

# 14th Meeting of the Working Group on Rad. Corrections and MC Generators for Low Energies

September 13, 2013 in Frascati, Italy

*Editors:* S. E. Müller (Dresden) and G. Venanzoni (Frascati)

## ABSTRACT

The mini-proceedings of the 14th Meeting of the “Working Group on Rad. Corrections and MC Generators for Low Energies” held in Frascati on September 13, 2013, as a satellite meeting of the PHIPSI13 <sup>1</sup> conference in Rome are presented. These meetings, started in 2006, have as aim to bring together experimentalists and theorists working in the fields of meson transition form factors, hadronic contributions to  $(g - 2)_\mu$  and the effective fine structure constant, and development of MonteCarlo generators and Radiative Corrections for precision  $e^+e^-$  and  $\tau$  physics.

The web page of the meeting, which contains all talks, can be found at

<https://agenda.infn.it/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=6618>

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.roma1.infn.it/phipsi13/>

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
	<i>H. Czyż and G. Venanzoni</i>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Short summaries of the talks</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Generic MC Generator for $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons at $\sqrt{s} < 2$ GeV . . . . .	4
	<i>S. Eidelman, A. Korobov</i>	
2.2	Luminosity measurement with CMD-3 detector at the VEPP-2000 $e^+e^-$ collider	5
	<i>G. V. Fedotov</i>	
2.2.1	Energy scan . . . . .	5
2.2.2	Luminosity determination . . . . .	6
2.3	A combined estimate of the KLOE08, KLOE10 and KLOE12 ISR measurements	8
	<i>S. E. Müller</i>	
2.4	Hadronic light-by-light scattering in the muon $g - 2$ : current status, open problems and impact of form factor measurements . . . . .	10
	<i>A. Nyffeler</i>	
2.5	Are $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \ell^+ \ell^- \nu_\tau$ decays within discovery reach in near future? . . . . .	14
	<i>P. Roig</i>	
2.6	The tau decay in three pions in Resonance Chiral Theory. Status of analysis . . . . .	16
	<i>O. Shekhovtsova</i>	
2.7	How to bring the error of the VP contributions down and how the WG could contribute in this important task? . . . . .	18
	<i>T. Teubner</i>	
<b>3</b>	<b>List of participants</b>	<b>20</b>

# 1 Introduction

H. Czyz<sup>1</sup> and G. Venanzoni<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, 40007 Katowice, Poland

<sup>2</sup> Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, 00044 Frascati, Italy

The importance of continuous and close collaboration between the experimental and theoretical groups is crucial in the quest for precision in hadronic physics. This is the reason why the Working Group on “Radiative Corrections and Monte Carlo Generators for Low Energies” (Radio MonteCarLow) was formed a few years ago bringing together experts (theorists and experimentalists) working in the field of low-energy  $e^+e^-$  physics and partly also the  $\tau$  community. Its main motivation was to understand the status and the precision of the Monte Carlo generators used to analyse the hadronic cross section measurements obtained as well with energy scans as with radiative return, to determine luminosities, and whatever possible to perform tuned comparisons, *i.e.* comparisons of MC generators with a common set of input parameters and experimental cuts. This main effort was summarized in a report published in 2010 [1]. During the years the WG structure has been enriched of more physics items and now it includes seven subgroups: Luminosity, R-measurement, ISR, Hadronic VP incl.  $g-2$  and  $\Delta\alpha$ , gamma-gamma physics, FSR models, tau.

During the workshop the last achievements of each subgroups have been presented. A particular emphasis has been put to the recent evaluations of the Leading order and Light-by-Light hadronic contributions to the  $g-2$  of the muon. Finally the status of MC generators for R-measurement with energy scan, ISR, and tau decays has been discussed.

All the information on the WG can be found at the web page:

<http://www.lnf.infn.it/wg/sighad/>

## References

- [1] S. Actis *et al.* [Working Group on Radiative Corrections and Monte Carlo Generators for Low Energies Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **66** (2010) 585.

## 2 Short summaries of the talks

### 2.1 Generic MC Generator for $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons at $\sqrt{s} < 2$ GeV

S. Eidelman, A. Korobov

Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics SB RAS and  
Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, Russia

There is a need for a generic MC generator approximately reproducing a real picture of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow$  hadrons below 2 GeV. Such generators exist for higher energy ranges: PYTHIA [1], LUARLW [2], ... based on a complicated scheme of quark and gluon hadronization and provide events of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}$ ,  $q = u, d, s, c, b$ . These generators are used for simulation of various processes studied and background estimation. However, at low energy one can't create a generator based on first principles, so existing data on cross sections should be used. We have created the first version of the MC generator helping in preselection of main backgrounds in analysis of CMD-3 data using our database of various cross section measurements. Currently about 30 various final states are taken into account. If data are not available, we use isospin relations.

The algorithm is the following. Energy dependence of the cross section for each exclusive final state is approximated by a physically motivated analytic function  $f_i(s)$ . At each energy  $\sqrt{s}$  event generation includes a calculation of the total cross section  $\sigma_{\text{tot}}(s) = \Sigma f_i(s)$ ; sampling of a random number specifying the final state to sample; sampling of an event of the specific process based on the corresponding dynamics.

A list of things to do includes an increase of the number of processes, using more data, improving isospin relations, taking into account dynamics (from phase space to real matrix elements). It is also planned to include approximately an ISR photon.

This work is supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, the RFBR grants 11-02-00112, 11-02-00558 and the DFG grant HA 1457/7-2.

## References

- [1] T. Sjostrand, Comp. Phys. Commun. **82**, 74 (1994).
- [2] H.-M. Hu et al., HEP & NC **25**, 1035 (2001).

## 2.2 Luminosity measurement with CMD-3 detector at the VEPP-2000 $e^+e^-$ collider

G. V. Fedotov

Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics SB RAS and  
Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, Russia

The preliminary results of the luminosity measurement in a broad energy range are presented. The analysis is based on the integrated luminosity about  $60pb^{-1}$ . For low energy range (smaller 320 MeV) the luminosity was determined using two processes:  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-$ . As for higher energies up to 2 GeV the luminosity determination was based on study processes  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-, \gamma\gamma$ . As a result we had possibility to arrange cross-check and better estimate the systematics errors.

### 2.2.1 Energy scan

The precise determination of the luminosity is the key ingredient in many experiments which study the hadronic cross sections at  $e^+e^-$  colliders. As a rule, the systematic error of the luminosity determination represents one of the largest sources of uncertainty which can cause significant reduction of the accuracy of the hadronic cross sections normalized to luminosity. Therefore it is very important to have several well known QED processes, for example,  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-, \mu^+\mu^-, \gamma\gamma$  to determine the luminosity and to have cross check possibility.

The process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  has essential advantages for luminosity [1]. It is free of difficulties related to both radiation of the final state particles and its Coulomb interaction. It is also of utmost importance that corresponding Feynman graphs do not contain photon propagators affected by the vacuum polarization effects. Events of this process have two collinear photons with similar energy deposition in calorimeters providing a clean signature for their selection. These reasons are the main motivation to explore this process as an independent tool for luminosity determination.

The energy range from 1 to 2 GeV was scanned up and down with the energy step 50 MeV. At each energy point the integrated luminosity of about  $500 nb^{-1}$  was collected. During the scan down the energy points, at which data were collected, have been shifted to the previous one by 25 MeV. The energy of the beams has been monitored ( $\sim 0.5$  MeV) by measuring the current in an additional dipole magnet which was connected on in series with dipole magnets of the main ring.

Two type of the first level triggers “CHARGED” and “NEUTRAL” were used while data taking. Signals from the drift and Z chambers start a special processor “TRACKFINDER” (TF). “CLUSTERFINDER” (CF) was started by signals coming from calorimeters. A positive decision of any processor produces a command to write a current event on the online storage (space  $\sim 2$  TB).




Figure 2.2.1: The ratio of the relative difference of the luminosities vs beam energy. Empty circles - scan up, full circles - scan down.

### 2.2.2 Luminosity determination

At the first step the collinear events were selected according to the next criteria: “CHARGED” trigger produced positive decision; at least two tracks were reconstructed in DC; total charge must be equal to zero; distance of the both tracks from the beam axis is less than 0.5 cm; distance of the both tracks along beam axis from the interaction point does not exceed 10 cm; acollinearity angles between two tracks in the scattering plane (contains the beam axis),  $|\Delta\Theta| = |\Theta_1 - (\pi - \Theta_2)| \leq 0.25$  rad; acollinearity angles between two tracks in the azimuthal plane (perpendicular to the beam axis),  $|\Delta\Phi| = |\pi - |\Phi_1 - \Phi_2|| \leq 0.15$  rad; average polar angle of two tracks  $[\Theta_1 + (\pi - \Theta_2)]/2$  should be between 1 and  $(\pi - 1)$  rad.

The energy deposition of these events in calorimeters was used to separate  $e^+e^-$  particles and determine their number. Thus, the integrated luminosity can be determined by the selected Bhabha events by the standard way.

Events of the process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  were also used to determine the integrated luminosity. To do that neutral collinear events were selected according to the following criteria: back-to-back clusters in the barrel calorimeters; no tracks in DC coming from the interaction point of the beams and no hits are in Z-chamber sectors associated with clusters. It is obvious the luminosity, determined by  $\gamma\gamma$  events, has absolutely different systematic. The ratio of the relative difference of the luminosities is presented in Fig. 2.2.1, where only statistical errors are shown. The empty circles correspond to the scan up, whereas full circles - scan down. The horizontal line is a fit for this ratio for the scan down. In this case the relative difference between luminosities is in average smaller than 1%. However, at the beginning of the run the difference was about  $\sim 5\%$  and explained by hardware problems and the quality of intercalibration of the detector subsystems. Collecting all the main sources which contribute to




Figure 2.2.2: The ratio of the relative difference of the luminosities vs beam energy.

systematic error we estimate its accuracy as  $\sim 2\%$ . At energies 0.36 - 0.65 GeV momentum resolution of the DC enough to separate  $e/\mu/\pi$  events. As it is shown in Fig. 2.2.2 the relative difference is about  $(-1 \pm 0.5)\%$ . In future runs we plan to have statistical error at the level 0.1% - 0.2% and directly check the Monte Carlo Generator Photon Jets [2] with radiative corrections with the similar accuracy.

This work is supported in part by the Russian Education and Science Ministry, by FEDERAL TARGET PROGRAM "Scientific and scientific-pedagogical personnel of innovative Russia in 2009-2013", by agreement 14.B37.21.07777, by the Russian Fund for Basic Research grant RFBR 10-02-00695-a, RFBR 10-02-00253-a, RFBR 11-02-00328-a, RFBR 11-02-00112-a, RFBR 12-02-31501-a, RFBR 12-02-31499-a, RFBR 12-02-31498-a, and RFBR 12-02-01032-a.

## References

- [1] S.Eidelman *et al.*, EPJ **C71**, 1597 (2011)
- [2] A.Arbutov *et al.*, EPJ **C46**, 689 (2006)

## 2.3 A combined estimate of the KLOE08, KLOE10 and KLOE12 ISR measurements

S. E. Müller

Institute of Radiation Physics, Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, Germany

The KLOE experiment at the Frascati  $\phi$ -factory DAΦNE has published 4 data sets for the cross section of the process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  below 1 GeV [1, 2, 3, 4]. Since the use of the KLOE05 [1] data set in high precision applications is disfavoured due to a possible inconsistency in the trigger evaluation, the KLOE08 [2] data set is considered to supersede the KLOE05 data. In the following, a combined estimate is constructed from the 3 remaining data sets KLOE08 [2], KLOE10 [3] and KLOE12 [4] and their covariance matrices [5].

Based on the method of the *best linear unbiased estimator* (BLUE) [6, 7], from the 195 data points in total [8] a best estimate is found for the 85 observables (corresponding to the 85 bins of 0.01 GeV<sup>2</sup> binwidth between 0.10 and 0.95 GeV<sup>2</sup>). Due to a possible bias in the presence of normalization errors [9], special care needs to be devoted to the construction of the (195 × 195) covariance matrix for the 195 input data points. A way out is to split the covariance matrix in 2 parts: A statistical covariance matrix that is used to construct the BLUE values, and a systematic covariance matrix that contains the normalization errors and is propagated properly a posteriori to the (85 × 85) covariance matrix of the best estimates.

Using the best linear unbiased estimates and their covariance matrix obtained in this way, an evaluation of the dispersion integral for  $\Delta a_\mu^{\pi\pi}$  yields

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\pi\pi}[0.10 - 0.95\text{GeV}^2] = (488.6 \pm 5.7) \times 10^{-10} \quad (1)$$

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\pi\pi}[0.35 - 0.85\text{GeV}^2] = (378.9 \pm 2.8) \times 10^{-10} \quad (2)$$

This can be compared to the results obtained using a combination of the KLOE08 and KLOE10 only [10], in which one obtains

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\pi\pi}[0.10 - 0.95\text{GeV}^2] = (488.6 \pm 6.0) \times 10^{-10} \quad (3)$$

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\pi\pi}[0.35 - 0.85\text{GeV}^2] = (379.1 \pm 2.9) \times 10^{-10} \quad (4)$$

As can be seen, the addition of the KLOE12 data does not change too much. This can be explained with the fact that the only additional independent contribution comes from the  $\mu\mu\gamma$ -spectrum used in the KLOE12 analyses. This spectrum is statistically limited compared to the  $\pi\pi\gamma$ -spectra, and therefore does not influence much the BLUE values.

As a final step, one can update the correction for vacuum polarization used in the published values of the KLOE08 and KLOE10 data sets from the `alphaQED03` to the `alphaQED12` software package [11], because the `alphaQED03` package shows some discrepancy when compared to more recent evaluations for the vacuum polarization correction [12]. Then constructing the BLUE values and evaluating  $\Delta a_\mu^{\pi\pi}$  gives the values

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\pi\pi}[0.10 - 0.95\text{GeV}^2] = (487.8 \pm 5.7) \times 10^{-10} \quad (5)$$

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\pi\pi}[0.35 - 0.85\text{GeV}^2] = (378.1 \pm 2.8) \times 10^{-10}, \quad (6)$$

a change by  $0.7 - 0.8 \times 10^{-10}$ , consistent with what was found in [10].

The author wishes to thank the organizers of the “PHIPSI13 - International Workshop on e+e- collisions from Phi to Psi 2013” for support.

## References

- [1] A. Aloisio *et al.* [KLOE Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **606**, 12 (2005) [hep-ex/0407048].
- [2] F. Ambrosino *et al.* [KLOE Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **670**, 285 (2009) [arXiv:0809.3950 [hep-ex]].
- [3] F. Ambrosino *et al.* [KLOE Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **700**, 102 (2011) [arXiv:1006.5313 [hep-ex]].
- [4] D. Babusci *et al.* [KLOE Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **720**, 336 (2013) [arXiv:1212.4524 [hep-ex]].
- [5] P. Masjuan, G. Venanzoni, H. Czyż, A. Denig, M. Vanderhaeghen *et al.*, arXiv:1306.2045 [hep-ph].
- [6] L. Lyons, D. Gibaut and P. Clifford, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **270** (1988) 110.
- [7] A. Valassi, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **500** (2003) 391.
- [8] Data tables and covariance matrices:  
<http://www.lnf.infn.it/kloe/ppg>.
- [9] G. D’Agostini, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **346**, 306 (1994).
- [10] KLOE public note 225:  
[http://www.lnf.infn.it/kloe/ppg/ppg\\_2010/kn225.pdf](http://www.lnf.infn.it/kloe/ppg/ppg_2010/kn225.pdf).
- [11] Vacuum polarization values provided by F. Jegerlehner:  
<http://www-com.physik.hu-berlin.de/~fjeger/alphaQED.tar.gz>.
- [12] S. Actis *et al.* [Working Group on Radiative Corrections and Monte Carlo Generators for Low Energies Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **66** (2010) 585 [arXiv:0912.0749 [hep-ph]].

## 2.4 Hadronic light-by-light scattering in the muon $g - 2$ : current status, open problems and impact of form factor measurements

A. Nyffeler

Regional Centre for Accelerator-based Particle Physics, Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhusi, Allahabad - 211019, India; nyffeler@hri.res.in

The hadronic light-by-light (HLbL) scattering contribution to the muon  $g - 2$  involves the Green function of four electromagnetic currents, connected to off-shell photons, see Ref. [1] for details and early references. In contrast to the hadronic vacuum polarization (HVP) contribution, it cannot be directly related to experimental data and therefore various hadronic models have been used to estimate HLbL. But the dependence on several momenta leads to a mixing of long and short distances and makes it difficult to avoid a double counting of quark-gluon and hadronic contributions. In Ref. [2] a classification of the different contributions to HLbL based on the chiral and large- $N_c$  counting was proposed. At leading chiral order, but subleading in  $N_c$ , appears a charged pion-loop. Leading in  $N_c$ , but subleading in the chiral counting, are the exchanges of the light pseudoscalars  $\pi^0, \eta, \eta'$ . Also leading in  $N_c$ , but more suppressed in the chiral counting, are the exchanges of other resonance states (axial-vectors, scalars) and a quark-loop, representing the short-distance complement of the low-energy hadronic models. In general, all the interactions of the hadrons or quarks with the photons are dressed by some form factors, e.g. via  $\rho - \gamma$  mixing.

A selection of estimates for HLbL is presented in Table 2.4.1. Note that only Refs. [3, 4] are full calculations, using, as much as possible, one model for all the contributions (ENJL in [3], HLS in [4]). The compilations [7, 8, 1] are based on these full calculations, with revised or newly calculated values for some of the contributions. More estimates, mostly for the pseudoscalar contribution, can be found in Ref. [12]. While most evaluations agree at the level of 15%, if one takes the extreme values, there is a spread of  $a_\mu^{\text{HLbL;PS}} = (59 - 107) \times 10^{-11}$ .

Until 2010, a consensus had been reached about the central value  $a_\mu^{\text{HLbL}} = 110 \times 10^{-11}$ , but there was a discussion on how to estimate the error, more progressively,  $\pm 26 \times 10^{-11}$ , in Ref. [8] and more conservatively,  $\pm 40 \times 10^{-11}$ , in Ref. [1]. In view of the precision goal of future  $g - 2$  experiments at Fermilab and J-PARC [13] with  $\delta a_\mu = 16 \times 10^{-11}$  and the continued progress in improving the error in HVP, the HLbL contribution might soon be the main uncertainty in the theory prediction, if it cannot be brought under better control.

In the last few years, several works have appeared which yield much larger (absolute) values for some of the contributions, see Table 2.4.1. In Ref. [9] the quark-loop was studied using a Dyson-Schwinger equation approach. In contrast to Refs. [3, 4], no damping compared to the bare constituent quark-loop result was seen, when a dressing was included. Note that this calculation of the quark-loop is not yet complete. The large size of the quark-loop contribution in Ref. [9] was questioned in the papers [14], using different quark-models and approaches. The pion-loop contribution was analyzed in Ref. [10]. The authors stressed the importance of the pion-polarizability effect and the role of the axial-vector resonance

$\pi, K$ -loops	$\pi^0, \eta, \eta'$	axial-vectors	scalars	quark-loop	Total	Reference
-19(13)	85(13)	2.5(1.0)	-6.8(2.0)	21(3)	83(32)	[3]
-4.5(8.1)	82.7(6.4)	1.7(1.7)	-	9.7(11.1)	89.6(15.4)	[4]
-	83(12)	-	-	-	80(40)	[5]
0(10)	114(10)	22(5)	-	0	136(25)	[6]
-	-	-	-	-	110(40)	[7]
-19(19)	114(13)	15(10)	-7(7)	2.3 [c-quark]	105(26)	[8]
-19(13)	99(16)	22(5)	-7(2)	21(3)	116(40)	[1]
-	81(2)	-	-	107(2)	188(4)	[9]
-(11 - 71)	-	-	-	-	-	[10]
-20(5)	-	-	-	-	-	[11]
-45	$+\infty$	-	-	60	-	undressed

Table 2.4.1: Summary of selected estimates for the different contributions to  $a_\mu^{\text{HLbL}} \times 10^{11}$ . For comparison, the last line shows some results when no form factors are used.

$a_1$ , which are not included in the models used in Refs. [3, 4]. Depending on the value of the pion-polarizability and the model for the  $a_1$  used, a large variation was seen. The issue was taken up in Ref. [11] where different models for the pion-loop were studied. The inclusion of the  $a_1$  was attempted, but no finite result for  $g - 2$  could be achieved. With a cutoff of 1 GeV, a result close to the earlier estimate in Ref. [3] was obtained.

Concerning the future, maybe lattice QCD will provide a reliable calculation of HLbL at some point (see Ref. [15] for some promising recent results), but in the meantime only a close collaboration between theory and experiment can lead to a better controlled estimate for HLbL. From the theory side, the hadronic models can be improved by short-distance constraints from perturbative QCD to have a better matching at high momenta. Also the issue about whether the dressing of the bare constituent quark-loop leads to a suppression or an enhancement needs to be studied further.

From the experimental side, the information on various processes (decays, form factors, cross-sections) of hadrons interacting with photons at low and intermediate momenta,  $|q| \leq 2$  GeV, can help to constrain the models. Important experiments which should be pursued include more precise measurements of the (transition) form factors of light pseudoscalars with possibly two off-shell photons in the process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-P$  ( $P = \pi^0, \eta, \eta'$ ) and the two-photon decay widths of these mesons. This could further reduce the error of the dominant pseudoscalar exchange contribution [16]. Concerning the pion-loop contribution, in addition to studying  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ , measurements of the pion-polarizability in various processes, e.g. in radiative pion decay  $\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+\nu_e\gamma$ , in radiative pion photoproduction  $\gamma p \rightarrow \gamma'\pi^+n$  or with the hadronic Primakoff effect  $\pi A \rightarrow \pi'\gamma A$  or  $\gamma A \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-A$  (with some nucleus  $A$ ), should help to improve the models [10]. For the development of models with  $a_1$  and estimates of the sizable axial-vector contribution, information about the decays  $a_1 \rightarrow \rho\pi, \pi\gamma$  would be useful as well. To extract the needed quantities from experiment will also require the development of dedicated Monte-Carlo programs for the relevant processes.

If the recent results for the quark-loop and pion-loop are taken at face value, one obtains the range  $a_\mu^{\text{HLbL}} = (64 - 202) \times 10^{-11}$ . While the new approaches raise some important issues and point to potential shortcomings in the previously used models, these estimates are also

still preliminary and further studies are needed. The estimate  $a_{\mu}^{\text{HLbL}} = (116 \pm 40) \times 10^{-11}$  from Ref. [1] therefore still seems to give a fair description of the current situation.

The author wishes to thank the organizers of the Working Group on Radiative Corrections and Generators for Low Energy Hadronic Cross Section and Luminosity, as well as the Heinrich-Greinacher-Stiftung, Physics Institute, University of Bern, Switzerland, for support. He is also grateful for the kind hospitality at the Albert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Bern, Switzerland.

## References

- [1] F. Jegerlehner, A. Nyffeler, Phys. Rept. **477**, 1 (2009); A. Nyffeler, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 073012 (2009).
- [2] E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett. B **322**, 239 (1994).
- [3] J. Bijnens, E. Pallante, J. Prades, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1447 (1995) [Erratum-ibid. **75**, 3781 (1995)]; Nucl. Phys. B **474**, 379 (1996); **626**, 410 (2002).
- [4] M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita, A.I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 790 (1995); Phys. Rev. D **54**, 3137 (1996); M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 465 (1998) [Erratum-ibid. D **66**, 019902 (2002)].
- [5] M. Knecht, A. Nyffeler, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 073034 (2002).
- [6] K. Melnikov, A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 113006 (2004).
- [7] J. Bijnens, J. Prades, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **22**, 767 (2007); J. P. Miller, E. de Rafael, B.L. Roberts, Rep. Prog. Phys. **70**, 795 (2007).
- [8] J. Prades, E. de Rafael, A. Vainshtein, arXiv:0901.0306.
- [9] T. Goecke, C.S. Fischer, R. Williams, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 094006 (2011) [Erratum-ibid. D **86**, 099901 (2012)]; Phys. Rev. D **87**, 034013 (2013).
- [10] K.T. Engel, H.H. Patel, M.J. Ramsey-Musolf, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 037502 (2012); K.T. Engel, Ph.D. thesis, May 2013; K.T. Engel, M.J. Ramsey-Musolf, arXiv:1309.2225.
- [11] M. Zahiri Abyaneh, arXiv:1208.2554; J. Bijnens, M. Zahiri Abyaneh, EPJ Web Conf. **37**, 01007 (2012) [arXiv:1208.3548]; Talk by J. Bijnens at MesonNet 2013 International Workshop, Prague, June 2013 [see: arXiv:1308.2575].
- [12] A. E. Dorokhov, W. Broniowski, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 073011 (2008); A.E. Dorokhov, A.E. Radzhabov, A.S. Zhevlakov, Eur. Phys. J. C **71**, 1702 (2011); **72**, 2227 (2012) and talk by A.E. Radzhabov at PHIPSI13, Rome, September 2013; D.K. Hong, D. Kim, Phys. Lett. B **680**, 480 (2009); L. Cappiello, O. Cata, G. D'Ambrosio, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 093006 (2011); K. Kampf, J. Novotny, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 014036 (2011); P. Masjuan, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 094021 (2012); R. Escribano, P. Masjuan, P. Sanchez-Puertas, arXiv:1307.2061.
- [13] Talks by S. Maxfield and K. Ishida at PHIPSI13, Rome, September 2013.
- [14] R. Boughezal, K. Melnikov, Phys. Lett. B **704**, 193 (2011); D. Greynat, E. de Rafael, JHEP **07** (2012) 020; P. Masjuan, M. Vanderhaeghen, arXiv:1212.0357.

- [15] T. Blum, M. Hayakawa, T. Izubuchi, PoS (Lattice 2012) 022 (2012) [arXiv:1301.2607] and references therein; updated at Lattice 2013 (private communication by T. Blum).
- [16] D. Babusci et al., Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1917 (2012).

## 2.5 Are $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \ell^+ \ell^- \nu_\tau$ decays within discovery reach in near future?

P. Roig

Instituto de Física, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,  
AP 20-364, México D.F. 01000, México

These decays [1] remain yet undetected, although being the crossed channels of the  $\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- e^+ e^- \nu_l$  decays, measured some time ago. These processes probe the  $W^* - \gamma^* - \pi$  vertex, with both gauge bosons off-shell and complement the  $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma \nu_\tau$  and  $\pi^- \rightarrow \ell^- \gamma \nu_l$  decays, which are sensitive to the  $W^* - \gamma - \pi$  vertex. Its knowledge in the full kinematical regime is important for testing QCD predictions, computing the radiative corrections to the non-photon processes and in the evaluation of the hadronic light-by-light contribution to the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon (through the vector part of the weak current). Hadronic tau decays are a powerful tool to extrapolate between the known chiral and asymptotic regimes.

The examined decays span different energy regions according to the virtualities of the exchanged  $W$  and  $\gamma$ . For low momentum transfers, Chiral Perturbation Theory is the effective field theory of QCD and determines the behavior of the form factors in the so-called chiral limit. At larger energies the associated expansion breaks down but  $1/N_C$  has proved to be an adequate alternative expansion parameter to enlarge the domain of applicability up to  $M_\tau$ . Resonance Chiral Theory [2] is a convenient realization of these ideas for the light-flavored mesons that we have employed. It is built upon the known chiral symmetry breaking and discrete symmetries of QCD and unitary symmetry for the resonances without any ad-hoc dynamical assumption. Although it yields an infinite number of states at leading order, the  $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \nu_\tau \ell^+ \ell^-$  decays damp completely the contribution of excited resonances erasing any dependence on the realization of the spectrum made by an infinite tower of resonances. We have also included the leading next-order correction, given by the energy-dependent off-shell widths [3].

These decays are generated by making the photon in the one-pion radiative tau decays virtual, then it converts into a lepton pair. Consequently, analogous contributions are obtained: inner bremsstrahlung off the tau, off the pion or from the local  $W\gamma\pi$  vertex and model dependent parts with the hadronization of the (axial-)vector current. The different interference terms are non-vanishing and sizable, in general. The hadronic form factors depend on the photon off-shellness and on the product of the photon and pion momenta. A vanishing diagram for on-shell photon [4] contributes in this case, being proportional to the isovector part of the di-pion vector form factor, for which a dispersive representation [5] describing successfully data was adopted.

Hadronic form factors must satisfy QCD short-distance behavior, which implies relations among the Lagrangian couplings that are in agreement with previous results [2, 4, 5, 6] and we can predict the phenomenology of these decays. A conservative variation of one fifth was allowed on these relations in order to estimate the error of the high-energy constraints

[7]. The branching ratio of the  $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \nu_\tau \ell^+ \ell^-$  decays ( $\ell = e, \mu$ ) are  $(1.7_{-0.3}^{+1.1}) \cdot 10^{-5}$  ( $e$ ) and  $[3 \cdot 10^{-7}, 1 \cdot 10^{-5}]$  ( $\mu$ ). According to these results the  $\ell = e$  decays should be discovered soon at Belle-II or at the Italian or Russian  $\tau - c$  factories. On the contrary, this is not guaranteed for the  $\ell = \mu$  decays which would deserve a dedicated search in any case at near-future facilities.

Structure-dependent effects amount to  $\sim 15\%$  and  $\sim 92\%$  of the decay width for ( $\ell = e, \mu$ ), respectively. The dominance of the model-dependent part in the di-muon case results in much larger quoted errors. In Ref. [1] we analyze in detail the normalized di-lepton invariant mass distribution in both cases. The inner-bremsstrahlung contribution dominates in either case up to  $\sim 0.1 \text{ GeV}^2$  where the axial-vector contribution overtakes it. This causes a change in the slope of the curve that can be easily measured even with very few events. In case a fine binning and enough statistics are achieved, the  $\rho(770)$  contribution (through the  $I = 1$  pion vector form factor) will show up as a prominent peak.

These matrix elements will be coded in the new TAUOLA hadronic currents [8]. The present study is also relevant for better characterizing the associated background for lepton flavour violating searches [9] in the  $\tau^- \rightarrow \mu^- \ell^+ \ell^-$  process.

I thank the WG organizers for their excellent job. This work has been partially funded by Conacyt and DGAPA. The support of project PAPIIT IN106913 is also acknowledged.

## References

- [1] P. Roig, A. Guevara and G. López Castro, Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) 033007.
- [2] G. Ecker *et. al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **321** (1989) 311; Phys. Lett. B **223** (1989) 425. V. Cirigliano *et. al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **753** (2006) 139. K. Kampf and J. Novotny, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 014036.
- [3] D. Gómez Dumm, A. Pich and J. Portolés, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 054014.
- [4] Z. -H. Guo and P. Roig, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 113016.
- [5] D. Gomez Dumm and P. Roig, Eur. Phys. J. C (2013) 73: 2528.
- [6] P. D. Ruiz-Femenía, A. Pich and J. Portolés, JHEP **0307** (2003) 003. D. Gómez Dumm, A. Pich and J. Portolés, Phys. Rev. D **69** (2004) 073002. D. G. Dumm, P. Roig, A. Pich and J. Portolés, Phys. Rev. D **81** (2010) 034031; Phys. Lett. B **685** (2010) 158. D. G. Dumm and P. Roig, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 076009. R. Escribano, S. González-Solís and P. Roig, arXiv:1307.7908 [hep-ph], JHEP. P. Roig, arXiv:1307.8277 [hep-ph].
- [7] P. Roig *et. al.*, AIP Conf. Proc. **1492** (2012) 57.
- [8] O. Shekhovtsova, T. Przedzinski, P. Roig and Z. Was, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 113008. I. M. Nugent, T. Przedzinski, P. Roig, O. Shekhovtsova and Z. Was, arXiv:1310.1053 [hep-ph].
- [9] Z. -H. Guo and P. Roig, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **218** (2011) 122.

## 2.6 The tau decay in three pions in Resonance Chiral Theory. Status of analysis

O. Shekhovtsova <sup>2</sup>

Institute of Nuclear Physics, PAN, Kraków, ul. Radzikowskiego 152, Poland

In our paper [1] we described an upgrade of the Monte Carlo generator TAUOLA using the results of the Resonance Chiral Lagrangian ( $R\chi L$ ) for the  $\tau$  lepton decay into the most important two and three meson channels. The necessary theoretical concepts were collected, numerical tests of the implementations were completed and documented. Finally, we presented strategy for fitting experimental data and calculated the systematic uncertainties associated with the experimental measurement. However, there was and remain until now, an obvious limitation due to the fact that we are using one-dimensional projections of the invariant masses of a multi-dimensional distribution. The first comparison [2] of the  $R\chi L$  results for the  $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$  mode with the BaBar data [3], did not demonstrate a satisfactory agreement for the two pion invariant mass distributions. With the recent availability of the unfolded distributions for all invariant masses constructed from observable decay products for this channel [3], we found ourselves in an excellent position to work on model improvement for the  $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$  mode. The choice of this channel is motivated by its relatively large branching ratio, availability of unfolded experimental distribution and already non-trivial dynamics of three-pion final state. In addition, this channel is important for Higgs spin-parity studies through the associated di- $\tau$  decays.

The  $R\chi L$  is devised for ordinary  $q\bar{q}$  resonances. As the  $\sigma$  meson is, predominantly, a tetraquark state, it cannot be included in the  $R\chi L$  formalism. We have decided to incorporate the  $\sigma$  meson as an extension of the phenomenological approach used by the CLEO collaboration [4]. The fit values of the parameters used in our new model to BaBar data [3] are collected in Table 2.6.1. The goodness of fit is quantified by  $\chi^2/ndf = 6658/401$ ; that is eight times better than the previous result [2].

We also have estimated the effects of the electromagnetic interaction among the final-state pions. The Coulomb interaction can be important near the production threshold. We use the far-field approximation; the final-state pions are treated as stable point-like objects and the three pion interaction is treated as a superposition of the two pion ones. To estimate the Coulomb interaction in S-wave we can apply the results of Section 94 of Ref. [6] and consequently neglect P-wave Coulomb interaction among the final-state pions as the precision studies of the P-wave two pion form factors does not require to include the Coulomb interaction. Taking into account the Coulomb interaction (when the  $\sigma$  contribution is not included) we obtain a  $\chi^2/ndf = 33225/401$ . Therefore, the Coulomb interaction without the  $\sigma$  contribution cannot describe the data in the low-energy region. For the details of fitting procedure and discussion on the numerical value of parameters, see [7].

The author acknowledges that the final step of this project is financed, in part, by Foundation of Polish Science, grant POMOST/2013-7/12. POMOST Programme is co-financed from European Union, Regional Development Fund.

---

<sup>2</sup>In collaboration with I. M. Nugent, T. Przedziński, P. Roig and Z. Wąs

	$M_\rho$	$M_{\rho'}$	$\Gamma_{\rho'}$	$M_{a_1}$	$M_\sigma$	$\Gamma_\sigma$	$F$	$F_V$
Min	0.767	1.35	0.30	0.99	0.400	0.400	0.088	0.11
Max	0.780	1.50	0.50	1.25	0.550	0.700	0.094	0.25
Fit	0.771849	1.350000	0.448379	1.091865	0.487512	0.700000	0.091337	0.168652
	$F_A$	$\beta_{\rho'}$	$\alpha_\sigma$	$\beta_\sigma$	$\gamma_\sigma$	$\delta_\sigma$	$R_\sigma$	
Min	0.1	-0.37	-10.	-10.	-10.	-10.	-10.	
Max	0.2	-0.17	10.	10.	10.	10.	10.	
Fit	0.131425	-0.318551	-8.795938	9.763701	1.264263	0.656762	1.866913	

Table 2.6.1: Numerical ranges of the  $R\chi L$  parameters used to fit the BaBar data for three pion mode [3].




Figure 2.6.1: The differential decay width of the  $\tau^- \rightarrow \pi^- \pi^- \pi^+ \nu_\tau$  channel is plotted versus the invariant mass distribution of the three-pion system and two-pion pair systems. The BaBar measurements [3] are represented by the data points, with the results from the  $R\chi L$  current as described in the text (blue line) and the old tune from CLEO from Refs. [5] (red-dashed line) overlaid. At the bottom of the figure, ratio of new  $R\chi L$  prediction to the data is given.

## References

- [1] O. Shekhovtsova, T. Przedzinski, P. Roig, and Z. Was, *Phys.Rev.* **D86** (2012) 113008, arXiv:1203.3955.
- [2] O. Shekhovtsova, I. Nugent, T. Przedzinski, P. Roig, and Z. Was, arXiv:1301.1964.
- [3] I. M. Nugent, arXiv:1301.7105.
- [4] CLEO Collaboration Collaboration, D. Asner *et al.*, *Phys.Rev.* **D61** (2000) 012002, arXiv:hep-ex/9902022.
- [5] N. Davidson, G. Nanava, T. Przedzinski, E. Richter-Was, and Z. Was, *Comput.Phys.Commun.* **183** (2012) 821, arXiv:1002.0543.
- [6] L. D. Landau, V. B. Berestetskii, E. M. Lifshitz, and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Relativistic quantum theory*. Course Theor. Phys. Pergamon, Oxford, 1971. Trans. from the Russian.
- [7] I. Nugent, T. Przedzinski, P. Roig, O. Shekhovtsova, and Z. Was, arXiv:1310.1053.

## 2.7 How to bring the error of the VP contributions down and how the WG could contribute in this important task?

T. Teubner

Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, U.K.

At the PhiPsi13 conference several talks have covered the latest developments for  $g-2$  of the muon in detail, and especially the hadronic vacuum polarisation (VP) contributions which still have the biggest error of all Standard Model contributions. Here we highlight issues which will need to be resolved in order to reduce the uncertainty of the VP contributions significantly as required by the new  $g-2$  experiments.

1. While more hadronic cross section measurements have increased the accuracy of the prediction in general, data combinations in the most important  $\pi^+\pi^-$  channel show an increasing tension between different data sets based on the energy scan and Radiative Return methods. For example, HLMNT [1] get (in units of  $10^{-10}$ )  $a_\mu^{\pi\pi, \text{w/out RadRet}} = 498.7 \pm 3.3$  for the two pion contribution from direct scan data only, whereas  $a_\mu^{\pi\pi, \text{with RadRet}} = 504.2 \pm 3.0$  when the data from Radiative Return are included, which is a significant shift of +5.5 units. This pull-up is mainly a consequence of the BaBar data [2], and the tension between the various sets prohibits a further shrinking of the error as would have been expected given the quality of the individual sets. The latest  $\pi\pi(\gamma)$  analysis from KLOE [3] confirms the earlier measurements and will not significantly alter the picture once fully included, see also [4]. With more data in this channel expected from the Novosibirsk experiments, KLOE-2 and possibly BESIII, the situation will hopefully improve, but at the same time a better understanding why the existing data are only marginally consistent would be highly desirable. The combined expertise within the Working Group on data analysis, Monte Carlo simulations, radiative corrections and Radiative Return may allow to gain the required insights.

At PhiPsi13 Maurice Benayoun presented results for the hadronic contributions to  $g-2$ , combining  $e^+e^-$  and  $\tau$  spectral function data and using combined fits based on a Hidden Local Symmetry (HLS) model, see [5, 6]. He quoted significantly smaller hadronic contributions resulting in a discrepancy of up to  $\sim 5\sigma$ , depending on the details of the analysis. While this seems to be incompatible with the numbers from HLMNT, it is worth to note that his number for the direct estimate, i.e. without the HLS model fit and using only direct scan data, is very close to the corresponding number from HLMNT given above. However, performing the HLS fit (and including the  $\tau$  data) leads to downwards shift,  $-4.3$  units, and even bigger when the Radiative Return data from KLOE are included. (They are not using the BaBar data as they are incompatible in their fit.) These three different shifts taken together explain the large difference in the quoted total numbers (and sigmas) between HLMNT and Benayoun *et al.*

2. In the  $K^+K^-$  channel the latest data from BaBar [7] lead to a significant shift upwards. These data are, certainly close to the  $\phi$  resonance, inconsistent with earlier measurements from SND and CMD2. BaBar also obtains a different mass in their resonance fit, which may

hint at an explanation of this puzzle. While  $K^+K^-$  is a subleading channel, such details must be clarified to achieve the best possible combination and the smallest error for the  $g-2$  prediction.

3. The sum of the many (subleading) channels at energies below/around 2 GeV is actually fairly consistent with the predictions from perturbative QCD. Many more data are becoming available and the Working Group should play a major role in pushing for the most relevant analyses. Manpower (or the lack of it) is a problem across the experiments, and any additional funding for PostDoctoral researchers would be highly welcome.

4. The hadronic VP contributions as predicted by various groups contain additional errors due to uncertainties in the treatment of radiative corrections applied to some of the data sets. For HLMNT this error is about  $2 \cdot 10^{-10}$ . Further efforts, combining theoretical with experimental expertise, should be made to re-address this problem. First studies at Liverpool indicate that this should allow to reduce the additional error substantially.

Tackling these issues will be important to decrease the error of the SM prediction of  $g-2$  by a factor of two, and the Working Group may become instrumental for this aim. For the VP contributions, a first step could be the creation of a ‘commented database’ of the required hadronic cross section, with clear additional information and recommendations w.r.t. the reliability of data sets, their systematic errors and the treatment of radiative corrections. Such a database could be supported by the PDG group at the IPPP Durham and could form a well-defined project for a future funding application of the Working Group.

## References

- [1] K. Hagiwara, R. Liao, A.D. Martin, D. Nomura and T. Teubner, J. Phys. G **38** (2011) 085003 [arXiv:1105.3149 [hep-ph]].
- [2] B. Aubert *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **103** (2009) 231801 [arXiv:0908.3589 [hep-ex]].
- [3] D. Babusci *et al.* [KLOE Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **720** (2013) 336 [arXiv:1212.4524 [hep-ex]].
- [4] Talk of S. Müller at the Working Group meeting (see also Sec. 2.3).
- [5] Talk of M. Benayoun at PhiPsi13.
- [6] M. Benayoun, P. David, L. DelBuono and F. Jegerlehner, Eur. Phys. J. C **73** (2013) 2453 [arXiv:1210.7184 [hep-ph]].
- [7] J.P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **88** (2013) 032013 [arXiv:1306.3600 [hep-ex]].

### 3 List of participants

- D. Babusci, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, `daniilo.babusci@lnf.infn.it`
- E. Baldin, Novosibirsk State University, `e.m.baldin@inp.nsk.su`
- J. Crnkovic, University of Washington, `jcrnkovi@uw.edu`
- H. Czyż, University of Silesia, `henryk.czyz@us.edu.pl`
- A. Denig, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, `denig@kph.uni-mainz.de`
- T. Dimova, NSU/BINP, `baiert@inp.nsk.su`
- V. Druzhinin, NSU/BINP, `druzhinin@inp.nsk.su`
- S. Eidelman, Novosibirsk State University, `eidelman@mail.cern.ch`
- G. Fedotov, Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, `fedotov@inp.nsk.su`
- S. Ivashyn, NSC/KIPT, `s.ivashyn@gmail.com`
- B. Kubis, Bonn University, `kubis@hiskp.uni-bonn.de`
- A. Kupsc, Uppsala University, `Andrzej.Kupsc@physics.uu.se`
- I. Logashenko, Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, `ivan.logashenko@gmail.com`
- X. Mo, Institute of High Energy Physics Beijing & CAS, `moxh@ihep.ac.cn`
- S. E. Müller, Helmholtz-Zentrum Dresden-Rossendorf, `stefan.mueller@hzdr.de`
- A. Nyffeler, Harish-Chandra Research Institute, `nyffeler@hri.res.in`
- S. Raspopov, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, `razserg@mail.ru`
- P. Roig, Instituto de Física UNAM, `proig@ifae.es`
- S. Serednyakov, Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, `seredn@inp.nsk.su`
- O. Shekhovtsova, Institute of Nuclear Physics Cracow, `olga.shekhovtsova@ifj.edu.pl`
- B. Schwartz, Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, `schwartz@inp.nsk.su`
- E. Solodov, Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, `E.P.Solodov@inp.nsk.su`
- T. Teubner, University of Liverpool, `thomas.teubner@liverpool.ac.uk`
- G. Venanzoni, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, `Graziano.Venanzoni@lnf.infn.it`
- P. Wang, IHEP Beijing & CAS, `wangp@ihep.ac.cn`
- C. Z. Yuan, IHEP Beijing, `yuancz@ihep.ac.cn`