear that the rate was underestimated. Higher-order corrections needed to be taken into account, starting at $O(G_F p^6)$.




Figure 2: Experimental results for the branching ratio $B(K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$ in comparison with the chiral prediction.

- i. Rescattering (unitarity) corrections turned out to be small for $K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ [25], but

they are sizable in the case of $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$ [26, 27].

- ii. Resonance contributions were estimated to be small for the K_S decay mainly because vector mesons cannot contribute. This is again different for the K_L decay: although the vector meson contribution is model dependent, it is to a good approximation parametrized by a single parameter a_V [27, 28].

It therefore came as a surprise when NA48 [31] announced a rate for $K_S \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ substantially bigger than the chiral prediction (see Fig. 2). Fortunately, the more recent result of KLOE [32], $B(K_S \rightarrow \gamma \gamma) = 2.26(12)(06) \times 10^{-6}$, is again in perfect agreement with expectations. The decision by the Particle Data Group [33] to average the results of NA48 and KLOE does not appear very illuminating: another experiment is needed to clarify the issue.

After several years of discrepancies, the experimental situation for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$ has now been clarified [29, 30]. Both the two-photon spectra shown in Fig. 3 and the branching ratios agree among each other and with CHPT [33]:

$$\begin{aligned} B(K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma) \cdot 10^6 &= 1.273 \pm 0.033 \\ a_V &= -0.43 \pm 0.06 . \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

As an important by-product of this result, the CP-conserving contribution $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma^* \gamma^* \rightarrow \pi^0 e^+ e^-$ is indeed negligible in comparison with the CP-violating amplitudes.

3 Carbogenesis

Almost all carbon in the universe is produced in stellar nucleosynthesis via the triple- α process shown in Fig. 4. In order to explain the observed carbon abundance, Hoyle [34] postulated the existence of an excited state of ^{12}C near the $^8\text{Be}-\alpha$ threshold that was observed soon afterwards. Two important characteristics of this resonance are the energy ϵ above the 3α threshold and its radiative width Γ_γ :

$$\epsilon = 379.47(18) \text{ keV}, \quad \Gamma_\gamma = 3.7(5) \text{ meV} . \tag{4}$$

Since the triple- α rate is proportional to $\Gamma_\gamma \exp -\epsilon/kT$, the rate is most sensitive to ϵ . This sensitivity has often been considered a prime example of the anthropic principle, but later investigations showed that a difference $\Delta\epsilon \lesssim 100 \text{ keV}$ could be tolerated to explain the abundance of ^{12}C and ^{16}O [35, 36].

Although this range cannot be considered extreme fine-tuning, the more interesting issue is the dependence of ϵ on fundamental parameters of strong and electromagnetic interactions. Using a one-parameter nuclear cluster model, Schlattl et al. [37] found that





Figure 3: Two-photon spectra for $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma \gamma$ from NA48 [29] (top) and KTeV [30] (bottom).

the tolerances for the strength parameter p and the Coulomb force F_{Coulomb} were indeed small:

$$\Delta p/p \lesssim 0.5\%, \quad \Delta F_{\text{Coulomb}}/F_{\text{Coulomb}} \lesssim 4\% . \quad (5)$$

However, the quantities p and F_{Coulomb} in the model of Ref. [37] are difficult to relate to




Figure 4: Triple- α process for ^{12}C .

fundamental parameters of QCD and QED. CHPT can provide at least a partial solution of this problem.

The chiral EFT of nuclear forces put forward by Weinberg [38] has proven to be very successful for small nuclei ($A \lesssim 3$). In a more recent development, the nuclear chiral EFT has been put on the lattice (for a review of nuclear lattice simulations, see Ref. [39]). The important difference to lattice QCD (see Sec. 4) is that instead of quarks and gluons the lattice degrees of freedom are now nucleons and pions. The nuclear simulations have been quite successful in calculating energy spectra of light nuclei. As an example, I reproduce in Table 2 the low-lying even-parity spectrum of ^{12}C calculated by Epelbaum et al. [40].

	0_1^+	$2_1^+(E^+)$	0_2^+
LO	-96(2)	-94(2)	-89(2)
NLO	-77(3)	-74(3)	-72(3)
NNLO	-92(3)	-89(3)	-85(3)
Exp	-92.16	-87.72	-84.51

Table 2: Energies of low-lying even-parity states of ^{12}C (in MeV) from Ref. [40]. 0_2^+ is the Hoyle resonance.

With nuclear CHPT one cannot study the influence of the strong coupling α_{QCD} (hidden in nucleons and pions), but the impact of the light quark mass m_q in the isospin limit (via $M_\pi^2 \sim (m_u + m_d)$ at lowest order CHPT) and of the fine-structure constant α_{em} can be investigated. The final conclusion obtained in Ref. [41] is that the necessary fine-tuning of m_q and α_{em} is much more severe than for the energy difference ϵ in Eq. (4):

$$\Delta m_q/m_q \lesssim 3\% , \quad \Delta \alpha_{\text{em}}/\alpha_{\text{em}} \lesssim 2.5\% . \quad (6)$$

While the constraint on the fine-structure constant is in accordance with the previous result in Eq. (5), the allowed range for the light quark mass adds another touch to the interpretation of the anthropic principle.

4 Low-energy constants and lattice QCD

In recent years, the collaboration between the two major players in low-energy hadron physics, CHPT and lattice QCD, has intensified considerably.

- i. Extrapolation to the physical quark (and meson) masses provided by CHPT is still useful for lattice simulations, but because of more powerful computers less so than some five years ago. On the other hand, finite-volume corrections accessible in CHPT are still needed for a reliable estimate of lattice uncertainties.
- ii. On the other hand, the determination of LECs from lattice studies has become more important over the years. This input is especially welcome for those LECs that modulate quark mass terms: unlike in standard phenomenological analysis, the lattice physicist can tune quark (and therefore meson) masses.

The present situation can be characterized by the following motto [42], modeled after a famous quote: “Ask not what CHPT can do for the lattice, but ask what the lattice can do for CHPT”.

As an illustrative example, consider one of the two leading-order LECs, the meson decay constant in the chiral limit. The chiral $SU(2)$ LEC $F = \lim_{m_u, m_d \rightarrow 0} F_\pi$ is well known, mainly from a combined analysis of lattice data by the FLAG Collaboration [43, 44]:

$$F = (85.9 \pm 0.6) \text{ MeV} . \quad (7)$$

The situation is different in the $SU(3)$ case. The lattice results for $F_0 = \lim_{m_u, m_d, m_s \rightarrow 0} F_\pi$ cover a much wider range, from about 66 MeV to 84 MeV [44]. Consequently, the FLAG group refrains from performing an average. A similar range is covered in the phenomenological fits of Bijmans and Jemos [45] as shown in Fig. 5.

The low-energy expansion in chiral $SU(3)$ is characterized by the ratio $p^2/(4\pi F_0)^2$ where p stands for a generic meson momentum or mass. The LEC F_0 thus sets the scale for the chiral expansion. In practical work, F_0 is usually traded for F_π at successive orders of the chiral expansion. Nevertheless, F_0 sets the scale of “convergence” of the chiral expansion: a smaller F_0 tends to produce bigger fluctuations at higher orders. It is therefore disturbing that its value is less known than for many higher-order LECs.




Figure 5: Results for $L_4^r(M_\rho)$ and F_0 from various fits in Ref. [45]. F_0 is not fitted but calculated a posteriori from the fitted LECs.

One clue to the difficulty of extracting F_0 is the apparent anti-correlation with the NLO LEC L_4 in the fits of Ref. [45]: the bigger F_0 , the smaller $L_4^r(M_\rho)$, and vice versa (see Fig. 5). The large- N_c suppression of L_4 is not manifest in the fits with small F_0 .

This anti-correlation can be understood to some extent from the structure of the chiral $SU(3)$ Lagrangian up to and including NLO (see Table 1):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{p^2}(2) + \mathcal{L}_{p^4}(10) &= \frac{F_0^2}{4} \langle D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger + \chi U^\dagger + \chi^\dagger U \rangle + L_4 \langle D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger \rangle \langle \chi U^\dagger + \chi^\dagger U \rangle + \dots \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \langle D_\mu U D^\mu U^\dagger \rangle \left[F_0^2 + 8L_4 \left(2\mathring{M}_K^2 + \mathring{M}_\pi^2 \right) \right] + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $U = 1 +$ meson fields, $\chi = 2B_0\mathcal{M}_q$ ($B_0 \sim$ quark condensate, \mathcal{M}_q is the quark mass matrix), $\langle \dots \rangle$ stands for the $SU(3)$ flavour trace and \mathring{M}_P denotes the lowest-order meson masses. The dots refer to the remainder of the NLO Lagrangian in the first line and to terms of higher order in the meson fields in the second line. Therefore, a LO tree-level contribution is always accompanied by an L_4 contribution in the combination

$$F(\mu)^2 := F_0^2 + 8L_4^r(\mu) \left(2\mathring{M}_K^2 + \mathring{M}_\pi^2 \right) . \quad (9)$$

Of course, there will in general be additional contributions involving L_4 at NLO, especially in higher-point functions (e.g., in meson meson scattering). Nevertheless, the observed anti-correlation between F_0 and L_4 is clearly related to the structure of the chiral Lagrangian. Note that $F_\pi^2/(16M_K^2) = 2 \times 10^{-3}$ is the typical size of a NLO LEC. Although of different chiral order, the two terms in $F(\mu)^2$ could a priori be of the same order of magnitude.

Independent information on F_0 comes from comparing the $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ expressions for F_π . To $O(p^4)$ in chiral $SU(2)$, F_π is given by [2]

$$F_\pi = F + F^{-1} \left[M_\pi^2 l_4^r(\mu) + \overline{A}(M_\pi, \mu) \right] \quad (10)$$

where l_4 is a NLO $SU(2)$ LEC and $\bar{A}(M_\pi, \mu)$ is a one-loop function. Expressing $l_4^r(\mu)$ in terms of $L_4^r(\mu)$, $L_5^r(\mu)$ and a kaon loop contribution [3] and equating Eq. (10) with the $SU(3)$ result for F_π [3], one arrives at the following relation:

$$F_0 = F - F^{-1} \left\{ (2M_K^2 - M_\pi^2) \left(4L_4^r(\mu) + \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \log \frac{\mu^2}{M_K^2} \right) + \frac{M_\pi^2}{64\pi^2} \right\} + O(p^6) . \quad (11)$$

Assuming the “paramagnetic” inequality $F_0 < F$ [46] to hold already at $O(p^4)$, one gets a lower bound for L_4 ,

$$L_4^r(M_\rho) > -0.4 \times 10^{-3} , \quad (12)$$

well compatible with existing estimates.

$SU(3)$ lattice data for F_π seem well suited for a determination of F_0 and L_4 . For a quantitative analysis, the use of CHPT to NNLO, $O(p^6)$, is essential. In many analyses of lattice data, the complete NNLO result for F_π in chiral $SU(3)$ [47], which is available in numerical form only, has not been employed so far. Some time ago, we proposed a large- N_c motivated approximation for NNLO calculations in chiral $SU(3)$ where the loop amplitudes are given in analytic form [48]. In the remainder of this section, I report on a preliminary analysis of F_π within this framework to extract the LECs F_0 , L_4 [49].

The following input is needed. The two-loop contribution depends on a single additional parameter M , the scale of double logs. Comparing with a numerical analysis [50], we have convinced ourselves that $M \simeq M_K$ as expected, at least for F_K/F_π and for F_π itself. In addition, some knowledge of the only other LEC L_5 appearing at NLO and of the other LECs entering at $O(p^6)$ is required. The following (preliminary) results [49] take the uncertainties of M and the LECs involved into account, adding errors in quadrature to the lattice errors. We use lattice data for F_π from the RBC/UKQCD Collaboration [51, 52].

The extracted values of F_0 and $L_4^r(M_\rho)$ are shown in Fig. 6. The ellipses describe two options, depending on whether the physical value of F_π is included in the fit (blue ellipse) or not (green ellipse). The red band originates from the comparison between chiral $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ as expressed by Eq. (11). Referring to Ref. [49] for a more complete discussion, I list the values of F_0 and $L_4^r(M_\rho)$ corresponding to the blue ellipse (F_π^{phys} included):

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 &= (88.3 \pm 4.3) \text{ MeV} \\ 10^3 L_4^r(M_\rho) &= -0.05 \pm 0.19 \\ \text{corr}(F_0, L_4^r) &= -0.997 . \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The two ellipses are roughly compatible with each other. The green ellipse is a little lower because from the RBC/UKQCD data alone the fitted value of F_π is slightly smaller than the experimental value. The value for L_4 is consistent with large N_c and with available lattice




Figure 6: Fitted values of F_0 , L_4 using RBC/UKQCD data [51, 52] with $M_\pi < 350$ MeV, with (blue ellipse) and without (green ellipse) including F_π^{phys} . The red band results from the comparison of F_π between $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ as expressed by Eq. (11), taking $F = (85.9 \pm 0.6)$ MeV from the FLAG compilation [44]. The horizontal line denotes $F_\pi = 92.2$ MeV.

results [44] shown in Fig. 7. The result for F_0 is more precise than both phenomenological (cp. Fig. 5) and existing lattice determinations [43, 44]. It is a little bigger than expected [46], approximately of the same size as the $SU(2)$ LEC F in Eq. (7). Moreover, F_0 in




Figure 7: A compilation of lattice determinations of $L_4^r(M_\rho)$ [44].

Eq. (13) does not match with the comparison between $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$ as indicated by the red band in Fig. 6.

Aside from possibly underestimated uncertainties, this discrepancy may be due to the fact that the red band in Fig. 6 is based on $O(p^4)$ calculations whereas the fit values in Eq. (13) result from an (albeit approximate) calculation to $O(p^6)$. Note also that the value for F in Eq. (7) is an average over all existing lattice results; the most precise determinations with $N_f = 2 + 1$ active flavours produce a slightly bigger average $F = (86.8 \pm 0.3)$ MeV [44]. Nevertheless, the discrepancy between the direct fit (13) and the $SU(2)$ constraint (11) would remain.

The strong anti-correlation between F_0 and L_4 persists because the kaon masses in the RBC/UKQCD data are all close to the physical kaon mass. Simulations with smaller kaon masses [53] would not only be welcome from the point of view of convergence of the chiral series, but they could also provide a better lever arm for reducing the anti-correlation and the fit errors of F_0 and L_4 . This expectation is justified because the quantity $F(M_\rho)$ defined in Eq. (9) is much better determined than F_0 .

5 Conclusions

We started out with stating the main objectives of CHPT: to understand the structure of the SM at low energies and to look for possible evidence of new physics. Have these objectives been accomplished?

We have certainly come some way with CHPT in understanding hadronic interactions at low energies. I discussed three examples where the CHPT approach has given rise to significant new insights. The investigation of the radiative nonleptonic kaon decays $K_S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $K_L \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma\gamma$ during the past 25 years has led to an overall agreement between theory and experiment, with a minor discrepancy between two experiments for the K_S decay still pending. Nuclear physics for light nuclei has made impressive progress with the help of chiral EFTs. A recent formulation on the lattice (with nucleons and pions) seems very promising. As an example, the impact of the light quark masses and of the fine-structure constant on the Hoyle resonance in ^{12}C was studied with such an approach. Finally, the interaction between CHPT and lattice QCD is prospering. Many of the CHPT couplings that are difficult to obtain from phenomenology are now becoming accessible on the lattice.

Concerning the second objective mentioned in the introduction, we have not found any evidence for new physics with CHPT. But neither has the LHC!

References

- [1] S. Weinberg, *Physica A* **96** (1979) 327.
- [2] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Annals Phys.* **158** (1984) 142.
- [3] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Nucl. Phys. B* **250** (1985) 465.
- [4] G. Ecker, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **35** (1995) 1 [hep-ph/9501357].
- [5] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser and U. -G. Meißner, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **4** (1995) 193 [hep-ph/9501384].
- [6] A. Pich, in *Proc. of Les Houches Summer School of Theoretical Physics*, vol. II, F. David and R. Gupta, eds., Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, 1999 [hep-ph/9806303].
- [7] S. Scherer, *Adv. Nucl. Phys.* **27** (2003) 277 [hep-ph/0210398].
- [8] J. Bijnens, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **58** (2007) 521 [hep-ph/0604043].
- [9] V. Cirigliano, G. Ecker, H. Neufeld, A. Pich and J. Portolés, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84** (2012) 399 [arXiv:1107.6001 [hep-ph]].
- [10] J. A. Cronin, *Phys. Rev.* **161** (1967) 1483.
- [11] J. Kambor, J. H. Missimer and D. Wyler, *Phys. Lett. B* **261** (1991) 496.
- [12] V. Cirigliano, G. Ecker, H. Neufeld and A. Pich, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **33** (2004) 369 [hep-ph/0310351].
- [13] J. Bijnens and F. Borg, *Nucl. Phys. B* **697** (2004) 319 [hep-ph/0405025].
- [14] J. Bijnens and F. Borg, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **39** (2005) 347 [hep-ph/0410333].
- [15] J. Bijnens and F. Borg, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **40** (2005) 383 [hep-ph/0501163].
- [16] G. Ecker, A. Pich and E. de Rafael, *Phys. Lett. B* **189** (1987) 363.
- [17] L. Cappiello and G. D'Ambrosio, *Nuovo Cim. A* **99** (1988) 155.
- [18] G. D'Ambrosio and D. Espriu, *Phys. Lett. B* **175** (1986) 237.
- [19] J. L. Goity, *Z. Phys. C* **34** (1987) 341.
- [20] J. F. Donoghue, B. R. Holstein and G. Valencia, *Phys. Rev. D* **35** (1987) 2769.
- [21] G. Ecker, A. Pich and E. de Rafael, *Nucl. Phys. B* **303** (1988) 665.

- [22] L. M. Sehgal, Phys. Rev. D **38** (1988) 808.
- [23] R. Funck and J. Kambor, Nucl. Phys. B **396** (1993) 53.
- [24] G. D. Barr *et al.* [NA31 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **242** (1990) 523.
- [25] J. Kambor and B. R. Holstein, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994) 2346 [hep-ph/9310324].
- [26] L. Cappiello, G. D’Ambrosio and M. Miragliuolo, Phys. Lett. B **298** (1993) 423.
- [27] A. G. Cohen, G. Ecker and A. Pich, Phys. Lett. B **304** (1993) 347.
- [28] G. D’Ambrosio and J. Portolés, Nucl. Phys. B **492** (1997) 417 [hep-ph/9610244].
- [29] A. Lai *et al.* [NA48 Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **536** (2002) 229 [hep-ex/0205010].
- [30] E. Abouzaid *et al.* [KTeV Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 112004 [arXiv:0805.0031 [hep-ex]].
- [31] A. Lai, D. Marras, J. R. Batley, R. S. Dosanjh, T. J. Gershon, G. E. Kalmus, C. Lazzeroni and D. J. Munday *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **551** (2003) 7 [hep-ex/0210053].
- [32] F. Ambrosino *et al.* [KLOE Collaboration], JHEP **0805** (2008) 051 [arXiv:0712.1744 [hep-ex]].
- [33] J. Beringer *et al.*, Review of Particle Physics (RPP), Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 010001.
- [34] F. Hoyle, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **1** (1954) 121.
- [35] M. Livio, D. Holwell, A. Weiss and J.W. Truran, Nature **340** (1989) 281.
- [36] H. Oberhummer, A. Csoto and H. Schlattl, Science **289** (2000) 88 [astro-ph/0007178].
- [37] H. Schlattl, A. Heger, H. Oberhummer, T. Rauscher and A. Csoto, Astrophys. Space Sci. **291** (2004) 27 [astro-ph/0307528].
- [38] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. B **251** (1990) 288.
- [39] D. Lee, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **63** (2009) 117 [arXiv:0804.3501 [nucl-th]].
- [40] E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs, T. A. Lahde, D. Lee and U. -G. Meißner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 252501 [arXiv:1208.1328 [nucl-th]].
- [41] E. Epelbaum, H. Krebs, T. A. Lahde, D. Lee and U. -G. Meißner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013) 112502 [arXiv:1212.4181 [nucl-th]].
- [42] L. Lellouch, Seminar at the Univ. of Vienna, May 2013.

- [43] G. Colangelo, S. Durr, A. Juttner, L. Lellouch, H. Leutwyler, V. Lubicz, S. Necco and C. T. Sachrajda *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **71** (2011) 1695 [arXiv:1011.4408 [hep-lat]].
- [44] G. Colangelo *et al.*, updated values can be found on the FLAG homepage <http://itpwiki.unibe.ch/flag/...>
- [45] J. Bijnens and I. Jemos, Nucl. Phys. B **854** (2012) 631 [arXiv:1103.5945 [hep-ph]].
- [46] S. Descotes-Genon, L. Girlanda and J. Stern, JHEP **0001** (2000) 041 [hep-ph/9910537].
- [47] G. Amoros, J. Bijnens and P. Talavera, Nucl. Phys. B **568** (2000) 319 [hep-ph/9907264].
- [48] G. Ecker, P. Masjuan and H. Neufeld, Phys. Lett. B **692** (2010) 184 [arXiv:1004.3422 [hep-ph]].
- [49] G. Ecker, P. Masjuan and H. Neufeld, in preparation.
- [50] V. Bernard and E. Passemar, JHEP **1004** (2010) 001 [arXiv:0912.3792 [hep-ph]].
- [51] Y. Aoki *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011) 074508 [arXiv:1011.0892 [hep-lat]].
- [52] R. Arthur *et al.* [RBC and UKQCD Collaborations], Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 094514 [arXiv:1208.4412 [hep-lat]].
- [53] A. Bazavov *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82** (2010) 1349 [arXiv:0903.3598 [hep-lat]].