Light- avor sea-quark distributions in the nucleon in the SU (3) chiral quark soliton model (I) | phenom enological predictions |

M . W akam atsu

Department of Physics, Faculty of Science,

O saka University,

Toyonaka, Osaka 560, JAPAN

Abstract

Theoretical predictions are given for the light- avor sea-quark distributions in the nucleon including the strange quark ones on the basis of the avor SU (3) version of the chiral quark soliton m odel. Careful account is taken of the SU (3) sym m etry breaking e ects due to the m ass di erence m s between the strange and nonstrange quarks, which is the only one parameter necessary for the avor SU (3) generalization of the model. A particular emphasis of study is put on the light- avor sea-quark asymmetry as exemplied by the observables d(x)u(x) d(x) = u(x); u(x)d(x) as well as on the particle-antiparticle asymmetry of the strange quark distributions represented by s(x) etc. As for the unpolarized sea-quark distributions, the pres(x); s(x) = s(x); s(x)s(x) dictions of the model seem qualitatively consistent with the available phenom enological inform ation provided by the NMC data ford (x) u (x), the E 866 data ford (x)=u(x), the CCFR data and B arone et al.'s t for s(x) = s(x) etc. The model is shown to give several unique predictions also for the spin-dependent sea-quark distribution, such that s(x)s(x) < 0 and d(x) < 0 < u(x), although the veri cation of these predictions must await more elaborate experim ental investigations in the near future.

I. IN TRODUCTION

As is widely known, the perturbative QCD can predict only the Q^2 -dependence of parton distribution functions (PDF), whereas it can say nothing about the PDF at a prescribed energy scale. To predict PDF them selves, we need to solve nonperturbative QCD, which is an extrem ely di cult theoretical problem. It cannot be denied that, at least at the present stage, we cannot be toom uch am bitious in this respect. Still, we can do qualitatively interesting investigations. The key observation here is the follow ing. In their sem i-phenom enological analyses of PDF, Gluck, Reya and Vogt prepared the initial PDF at fairly low energy scale around 600 M eV, in contrast to the standard consent of perturbative QCD, and they concluded that light-avor sea-quark (or antiquark) components are absolutely necessary even at this relatively low energy scale [1],[2]. Furtherm ore, even the avor asymmetry of the sea-quark distributions have been established by the celebrated NM C m easurem ent [3]. The origin of this sea-quark asymmetry seems de nitely nonperturbative, and cannot be explained by the sea-quarks radiatively generated through the perturbative QCD evolution processes. Here we certainly need some low energy (nonperturbative) mechanism which generates sea-quark distributions in the nucleon. In our opinion, the chiral quark soliton m odel (CQSM) is the simplest and most powerfule ective m odelofQCD, which fulls the above physical requirement [4] [9]. A though it may still be a toy model in the sense that the gluon degrees of freedom are only in plicitly handled, it has several nice features that are not shared by other e ective m odels like the M II bag m odel. Am ong others, m ost im portant in the above explained context is its eld theoretical nature, i.e. the proper account of the polarization of D irac sea quarks, which enables us to m ake reasonable estim ation not only of quark distributions but also of antiquark distributions [10]{ [13]. It has already been shown that, without introducing any adjustable parameter, except for the initial-energy scale of the Q²-evolution, the CQSM can describe nearly all the qualitatively noticeable features of the recent high-energy deep-inelastic scattering observables. It naturally explains the NMC observation, i.e. the excess of d-sea over the u-sea in the proton [12], [14] { [16], [17]. It also reproduces the characteristic features of the observed longitudinally polarized structure functions of the proton, the neutron and the deuteron [13], [18]. Even the most puzzling observation, i.e. the unexpectedly small quark spin fraction of the nucleon, can be explained at least qualitatively with no need of a large gluon polarization at the low renorm alization

scale [5], [19]. Finally, the model predicts a sizably large isospin asymmetry also for the spin-dependent sea-quark distributions, which we expect will be con med by near future experiments [10], [13], [18], [20].

The above-mentioned unique feature of the CQSM is believed to play important roles also in the study of hidden strange quark excitations in the nucleon, which entirely have non-valence character [21]. The main purpose of the present study is to give theoretical predictions for both of the unpolarized and the longitudinally polarized strange quark distributions in the nucleon, on the basis of the CQSM generalized to the case of avor SU(3). N aturally, because of fairly large m ass di erence between the strange and nonstrange quarks, the avor SU (3) symmetry is not so perfect symmetry as the avor SU (2) one is. We must take account of this sym m etry breaking e ects in som e way or other. Here, we shall accom plish it relying upon the rst order perturbation theory. It should be an phasized that, in our e ective theory at quark level, this e ective mass di erence m_s between the s-quark and the u;d-quarks is the only one additional parameter necessary for the avor SU (3) generalization of the CQSM. Through the study outlined above, we will be able to answer several interesting questions as follows. How important in nature is the admixture or the virtual excitation of s-s pairs in the nucleon, a system of total strange-quantum -num ber being zero? Does the asymmetry of the s-quark and s-quark distributions exist at all? If it exists, how large is it? Do we expect an appreciable particle antiparticle asymmetry also for the spindependent strange quark distribution? We also want to verify whether a favorable prediction of the avor SU (2) CQ SM, i.e. the excess of the d-sea over the u-sea in the proton, is taken over by the SU (3) model or not. W hat answer do we obtain for the isospin asymmetry of the spin dependent sea-quark distributions u(x) d(x) in the avor SU (3) CQ SM ?

In consideration of the length of the theoretical form ulation of the model, we think it m ore appropriate to organize the paper as follows. That is, for the bene t of readers who have interest only in the phenom enological consequences of the SU (3) CQ SM, we have the description of the full theoretical form alism to a separate paper. (This paper will hereafter be referred to as II.) Instead, we will give in next section a brief summary of what dynam ical assumptions the model is constructed on and what approximations are necessary there. Next, in sect.3, we compare the theoretical predictions of the model with available phenom enological information. We shall also give some discussions on the physical origin of the unique predictions of the model as to the light- avor sea-quark asymmetry. Finally, in

3

sect 4, som e concluding rem arks will m ade.

II. A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE MODEL

Since the avor SU (3) CQ SM is constructed on the basis of the avor SU (2) model, we rst recall some basics of the SU (2) CQ SM. It is specified by the elective Lagrangian [4],

$$L = (x) (iQ M U^{5}(x)) (x):$$
 (1)

with

$$U^{5}(x) = e^{i_{5}(x)=f};$$
 (x) = a(x) a (a = 1; ;3) (2)

which describes the e ective quark elds with a dynamically generated mass M, interacting with massless pions. The nucleon (or) in this model appears as a rotational state of a symmetry-breaking hedgehog object, which itself is obtained as a solution of the self-consistent Hartree problem with in nitely many Dirac-sea quarks [4],[5]. The theory is not renormalizable, and it is dened with an ultraviolet cuto. In the Pauli-Villars regularization scheme, which is used throughout the present analysis, that which plays the role of the ultraviolet cuto is the Pauli-Villars mass M _{PV} obeying the relation $(N_cM^2=4^2) \ln (M_{PV}=M)^2 = f^2$ with f the pion weak decay constant [10]. Using the value M ' 375M eV, which is obtained from the phenomenology of nucleon low energy observables, this relation xes the Pauli-Villars mass as M _{PV} ' 562M eV. Since we are to use these values of M and M _{PV}, there is no free parameter additionally introduced into the calculation of distribution functions [18].

The basic lagrangian of the SU (3) CQSM is given as

$$L = (x) (i \Theta M U^{5} (x) m_{s} P_{s}) (x):$$
(3)

with

$$U^{5}(x) = e^{i_{5}(x)=f};$$
 (x) = _a(x) _a (a = 1; ;8) (4)

and

$$m_{s}P_{s} = m_{s} \frac{1}{3} \frac{1}{p_{\overline{3}}} = B_{e}^{s} = B_{e}^{0} \frac{0}{0} \frac{0}{0} C_{c}^{c} C_$$

0

1

It is a straightforward generalization of the SU (2) model [22], [23], except for one in portant new feature, i.e. the existence of SU (3) symmetry breaking term due to the sizably large mass di erence m_s between the strange and nonstrange quarks. This mass di erence m_s is the only one additional parameter necessary for the avor SU (3) generalization of the CQSM.

Now, the fundam ental dynam ical assumption of the SU (3) CQSM is as follows. The rst is the embedding of the SU (2) self-consistent mean-eld (of hedgehog shape) into the SU (3) matrix as $0 \qquad 1$

$$U_{0}^{5}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ B & e^{i_{5}} & \hat{T}F(\mathbf{x}) & 0 \\ 0 & A \end{bmatrix} ;$$
 (6)

just analogous to the SU (3) Skyrm em odel [24], [25]. The next assumption is the sem iclassical quantization of the rotational motion in the SU (3) collective coordinate space represented as

$$U^{5}(x;t) = A(t)U_{0}^{5}(x)A^{Y}(t);$$
 (7)

with

A (t) =
$$e^{it}$$
; = $\frac{1}{2}$ a 2 SU (3): (8)

The sem iclassical quantization of this collective rotation leads to a system atic method of calculation of any nucleon observables, including the parton distribution functions, which is given as a perturbative series in the collective angular velocity operator . (We recall that this reduces to a kind of $1=N_c$ expansion, since itself is an order $1=N_c$ quantity.) In the present study, all the terms up to the rst order in are consistently taken into account, basically according to the path integral form alism explained in [13]. Unfortunately, in the evaluation of the O (¹) contribution to the parton distribution function, we sometimes encounter ordering ambiguity of the collective space operators $[26]{[34]}$. In the case of avor SU (2) CQSM, this ordering ambiguity of two collective operators is known to be avoided by adopting the tim e-order-preserving collective quantization procedure, which leads to the resolution of the long-standing g_A problem inherent in the soliton model based on the classical hedgehog con guration [26], [27]. However, it was pointed out that there exists som e inconsistency between this particular quantization procedure and the basic dynam ical fram ework of the SU (3) CQSM, i.e. the embedding of the SU (2) hedgehog mean-eld into the SU (3) matrix followed by the subsequent quantization of the rotational motion in the full SU (3) collective coordinate space [34]. Here, we avoid this problem simply following

the symmetry preserving approach advocated in [34]. The more detailed discussion of this delicate problem will be given in Π .

A nother in portant feature of the m odel lagrangian is the existence of sizably large SU (3) breaking term. We assume that the SU (3) symmetry breaking elects can be estimated by using the inst order perturbation theory in the parameter m $_{\rm s}$. In fact, its perturbative treatment would be justified (though not completely), since the electrive mass difference m $_{\rm s}$ of the order of 100 M eV is much smaller than the typical energy scale of them odel, which m ay be specified by the Pauli-V illars cuto mass around 600 M eV. In the present investigation, we are to take account of three possible SU (3) breaking corrections in a consistent way, which are all inst order in the mass parameter m $_{\rm s}$. The simultaneous account of these corrections is shown to be essential for maintaining the quark number sum rules for the unpolarized distribution functions. The detail will again be explained in II.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The basic lagrangian of the model contains three physical parameters, the weak pion decay constant f, the dynamically generated e ective quark massM, and the mass dierence m s between the strange and nonstrange quarks. As usual, f is xed to be its physical value, i.e. $f = 93 \text{ M eV} \cdot 0$ n the other hand, M is taken to be 375 M eV, which is the same value as used in our previous analysis of the nucleon spin structure functions within the frame work of the avor SU (2) CQ SM [13]. As a consequence, only one parameter remains in the SU (3) CQ SM : it is m s, i.e. the e ective mass dierence between the strange and nonstrange quarks. In the present analysis, we have tried to vary this parameter within the physically reasonable range, i.e. $60 \text{ M eV} < \text{ m}_{s} < 170 \text{ M eV}$, and found that overall success of the theory is obtained for the value of m s around 100 M eV. All the following analyses are thus carried out by using the value m $_{s} = 100 \text{ M eV}$.

The model contains ultraviolet divergences so that it must be regularized by introducing som e physical cuto . Follow ing the previous studies, we use the Pauli-V illars regularization scheme. In this scheme, any nucleon observables including quark distribution functions in the nucleon are regularized through the subtraction:

$$\text{bo i}^{\text{reg}} \quad \text{bo i}^{\text{M}} \quad \frac{M}{M_{PV}}^{2} \text{bo i}^{M_{PV}} : \tag{9}$$

Here hO i^{M} denotes the nucleon m atrix element of an operator O evaluated with the original e ective action with the mass parameter M, while hO $i^{M_{PV}}$ stands for the corresponding m atrix element obtained from hO i^{M} by replacing the parameter M with the Pauli-V illars cuto mass M_{PV}. We emphasize that the Pauli-V illars mass M_{PV} is not an adjustable parameter of the model. Demanding that the regularized action reproduces the correct normalization of pion kinetic term in the corresponding bosonized action, M_{PV} is uniquely xed by the relation

$$\frac{N_{c}}{4^{2}}M^{2}\log\frac{M_{PV}^{2}}{M^{2}} = f :$$
 (10)

For M = 375 MeV, this gives M_{PV} ' 562 MeV.

Several additional comments are in order for the regularization scheme explained above. First, in the present investigation, the regularization speci ed by (9) is introduced into all the observables, including those related to the imaginary part of the Euclidean action. This is in contrast to some authors' claim that the imaginary action should not be regularized [23], [35]. The ground of their assertion is that the imaginary part of the Euclidean action is ultraviolet nite and that the introduction of regularization would destroy conservation laws of some fundamental quantities like the baryon number and/or the quark numbers. It would be true if one uses the energy cuto scheme like the proper-time regularization scheme. If fact, the proper-time regularization scheme is known to lead a violation of baryonnumber conservation law at the level of 3%. This is not the case for the Pauli-Villars regularization scheme, however. The baryon-number is just intact in this regularization scheme. Generally speaking, the introduction of regularization would give some e ects on the quark distribution functions even though the fundam ental conservation laws are intact. Since what we are handling is not a renorm alizable theory but an elective theory, a di erent choice of regularization scheme leads to a di erent e ective theory. We can say that our e ective theory is de ned with the above-explained regularization prescription.

Secondly, as was shown in Ref. [36], the Pauli-V illars scheme with a single subtraction term is not a completely satisfactory regularization procedure. It fails to remove ultraviolet divergences of some special quantities like the vacuum quark condensate, which contains quadratic divergence instead of logarithm ic one. For obtaining nite answers also for these special observables, the single-subtraction Pauli-V illars scheme is not enough. It was shown that more sophisticated Pauli-V illars scheme with two subtraction terms meets

7

this requirement [36]. Fortunately, the self-consistent solution of the CQ SM obtained in this double-subtraction Pauli-V illars scheme is only slightly dierent from that of the naive single-subtraction scheme, except when dealing with some special quantities containing quadratic divergences [36]. Considering the fact that the calculation of quark distribution functions in the CQ SM is extremely time-consuming and that the most nucleon observables are rather insensitive to which regularization scheme is chosen, we shall simply use here the single-subtraction Pauli-V illars scheme except for one special quantity to be just mentioned. It is the quantity de ned in Eq.(206) of II, i.e. the scalar charge of the nucleon. This parameter, appearing in the representation mixing m_s correction to the quark distribution functions, contains a quadratic divergence that can be regularized only by using the double-subtraction Pauli-V illars scheme except for one special quantity is not so far from the canonical value ' 7:5, which is obtained from the analysis of the pion-nucleon sigm a term [37], we shall simply use this value in the present study.

To compare the predictions of the CQ SM with the existing high energy data, we must take account of the scale dependencies of the quark distribution functions. This is done by using the Fortran codes provided by Saga group [38],[39],[40] which enable us to solve the DGLAP equations at the next-to-leading order. The initial energy of this scale evolution is xed to be the value $Q^2 = 0.30 \text{ GeV}^2$ throughout the whole investigation. Strictly speaking, it is a serious question how much meaning one can give to starting the QCD evolution at such low energy as Q^2 ' (600M eV)², even though it is just motivated by a similar sem iphenom enological prescription by G luck, R eya and Vogt [1]. Furtherm ore, any precise statem ent about the model energy scale, where the Q^2 -evolution of the theoretical PDF should be started, is hard to give at our present understanding of the elective theory within the full QCD framework. (W orthy of specialm ention here is an interesting challenge to this di cult problem [41].) One should then keep in m ind theoretical uncertainties introduced by such a sem iphenom enological prescription.

Generally, the theoretical distribution functions obtained in the CQSM have unphysical tails beyond x = 1, although they are very small in magnitude. These unphysical tails of the theoretical distributions come from an approximate nature of our treatment of the soliton center-of-mass motion, which is essentially nonrelativistic. Since the Fortran programs of Saga group require that the distribution functions must vanish exactly for x 1, we in-

8

troduce a x-dependent cuto factor $(1 \ x^{10})$ into all the theoretical distribution functions prepared at the model energy scale before substituted into the DGLAP equations. One can however con rm from Fig. 13 of Ref. [13] that the introduction of this cuto factor hardly modiles the original distributions except for their tail behavior near and beyond x = 1.



FIG.1: Six basic functions necessary for obtaining unpolarized distribution functions within the SU (3) CQSM with m $_{\rm s}$ corrections. Here, the solid and dashed curves respectively stand for the contributions of N $_{\rm c}$ valence quarks and those of D irac-sea quarks.

Now we are ready to show the results of the numerical calculations. Fig. 1 shows six basic functions necessary for evaluating unpolarized distribution functions. Here, the rst three functions $k_0(x)$; $k_1(x)$ and $k_2(x)$ appear in the leading $O(^0 + ^1)$ contributions, while the remaining three functions $\tilde{K}_0(x)$; $\tilde{K}_2(x)$ and $\tilde{K}_2(x)$ are contained in the SU (3) breaking corrections to the unpolarized distribution functions. In all the gures, the solid and dashed curves represent the contributions of the N_c valence quarks and those of the D irac-sea quarks. (W e recall that the term inology \valence quark" above should not be confused with the corresponding term in the quark-parton m odel. The valence quarks in the CQ SM denote

quarks occupying the particular bound-state orbital, which emerges from the positive-energy D irac continuum under the in uence of the background pion eld of hedgehog shape. Note however that the valence quark distribution in the sense of quark-parton model is easily obtained, as a di erence of quark and antiquark distributions evaluated in the CQSM. One clearly sees that the elects of D irac-sea quarks, or equivalently the vacuum polarization elects, are very important in all the basic distribution functions shown in Fig. 1. One can also convince that the above-mentioned unphysical tails of the distribution functions beyond x = 1 are really very small and of little practical importance.



FIG.2: The unpolarized distribution functions with respective avors. The distribution functions in the negative x region should actually be interpreted as the antiquark distributions according to the rule q(x) = q(x) with 0 < x < 1.

By using these basic functions, we can calculate any unpolarized distribution function with a speci ed avor. Shown in Fig.2 are the theoretical unpolarized distribution functions corresponding to three light avors u;d and s. Remember that a distribution functions in the negative x region are interpreted as antiquark distributions according to the rule q(x) = q(x) with 0 < x < 1. The fam iliar positivity constraint for the unpolarized quark and antiquark distributions means that q(x) > 0 for 0 < x < 1, while q(x) < 0 for

1 < x < 0. One clearly sees that our theoretical calculation legitimately satisfies this general constraint for the PDF.One can understand that this is not a trivial result, if one remembers the fact that the previous calculations by Tubingen group carried out in the so-called "valence-quark-only" approximation violate this general constraint in an intolerable way [42]. This proves our assertion that the proper account of the vacuum polarization contributions is vital to give any reliable predictions for the sea-quark distributions.



FIG. 3: Six basic functions necessary for evaluating longitudinally polarized distribution functions within the SU (3) CQSM with m $_{\rm S}$ corrections. The curves have the same meanings as in Fig. 1.

Next, in Fig. 3, we show six basic functions necessary for evaluating longitudinally polarized distribution functions. (Here, only the combination of g(x) and h(x) is shown, since it is this combination that enters the theoretical expression of physical distribution functions.) The rst three functions g(x) + h(x); e(x) and s(x) appear in the leading 0 ($^{0} + ^{-1}$) term s, while the remaining three functions f'(x); e(x) and s(x) are contained in the SU (3) symmetry breaking corrections to the longitudinally polarized distribution functions. One again sees that the contributions of D irac-sea quarks have appreciable elects on the total distributions, although they are less signing cant than the case of the unpolarized distribution functions [43]. Among others, we point out that the function g(x) + h(x) receives appreciably large and positive vacuum polarization contributions in the negative (as well as the positive) x region. We shall discuss later that this leads to a sizable large isospin asymmetry for the longitudinally polarized sea-quark (antiquark) distribution functions.



FIG.4: The longitudinally polarized distribution functions with respective avors. The distribution functions with negative arguments should be interpreted as antiquark distributions according to the rule q(x) = q(x) with 0 < x < 1.

U sing the above basic functions, we can calculate the longitudinally polarized distribution functions with any avors. They are shown in Fig. 4. Here, the polarized distributions in the negative x region should be interpreted as the polarized antiquark ones according to the nule (5) of II, i.e. q(x) = q(x) with 0 < x < 1. From these gures, one can, for instance, read from these three gures that u(x) > 0; d(x) < 0, and s(x) < 0. More detailed discussion of this interesting predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM will be given later.



FIG.5: The theoretical predictions for the unpolarized s- and s-quark distributions at the model energy scale. The left gure is obtained without m $_{\rm s}$ corrections, while the right one is with the value of m $_{\rm s}$ = 100M eV.



FIG.6: The theoretical predictions for the longitudinally polarized s-and s-quark distributions at the model energy scale. The left gure shows the result obtained without m $_{\rm s}$ corrections, while the right one corresponds to the result obtained with m $_{\rm s} = 100$ MeV.

Shown in Fig. 5 are the nalpredictions of the SU (3) CQSM for the unpolarized s- and s-quark distributions at the model energy scale. The left panel shows the result obtained in the chiral limit, i.e. without SU (3) symmetry breaking e ects, while the right panel corresponds to the result obtained after introducing m_s corrections. One sees that the s-s asymmetry of the unpolarized distribution functions certainly exists. The di erence s(x) s(x) has some oscillatory behavior with several zeros as a function of x. This is of course due to the following two general constraints of the PDF : the positivity constraint for the unpolarized distributions and the strangeness quantum number conservations. Com paring the two gures, one also nds that s(x)s(x) is extremely sensitive to the SU (3) symmetry breaking e ects. Fig. 6 shows the theoretical predictions for the longitudinally polarized strange quark distributions. In the chiral lim it case, the s- and s-quarks are both negatively polarized, although the magnitude of s(x) is smaller than that of s(x). After introducing m s corrections, s(x) remains large and negative, while s(x) becomes very sm all although slightly negative.

To sum up, it is a denite conclusion of our theoretical analysis that the particleantiparticle asymmetry of the strange-quark excitation in the nucleon is most likely to exist. Furthermore, the magnitude of the asymmetry seems more profound for the longitudinally polarized distribution than for the unpolarized one relating the fact that, for the polarized



FIG. 7: The theoretical unpolarized distribution functions s(x) and s(x) at $Q^2 = 4 \text{ G eV}^2$ in comparison with the corresponding CCFR data obtained under the assumption s(x) = s(x) [44]. The left panel shows the result obtained without m_s corrections, whereas the right panel represents the one with m_s = 100 M eV².

one, there exists no conservation laws that prevents the generation of asymmetry. To understand the physical origin of these observations, it may be interesting to recall a simple argument of Brodsky and M a based on the light-cone meson baryon uctuation model [45]. (See also Ref. [46].) A coording to them, the intrinsic strangeness excitation in the proton is mainly due to the virtual K⁺ dissociation process. Because of parity conservation, the relative orbital angular momentum of this two particle system must be odd, most probably be p-wave state. U sing the C lebsh-G ordan decomposition of this p-wave state,

s ____

$$\mathbf{\check{K}}^{+} (\mathbf{J} = \frac{1}{2}; \mathbf{J}_{z} = \frac{1}{2})\mathbf{i} = \frac{3}{2}\mathbf{\check{L}} = 1; \mathbf{L}_{z} = 1\mathbf{i}\mathbf{\check{S}} = \frac{1}{2}; \mathbf{S}_{z} = \frac{1}{2})$$

$$s \frac{3}{2}\mathbf{\check{L}} = 1; \mathbf{L}_{z} = 0\mathbf{i}\mathbf{\check{S}} = \frac{1}{2}; \mathbf{S}_{z} = +\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{i}; \quad (11)$$

one easily nds that the average spin projection of in the proton is negative. Because the spin mostly comes from the s-quark in it, it then immediately follows that the s-quark in the proton is negatively polarized. The situation is entirely different for the s-quark. Since the s-quark is contained in K⁺ meson with zero spin, it follows that the net spin of s in K⁺ and consequently in proton is zero. Note that whole these arguments are qualitatively consistent with the predictions of the CQSM. This indicates that the kaon cloud elects are



FIG. 8: The theoretical unpolarized distribution functions s(x) and s(x) at $Q^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$ in comparison with the corresponding CCFR data [44]. The meanings of the curves are the same as in Fig. 7

autom atically taken into account by the collective rotation in the avor SU (3) space, a basic dynam ical assumption of the SU (3) CQSM .

Now we want to make some preliminary comparisons with the existing high-energy data for the strange quark distributions. Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 respectively shows the theoretical distributions evolved to $Q^2 = 4G \text{ eV}^2$ and $Q^2 = 20G \text{ eV}^2$ in comparison with the corresponding result of CCFR (NLO) analyses of the neutrino-induced charm production carried out with the assumption s(x) = s(x). In both gures, the solid and long-dashed curves represent the theoretical s- and s-quark distributions, while the left panel shows the predictions obtained with m_s = 0 and the right panel shows those obtained with m_s = 100M eV. As was intuitively anticipated, the SU (3) symmetry breaking elects considerably suppress the magnitude of s(x) and s(x) at the moderate range of x. The null theoretical predictions obtained with the m_s corrections appears to be qualitatively consistent with the CCFR data, although various uncertainties of the phenom enological data for s(x) and s(x) should not be forgotten.

Very recently, B arone et al. carried out quite elaborate global analysis of the D IS data, especially by using all the presently-available neutrino data also, and they obtained som e interesting inform ation even for the asym m etry of the s-and s-quark distributions [47]. Fig. 9



FIG. 9: The theoretical predictions for the di erence of s- and s-quark distributions at $Q^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$ in comparison with the corresponding result of Barone et al's global analysis including neutrino data [47]. Here, the solid and dashed curves respectively stand for the predictions of the SU (3) CQSM with and without m_s corrections.

shows the comparison with their t for the di erence s(x) = s(x) at $Q^2 = 20 \text{ eV}^2$. Here, the thin shaded area represent the phenom enologically favorable region for this di erence function obtained by Barone et al's global t. On the other hand, the solid and dashed curves are the predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM, respectively obtained with and without the m_s correction. One sees that, the di erence s(x) = s(x) is extremely sensitive to the SU (3) symmetry breaking e ects and that, after inclusion of it, the theory reproduces the qualitative tendency of the phenom enologically obtained behavior of s(x) = s(x) although not perfectly.

This tendency is more clearly seen in the ratio of s(x) and s(x) at $Q^2 = 20 \text{ eV}^2$. In Fig.10, the solid and dashed curves are the predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM with and without the m_s corrections, while the thin and thick shaded areas represent the phenom enologically favorable regions for this ratio, respectively obtained by the CCFR group and by Barone et al. One clearly sees that the observed tendency of this ratio is reproduced (at least qualitatively) only after including the SU (3) symmetry breaking e ects.



FIG.10: The theoretical predictions for the ratio of s- and s-quark distributions at $Q^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$ in comparison with the results of CCFR analysis [44] and of Barone et al's global t [47]. The m eaning of the curves are the same as in Fig.9

Now, turning to the spin-dependent distribution functions, the quality of the presently available sem i-inclusive data is rather poor, so that the analyses are mainly limited to the inclusive D IS data alone. (There exist som e combined analyses of inclusive and sem i-inclusive polarized D IS data [48], [49], [50].) This forces them to introduce several sim plifying assumptions in the ttings. For instance, m any previous analyses have used the apparently groundless assumption of a avor-symmetric polarized sea, i.e. u(x) = d(x) = s(x) [51]. A nother analysis assumed that $q_3(x) = c q_8(x)$ with c being a constant. Probably, the most ambitious analyses free from these ad hoc assumptions on the sea-quark distributions are those of Leader, Sidorov and Stam enov (LSS) [52]. (See also Ref. [53].) We recall that they also investigated the sensitivity of their t to the size of the SU (3) symmetry breaking e ect. (A lthough they did not take account of the possibility that $s(x) \in s(x)$, this simplication is harm less, because only the combination s(x) + s(x) appears in their analyses of D IS data.)

To compare the theoretical distributions of the SU (3) CQSM with the LSS ts given at

 $Q^2 = 1 \text{GeV}^2$, we must consider the fact that their analyses are carried out in the so-called JET scheme (or the chirally invariant factorization scheme). To take account of this, we start with the theoretical distribution functions u(x); u(x); d(x); d(x); s(x) and s(x), which are taken as the initial scale distribution functions given at $Q_{\text{ini}}^2 = 0.30 \text{GeV}^2$. Under the assumption that g(x) = 0 at this initial energy scale, we solve the DGLAP equation in the standard $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme with the gauge-invariant factorization scheme to obtain the distributions at $Q^2 = 1 \text{GeV}^2$. The corresponding distribution functions in the JET scheme are then obtained by the transform ation

$$(x Q^{2})_{JET} = (x Q^{2})_{MS} + \frac{s (Q^{2})}{MS} N_{f} (1 x) g (x Q^{2})_{MS};$$
 (12)

$$g(xQ^{2})_{JET} = g(xQ^{2})_{MS};$$
 (13)

 $(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{Q}^{2}) = \prod_{i=1}^{P_{N_{f}}} (q_{i}(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{Q}^{2}) + q_{i}(\mathbf{x} \mathbf{Q}^{2}))$ being the avor-singlet quark polarization. with Now we show in Fig.11 the theoretical distributions x (u(x)+u(x)); x (d(x)+u(x))d(x)), x(s(x) + s(x)) and g(x) at $Q^{2} = 1 \text{ GeV}^{2}$ in comparison with the corresponding LSS ts. The solid and dashed curves in these four gures are respectively the predictions of the SU (3) CQSM obtained with and without the m $_{\rm s}$ corrections. To estimate the sensitivity of the t to the SU (3) symmetry breaking e ects, Leader et al. performed their t by varying the value of axial charge a_8 from its SU (3) symmetric value 0.58 within the range 0.86. They found that the value of 2 -t to the presently available D IS data 0:40 a are practically insensitive to the variation of a_8 , which in turn means that a_8 cannot be determ ined from the existing D IS data. Consequently, the distributions x [u(x) + u(x)]d(x)] are insensitive to the SU (3) symmetry breaking e ects and can be and x [d(x) +determ ined with little uncertainties. This is also con m ed by our theoretical analysis. In Fig. 11 (a) and Fig. 11 (b), the solid and dashed curves are the predictions of the SU (3) CQSM for the distributions x[u(x) + u(x)] and x[d(x) +d(x)] respectively obtained with and without the m $_{\rm s}$ corrections. One con rm s that they are nearly degenerate and that they reproduce well the results of LSS t. On the other hand, the distributions of the strange quarks and the gluons are very sensitive to the variation of the axial charge a_8 , so that it brings about large uncertainties for these distributions in the LSS tas illustrated by the shaded regions in Fig. 11 (c) and Fig. 11 (d). The feature is again consistent with our theoretical analysis at least for the polarized strange-quark distributions. In fact, the SU (3) CQSM predicts that x [s(x) + s(x)] is large and negative but the m s correction reduces its magnitude by a factor of about 0:6.



FIG.11: The theoretical distribution functions (a) x (u(x) + u(x)), (b) x (d(x) + d(x)), (b) x (s(x) + s(x)), and (d) xg(x) at $Q^{-2} = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$, in comparison with the corresponding LSS ts in the JET scheme [52]. Here, the solid and dotted curves are the predictions of the SU (3) CQSM with and without m_s corrections, while the central t by LSS analyses are represented by the dash-dotted curves. The large uncertainties for the strange-quark distribution as well as the gluon distribution in the LSS ts are illustrated by the shaded areas.

A noteworthy feature of the theoretical predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM is that the negative polarization of strange sea comes almost solely from s(x), while s(x) is nearly zero. This is illustrated in Fig. 12. The predicted sizable particle antiparticle asymmetry of the polarized strange sea can be veried only by the near future experiments beyond the totally inclusive D IS scatterings such as the sem i-inclusive D IS processes, the neutrino reactions, etc.



FIG. 12: The theoretical prediction of the SU (3) CQSM for the separate contributions of s- and s-quarks to the longitudinally polarized distribution functions x[s(x)+s(x)] in comparison with the LSS t [52].

From the theoretical view point, it is interesting to see the particular linear combinations of the distributions u(x) + u(x); d(x) + d(x) and s(x) + s(x) given by

$$q_0(x) = u(x) + u(x) + d(x) + d(x) + s(x) + s(x);$$
 (14)

$$q_{3}(x) = u(x) + u(x) \quad d(x) \quad d(x);$$
 (15)

$$q_8(x) = u(x) + u(x) + d(x) + d(x) - 2[s(x) + s(x)]$$
: (16)

W e show in Fig. 13 (a) the predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM for these densities at $Q^2 = 1 \text{GeV}^2$ in the JET scheme. One clearly sees that $q_0(x)$ is negative in the smaller x region. One can also convince that the polarized strange quark densities given by

$$s(x) + s(x) = \frac{1}{3} [q_0(x) \quad q_8(x)];$$
 (17)

is certainly negative for all range of x. Of special interest here is the di erence or the ratio of $q_3(x)$ and $q_8(x)$, since, as already pointed out, som e previous phenom enological analyses assume $q_3(x) = q_8(x) = constant$ with no justi cation. The solid and dashed curves in



FIG.13: The avornonsinglet and single combinations of the longitudinally polarized distribution functions and their ratio at $Q^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ in the JET scheme : (a) $q_3(x)$; $q_8(x)$, and $q_0(x)$, and (b) $q_3(x) = q_8(x)$. In the right panel, the solid and dashed curves are the predictions of the SU (3) CQSM with and without m_s corrections, whereas the dash-dotted curve stands for the corresponding LSS t.

Fig. 13(b) are the predictions of the SU (3) CQSM for this ratio, respectively obtained with and without m_s corrections, while dash-dotted curves is the corresponding result of LSS t. A fler including the SU (3) sym m etry breaking e ects, one can say that the theory reproduces the qualitative behavior of the LSS t for this ratio.

Through the analyses so far, we have shown that the avor SU (3) CQ SM can give unique and interesting predictions for both of the unpolarized and the longitudinally polarized strange quark distributions in the nucleon, all of which seems to be qualitatively consistent with the existing phenom enological inform ation for strange quark distributions. A natural question here is whether or not it is realistic enough as the avor SU (2) CQ SM has been proved so. (W e recall that the SU (2) CQ SM reproduces alm ost all the qualitatively noticeable features of the presently available D IS data.) W hich is more realistic m odel of the nucleon, the SU (2) CQ SM or the SU (3) one? Naturally, at least concerning one particular aspect, i.e. the problem of hidden strange-quark excitations in the nucleon, the SU (3) m odel is superior to the SU (2) m odel, since the strange quark excitations in the nucleon can be treated only in the form erm odel. The question is then reduced to which m odel gives m ore realistic descriptions for the u;d-avordom inated observables, which have been the objects of studies of the SU (2) CQSM. To answer this question, we try to reanalyze several interesting observables, which we have investigated before in the SU (2) CQSM, here within the fram ework of the avor SU (3) CQSM.



FIG.14: The theoretical predictions for the proton, neutron, and deuteron spin structure functions $g_1^p(x); g_1^n(x)$, and $g_1^d(x)$ at $Q^2 = 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ in comparison with the corresponding SLAC and SMC data. The solid and dashed curves in these gures respectively stand for the predictions of the SU (3) CQSM and those of the SU (2) CQSM. The black circles in (a) and (b) are the E143 [54] and the E154 data [55], while the diam onds, the circles and the squares in (c) represent the E143 [54], the E155 [56] and the SMC data [57].

At this opportunity, the calculation in the SU (2) model were redone, because there is a little change in the theoretical treatment of the O (1) contribution to the longitudinally

polarized distribution functions as was explained in the previous section. First, in Fig. 14, we show the theoretical predictions of the SU (3) and SU (2) CQSM for the longitudinally polarized structure functions of the proton, the neutron and the deuteron in comparison with the corresponding EMC and SMC data at $Q^2 = 5G eV^2$. Here, the solid and dashed curves are the predictions of the SU (3) and SU (2) CQSM, respectively. The black circles in Fig. 14 (a) are E 143 data, whereas those in Fig. 14 (b) are E 154 data [55]. On the other hand, the black circles, white circles and white squares in Fig. 14 (c) and Fig. 14 (d) correspond to the E143 [54], E155 [56] and SM C data [57], respectively. Comparing the predictions of the two versions of the CQSM, one notices two features. First, the magnitudes of $g_1^p(x)$ and g_1^n (x) are reduced a little when going from the SU (2) model to the SU (3) one. As we will discuss shortly, this feature can be understood as a reduction of the isovector axial charge in the SU (3) CQ SM . A nother feature is that the sm all x behavior of the deuteron structure function (the avor singlet one) becomes slightly worse in the SU (3) model. (This is due to the SU (3) symmetry breaking e ects.) These di erences between the predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM and the SU (2) one are very sm all, how ever. Considering the qualitative nature of our model as an e ective low energy theory of QCD, we may be allowed to say that both m odels reproduces the experim ental data fairly well.

As mentioned above, the reduction of the magnitudes of $g_1^p(x)$ and $g_1^n(x)$ in the SU (3) CQSM can be traced back to the change of the isovector charge, which is related to the rst moment of $g_1^p(x)$ $q^q(x)$. We show in Table 1 the predictions of the SU (3) and SU (2) CQSM for the avor nonsinglet as well as avor singlet axial charges, the quark polarization of each avor de ned as $q = {R_1 \atop 0} [q(x) + q(x)] dx$, in comparison with some phenom enological information. One sees that, aside from the addition of the strange quark degrees of freedom, a main change when going from the SU (3) model to the SU (2) one is a decrease of isovector axial charge $g_A^{(3)}$, while the avor singlet axial charge $g_A^{(0)}$ is alm ost unchanged. Corresponding to this reduction of $g_A^{(3)}$, the magnitudes of u and d are both reduced a little. A lso shown in this table is the fundam ental coupling constants F and G in the avor SU (3) scheme as well as their ratio. They are all qualitatively consistent with the phenom enological information. Interestingly, the predicted ratio F=D is very close to that of the naive SU (6) model, i.e. 3=5, even though such dynam ical symmetry is not far from being justi ed in our theoretical fram ework.

Next, we go back to the spin-independent observables. The solid and dashed curves

TABLE I: The predictions of the SU (3) and SU (2) CQ SM for the axial charges, the quark polarization q ${}^{R_1}_{0}$ [q(x) + q(x)]dx of each avor, and the basic coupling constant of SU (3), in comparison with phenom enological information. Here, the experimental values for $g_A^{(3)}$; $g_A^{(8)}$; F; D and F=D are from [58], while u; d; s and g ${}^{(0)}_{A}$ corresponds to the values at Q² = 10 G eV² given in [59].

	SU (2) CQSM	SU (3) CQSM	E xperin ent	
g _A ⁽³⁾	1.41	1.20	1,257	0.016
g _A ⁽⁸⁾		0.59	0.579	0.031
g _A ⁽⁰⁾	0.35	0.36	0.31	0.07
u	0.88	0.82	0.82	0.03
d	-0.53	-0.38	-0.44	0.03
S	0	-0.08	-0.11	0.03
F		0.45	0.459	800.0
D		0.76	0.798	0.008
F=D		0.59	0.575	0.016

in Fig. 15 (a) stand for the predictions of the SU (3) and SU (2) CQSM for the di erence $F_2^{p}(x) = F_2^{n}(x)$ of the proton and neutron structure function $F_2(x)$, in comparison with the corresponding NMC data at $Q^2 = 4 \text{G eV}^2$. One the other hand, the solid and dashed curves in Fig. 15 (b) are the predictions of the SU (3) and SU (2) CQSM for the ratio $F_2^{n}(x) = F_2^{p}(x)$ in comparison with the NMC data. One con rm s that these di erence and the ratio functions are rather insensitive to the avor SU (3) generalization of the model and that the success of the SU (2) CQSM is basically taken over by the SU (3) m odel.

In Fig. 16, the theoretical predictions of both m odels for the sea-quark distribution d(x)u (x) is compared with the corresponding E 866 data at $Q^2 = 54 \text{GeV}^2$ [61] and with HERMES data at $Q^2 = 4 \text{GeV}^2$ [60], for reference. The isospin asymmetry of the sea-quark distributions or the magnitude of d(x) u (x) turns out to become a little smaller in the SU (3) m odel than in the SU (2) m odel, although the change is fairly small.

Next, in Fig. 17, the theoretical predictions for the ratio d(x)=u(x) at $Q^2 = 30 \text{ GeV}^2$ are



FIG. 15: The theoretical predictions of the two versions of the CQSM for $F_2^{p}(x) = F_2^{n}(x)$ and $F_2^{n}(x) = F_2^{p}(x)$ at $Q^{2} = 4 \text{ GeV}^{2}$ are compared with the NMC data given at the corresponding energy scale [3].

com pared with the corresponding E 866 data as well as the old NA 51 data. This ratio turns out to be a little sensitive to the avor SU (3) generalization of the model. It is found that the SU (3) version of the CQ SM well reproduces the qualitative tendency of the E 866 data for this ratio, although the magnitude itself is a little overestim ated. To reveal the reason of this overestim ation, it may be interesting to compare the magnitudes of quark and antiquark distributions them selves. Shown in Fig. 19 are the predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM for the unpolarized quark and antiquark distribution functions with each avor at $Q^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$. O f special interest here are the magnitudes of u (x); d (x) and s (x). The model predicts that

$$d(x) > s(x) > u(x);$$
 (18)

while the standard MRST [64] or CTEQ t [65] says that

$$d(x) > u(x) > s(x)$$
: (19)

Undoubtedly, the magnitudes of u-distribution as compared with the other two avors seem s to be underestimated a little too much by some reason.

As repeatedly emphasized, a quite unique feature of the SU (2) CQSM is that it predicts sizably large isospin asymmetry not only for the unpolarized sea-quark distributions but



FIG.16: The theoretical predictions of the SU (3) and SU (2) CQSM for the unpolarized antiquark distribution d(x) u(x) at $Q^2 = 54 \text{ GeV}^2$ in comparison with the HERMES [60] and E866 data [61].

also for the longitudinally polarized ones. A natural question is what the predictions of the avor SU (3) CQ SM is like. We have already shown that the predictions of these two models are not largely diment for the isospin asymmetry of the unpolarized seas, for instance, for d(x) u(x). To con m it again but here in comparison with the case of polarized distributions, we show in Fig. 18 the theoretical predictions for d(x) u(x) evaluated at $Q^2 = 0.88 \text{GeV}^2$ in comparison with Bhalerao's sem itheoretical prediction for reference [63]. The solid and dashed-dotted curves in Fig. 18 (a) are the predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM obtained with and without the m s corrections, while the dotted curve is the prediction of the SU (2) CQ SM . We recall that Bhalerao's prediction shown by the dotted curve is obtained based on what-he-call the statistical quark model, which is based on some statistical assumptions on the parton distributions while introducing several experimental information. A s one can see, all the four curves are more or less degenerate and they are all qualitatively consistent with the magnitude of isospin asymmetry of d-sea and u-sea observed by the NMC



FIG.17: The theoretical predictions of the SU (3) and SU (2) CQSM for the ratio d(x)=u(x) in the proton as a function of x in comparison with the result of E 866 analysis [61]. Also shown is the result from NA51 [62], plotted as an open box.

m easurem ent. On the other hand, Fig. 18 (b) shows the sim ilar analysis for the longitudinally polarized sea-quark distributions u(x) d(x). The meaning of the curves are all similar as in Fig. 18(a). One nds that the magnitude of u(x)d(x) is fairly sensitive to the avor SU (3) generalization of the CQSM, or more precisely, to the di erence between the dynam ical assumptions of the two models. (This provides us with one of the few exceptions to our earlier statem ent that u;d- avor dom inated observables are generally insensitive to it.) The sign of u(x) d(x) remains de nitely positive but its magnitude is reduced by nearly a factor of 2 when going from the SU (2) model to the SU (3) model the chiral $\lim it (m_s = 0)$. As was conjectured in [21], the inclusion of the SU (3) symmetry breaking corrections partially cancels this reduction and works to pull back the prediction of the SU (3) m odel toward that of the SU (2) m odel. Still, the nalprediction of the SU (3) CQ SM is fairly sm all as compared with that of the SU (2) one although it is not extrem ely far from the prediction of Bhalerao's statistical model [63].



FIG. 18: The isospin asymmetries of the light- avor sea-quark distribution functions evaluated at $Q^2 = 0.88 \text{ GeV}^2$ in the standard $\overline{\text{M S}}$ factorization schemew ith gauge invariant regularization. The left gure shows the unpolarized distribution x[d(x) - u(x)], while the right gure represents the longitudinally polarized one x[-u(x) - d(x)]. In both gures, the solid and dash-dotted curves are the predictions of the SU (3) CQSM with and without m_s corrections, whereas the dotted curves are those of the SU (2) CQSM. Bhalerao's sem itheoretical predictions are also shown for comparison [63].

O nem ay be also interested in the signs and the relative order of the absolute m agnitudes of u(x); d(x) and s(x) them selves. We show in Fig. 20 the theoretical predictions of the SU (3) CQSM for the longitudinally polarized quark and antiquark distributions with each avor at the energy scale of Q² = 0.88 G eV^2 . In addition to that the model reproduces the well-established fact u(x) > 0 and d(x) < 0, it also predicts that u(x) > 0; d(x) < 0 and s(x) < 0 with

$$j d(x)j > ju(x)j > js(x)j;$$
 (20)

We point out that these predictions of the SU (3) CQSM are qualitatively consistent with those of Bhalerao's statistical quark model except for the fact that he assumes s(x) = s(x), while the SU (3) CQSM indicates that

$$js(x)j js(x)j$$
; (21)

Sum m arizing the predictions of the two versions of the CQSM for the light- avor seaquark asymmetry, both turn out to give equally good explanation for the shape and m ag-



F IG. 19: The theoretical predictions of the SU (3) CQ SM for the unpolarized quark and antiquark distribution functions with each avor at the energy scale of Q² = 20 GeV^2 .



FIG. 20: The theoretical predictions of the SU (3) CQSM for the longitudinally polarized quark and antiquark distribution functions with each avor at the scale of Q² = 0.88 GeV^2 .

nitude of spin-independent distribution d(x) u(x). The situation is a little different for the longitudinally polarized sea-quark distributions. A lithough the sign of u(x) d(x) is

de nitely positive in both models, the SU (2) CQSM predicts that

$$j_{\mu}(x) \quad d(x)j < j_{\mu}(x) \quad d(x)j$$
(22)

while the SU (3) m odel gives

$$j_{\mu}(x) d(x)j' j_{\mu}(x) d(x)j;$$
 (23)

or ju(x) d(x) j is slightly small than $j_1(x) = d(x)$ j. Still, the sizably large isospin asymmetry of the spin-dependent sea-quark distributions is a common feature of the two versions of the CQ SM . (It is interesting to remember that large avor and spin asymmetry of the nucleon sea is also predicted by the instanton m odel [66], [67].) We think that this fact is worthy of special mention. The reason becomes clear if one compares the predictions of the CQSM with those of the naive meson cloud convolution model. As is widely known, the NM C observation d(x) = u(x) > 0 in the proton can be explained equally well by the CQ SM and by the meson cloud model [68], [69], [70]. A simple intuitive argument, however, indicates that the latter model would generally predict both of u(x) and d(x) is small. This is because the lightest meson, i.e. the pion has no spin and that the e ect of heavier meson is expected to be less in portant. A ctually, the situation seems a little m ore complicated. In a recent paper, K um ano and M iyam a estim ated the contribution of -m eson to the asym m etry d(x) and found that it is slightly negative [71]. On the other hand, Fries et al. u (x) argued that a large positive u(x)d(x), as obtained in the CQSM, can be obtained from N - N interference-type contributions in the meson cloud picture [72]. Undoubtedly, for drawing a de nite conclusion within the framework of the meson cloud model, more exhaustive studies of possibly important Feynm an diagram s are necessary. This should be contrasted with the prediction of the CQSM. Since there is little arbitrariness in its theoretical fram ework, its prediction once given is one and only in nature and cannot be easily modied. Both of the CQSM and the meson cloud convolution model give equally nice explanation for the novel isospin asymmetry for the unpolarized sea-quark distributions, so that one m ight have naively thought that they are two sim ilar m odels containing basically the same physics. In fact, a commonly important ingredients of the two models are the N am bu-G oldstone pions resulting from the spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking of QCD vacuum. How ever, a lesson learned from the above consideration of the isospin asymmetry for the spin-dependent sea-quark distributions is that it is not necessarily true. An interesting

question is what makes a marked di erence between these two models. In our opinion, it is a strong correlation between spin and isospin quantum numbers embedded in the basic dynam ical assumption of the CQSM, i.e. the hedgehog ansatz. We recall that we have long known one example in which the di erence of these two models makes more profound e ect [73], [74], [5], [19]. It is just the problem of quark spin fraction of the nucleon. Is there any simple and convincing explanation of this nucleon spin puzzle within the fram ework of the meson cloud model? The answer is no, to our know ledge. On the other hand, assuming that the dynam ical assumption of the CQSM is justiled in nature, it gives quite a natural answer to the question why the quark spin fraction of the nucleon is so small. In fact, according to this model, a nucleon is a bound state of quarks and antiquarks moving in the rotating mean-eld of hedgehog shape. Because of the collective rotational motion, it happens that a sizable amount (65%) of the total nucleon spin is carried by the orbital angular momentum of quark and antiquark elds. We conjecture that the cause of the simultaneous large violation of the isospin asymmetry for both the spin-independent and spin-dependent sea-quark distributions can also be traced back to the strong spin-isospin correlation generated by the form ation of the hedgehog m ean eld.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In sum mary, several theoretical predictions are given for the light- avor quark and antiquark distribution functions in the nucleon on the basis of the avor SU (3) CQ SM. Its basic lagrangian is a straightforward generalization of the corresponding SU (2) model except for the presence of sizably large SU (3) sym metry breaking term, which comes from the appreciable mass difference m_s between the s-quark and the u;d-quarks. A sexplained in the text, this SU (3) symmetry breaking e ect is treated by using a perturbation theory in the mass parameter m_s. We have shown that the SU (3) CQ SM can give several unique predictions for the strange and antistrange quark distributions in the nucleon while maintaining the success previously obtained in the avor SU (2) version of the CQ SM for u;d- avor dominated observables. For instance, it predicts a sizable amount of particle-antiparticle asymmetry for the strange-quark distributions. Its predictions for the distributions s(x) s(x) and s(x)=s(x) at Q² = 20 G eV² are shown to be consistent with the corresponding phenom enological inform ation given by Barone et al. and by CCFR group at least qualitatively. A s

expected, the magnitudes of s(x) and s(x) turn out to be very sensitive to the SU (3) sym metry breaking e ects. We showed that the theoretical predictions for xs(x) and xs(x) at $Q^2 = 4 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $Q^2 = 20 \text{ GeV}^2$ are qualitatively consistent with the CCFR data after taking account of the SU (3) sym m etry breaking e ects. The particle antiparticle asym m etry of the strange quark distributions are even m ore profound for the spin-dependent distributions than for the unpolarized distributions. Our theoretical analysis strongly indicates that the negative (spin) polarization of the strange quarks, i.e. the fact that s(x) + s(x) < 0, as suggested by the LSS t as well as m any other phenom enological analyses, com es alm ost solely from the s-quark and the polarization of s-quark is very sm all. The model gives interesting predictions also for the isospin asymmetry of the u-and d-quark distributions. We had already known that the avor SU (2) CQ SM gives a natural explanation of the NM C observation, i.e. the excess of d-sea over the u-sea in the proton. In the present investigation, we have con med that this favorable aspect of the SU (2) CQSM is just taken over by the SU (3) CQ SM and that they in fact give nearly the same predictions for the magnitude of the asymmetry $d(x) = u(x) \cdot 0$ n the other hand, we not that the predictions of the two models for the isospin asymmetry of the longitudinally polarized sea-quark distributions are a little dierent.Both models predicts that u(x) d(x) > 0, but the magnitude of asym metry is reduced by a factor of about 0.6 when going from the SU (2) model to the SU (3) one. Still, a sizably large isospin asymmetry of the spin-dependent sea-quark distributions is a common prediction of both versions of the CQSM, and it should be compared with the unsettled situation in the meson-cloud convolution models. In our opinion, the physical origin of the simultaneous violation of the isospin symmetry for the spin-independent and spindependent sea-quark distributions may be traced back to the strong correlation between spin and isospin embedded in the hedgehog symmetry of soliton solution expected to be realized in the large N_c limit of QCD. What should be emphasized here is another consequence of the hedgehog symmetry embedded in the CQSM. It has long been recognized that, according to this model, only about 35% of the total nucleon spin is due to the intrinsic quark spin and the remaining 65% is borne by the orbital angular momentum of quark and antiquark elds. We emphasize that this is a natural consequence of the nucleon picture of this model, i.e. \rotating hedgehog". Unfortunately, unresolved role of gluon elds, especially the role of U_A (1) anom aly makes it di cult to draw a de nite conclusion on this interesting but mysterious problem. In this respect, more thorough study of simpler problem, i.e. the possible

isospin asymmetry of longitudinally polarized sea-quark distributions may be of some help to test the validity of the basic idea of the soliton picture of the nucleon. At any rate, an important lesson learned from our whole analyses is that the spin and avor dependencies of antiquark distributions in the nucleon are very sensitive to the nonperturbative dynamics of Q C D . To reveal this interesting aspect of baryon structures, it is absolutely necessary to carry out avor and valence plus sea quark decom positions of the parton distribution functions. We hope that this expectation will soon be full led by various types of sem i-inclusive D IS scatterings as well as neutrino-induced reactions planned in the near future.

A cknow ledgm ents

This work is supported in part by a Grant-in-A id for Scienti c Research for M inistry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, Japan (No.C-12640267)

- [1] M.Gluck, E.Reya, and A.Vogt. Z.Phys., C 67:433, 1995.
- [2] M.Gluck, E.Reya, M. Stratmann, and W. Vogelsang. Phys. Rev., D 53:4775, 1996.
- [3] NM C Collaboration : P.Am audruz et al. Phys. Rev. Lett., 66:2712, 1991.
- [4] D.J.Diakonov, V.Yu. Petrov, and P.V. Pobylitsa. Nucl. Phys., B 306:809, 1988.
- [5] M.W akam atsu and H.Yoshiki. Nucl. Phys., A 524:561, 1991.
- [6] M.W akam atsu. Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl., 109:115, 1992.
- [7] Chr.V. Christov, A. Blotz, H.-C. Kim, P.V. Pobylitsa, T. Watabe, Th. Meissner, E. Ruiz Arriola, and K. Goeke. Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys., 37:91, 1996.
- [8] R.Alkofer, H.Reinhardt, and H.Weigel. Phys. Rep., 265:139, 1996.
- [9] D.J.D iakonov and V.Yu.Petrov. At the frontier of particle physics, Vol.1.NationalA cademy Press, 2001.
- [10] D.J. Diakonov, V.Yu. Petrov, P.V. Pobylitsa, M.V. Polyakov, and C.Weiss. Nucl. Phys., B480:341, 1996.
- [11] D.J. Diakonov, V.Yu. Petrov, P.V. Pobylitsa, M.V. Polyakov, and C. Weiss. Phys. Rev., D 56:4069, 1997.
- [12] M.W akam atsu and T.Kubota. Phys. Rev., D 56:4069, 1998.

- [13] M.W akam atsu and T.Kubota. Phys. Rev., D 60:034020, 1999.
- [14] M.W akam atsu. Phys. Rev., D 44 R 2631, 1991.
- [15] M.W akam atsu. Phys. Lett., B269:394, 1991.
- [16] M.W akam atsu. Phys. Rev., D 46:3762, 1992.
- [17] P.V. Pobylitsa, M.V. Polyakov, K.Goeke, T.W atabe, and C.W eiss. Phys. Rev., D 59:034024, 1999.
- [18] M.W akam atsu and T.W atabe. Phys. Rev., D 62:017506, 2000.
- [19] M.W akam atsu and T.W atabe. Phys. Rev., D 62:054009, 2000.
- [20] B.D ressler, K.Goeke, M.V.Polyakov, and C.W eiss. Eur. Phys. J., C14:147, 2000.
- [21] M.W akam atsu. Prog. Theor. Phys., 107:1037, 2002.
- [22] H.Weigel, R.Alkofer, and H.Reinhardt. Nucl. Phys., B 387:638, 1992.
- [23] A.B lotz, D.J.D iakonov, K.Goeke, N.W. Park, V.Yu.Petrov, and P.V. Pobylitsa. Nucl. Phys., A 555:765, 1993.
- [24] E.Guadanini. Nucl. Phys., B 336:35, 1984.
- [25] P.O. Mazur, M.A. Nowak, and M. Praszalowicz. Phys. Lett., 147B 137, 1984.
- [26] M.W akam atsu and T.W atabe. Phys. Lett., B 312:184, 1993.
- [27] Chr.V. Christov, A. Blotz, K. Goeke, P. Pobylitsa, V.Yu. Petrov, M. Wakamatsu, and T.Watabe. Phys. Lett., B325:467, 1994.
- [28] J. Schechter and H. Weigel. Mod. Phys. Lett., A 10:885, 1995.
- [29] J. Schechter and H > W eigel. Phys. Rev., D 51:6296, 1995.
- [30] M.W akam atsu. Phys. Lett., B 349:204, 1995.
- [31] M.W akam atsu. Prog. Theor. Phys., 95:143, 1996.
- [32] Chr.V.Christov, K.Goeke, and P.V.Pobylitsa. Phys. Rev., C 52:425, 1995.
- [33] R.A kofer and H.W eigel. Phys. Lett., B 319:1, 1993.
- [34] M. Praszalowicz, T. Watabe, and K. Goeke. Nucl. Phys., A 647:49, 1999.
- [35] H.Weigel, E.Ruiz Arriola, and L.Gamberg. Nucl. Phys., B 560:383, 1999.
- [36] T.Kubota, M.Wakamatsu, and T.Watabe. Phys. Rev., D 60:014016, 1999.
- [37] J.Gasser, H.Leutwyler, and M.E.Sainio. Phys. Lett., B253252, 1991.
- [38] M.M iyam a and S.K um ano. Com put. Phys. Com m un., 94:185, 1996.
- [39] M. Hirai, S. Kum ano, and M. Miyam a. Comput. Phys. Commun., 108:38, 1998.
- [40] M. Hirai, S Kum ano, and M. Miyam a. Comput. Phys. Commun., 111:150, 1998.

- [41] M. Burkardt, X. Ji, and F. Yuan. Phys. Lett., B545:345, 2002.
- [42] O.Schroder, H.Reinhardt, and H.Weigel. Nucl. Phys., A 651:174, 1999.
- [43] O.Schroder, H.Reinhardt, and H.Weigel. Phys. Lett., B439:398, 1998.
- [44] CCFR Collaboration : A. Bazarko et al. Z. Phys., C 65:189, 1995.
- [45] S.Brodsky and B.Ma. Phys. Lett., B381:317, 1996.
- [46] A J. Signal and A W . Thom as. Phys. Lett., B191:205, 1987.
- [47] V.Barone, C.Pascaud, and F.Zom er. Eur. Phys. J., C12:243, 2000.
- [48] T.Morii and T.Yam anishi. Phys. Rev., D 61:057501, 2000.
- [49] D de Florian and R. Sassot. Phys. Rev., D 62:094025, 2000.
- [50] J.B lum lein and H.Bottcher. Nucl. Phys., B 636:225, 2002.
- [51] T.Gehrm ann and W. Stirling. Phys. Rev., D 53:6100, 1996.
- [52] E. Leader, A. Sidorov, and D. Stam enov. Phys. Lett., B 488 283, 2000.
- [53] M.Gluck, E.Reya, M. Stratmann, and W. Vogelsang. Phys. Rev., D 63:094005, 2001.
- [54] E143 Collaboration : K. Abe et al. Phys. Rev., D 58:112003, 1998.
- [55] E154 Collaboration : K. Abe et al. Phys. Rev. Lett., 79:26, 1997.
- [56] E155 Collaboration : P.L. Anthony et al. Phys. Lett., B463:339, 1999.
- [57] SM C Collaboration : B. A deva et al. Phys. Rev., D 58:112001, 1998.
- [58] F E C lose and R G. Roberts. B 316:165, 1993.
- [59] J.Ellis and M.Karliner. Phys. Lett., B 341:397, 1995.
- [60] HERMESCollaboration: K.Ackersta et al. Phys. Rev. Lett., 81:5519, 1998.
- [61] E 866 Collaboration : E.A. Hawker et al. Phys. Rev. Lett., 80:3715, 1998.
- [62] A.Baldit et al. Phys. Lett., B332:244, 1994.
- [63] R.Bhalerao. Phys. Rev., C 63:025208, 2001.
- [64] A.D.Martin, R.G.Roberts, W.J.Stirling, and R.S.Thome. Eur. Phys. J., C4:463, 1998.
- [65] CTEQ Collaboration : H.L.Laiet al. Eur. Phys. J., C12:375, 2000.
- [66] A E.D orokhov and N.J.K ochelev. Phys. Lett., B 304:167, 1993.
- [67] A E.Dorokhov, N.J.Kochelev, and YuA.Zubov. Int.J.Mod. Phys., A8:603, 1993.
- [68] S.Kum ano. Phys. Rep., 303:183, 1998.
- [69] G.I.Garvey and J.C. Peng. Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics, 47203, 2001.
- [70] G P.Ram sey. Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys., 39:599, 1997.
- [71] S.Kum ano and M.M iyam a. Phys. Rev., D 65:034012, 2002.

- [72] R.J.Fries, A.Schafer, and C.W eiss. hep-ph / 0204060, 2002.
- [73] M.W akam atsu. Phys. Lett., B232:251, 1989.
- [74] M.W akam atsu. Phys. Rev., D 42:2427, 1990.