

Model-independent determination of \overline{m}_s
 from γ -like inclusive decays in e^+e^- and
 implications for the \overline{MS} -parameters

S. Narison

Laboratoire de Physique Mathématique
 Université de Montpellier II
 Place Eugène Bataillon
 34095 - Montpellier Cedex 05, France

Abstract

We determine the strange quark running mass of the \overline{MS} -scheme by simulating γ -like inclusive processes for the old DasMathur-O'Kubo sum rule relating the e^+e^- into $I = 0$ and $I = 1$ hadrons total cross-sections data. We obtain to three-loop accuracy: $\overline{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV}) = (196.7 \pm 29.1) \text{ MeV}$. By combining this result with the pseudoscalar sum rule estimate of $(\overline{m}_d + \overline{m}_u)$ and the standard current algebra values of the light quark mass ratios, we deduce the average: $\overline{m}_d(1 \text{ GeV}) = (10.3 \pm 1.5) \text{ MeV}$, $\overline{m}_u(1 \text{ GeV}) = (5.0 \pm 1.5) \text{ MeV}$ and $\frac{1}{2}(\overline{m}_u + \overline{m}_d) = [(228.6 \pm 9.1) \text{ MeV}]^3$. Using also our value of m_s , we update the estimates of the $K^0(1.46)$ and $K_0(1.43)$ decay constants and of the (pseudo)scalar two-point correlator subtraction constants. Then, we deduce a deviation of about 34% from kaon PCAC and the ratio of the normal-ordered condensates: $\overline{hss} = \overline{huu} = 0.68^{+0.15}_{-0.29}$, which confirm previous findings from QCD spectral sum rules. Finally, using the recent value of the \overline{m}_b from the γ -sum rules, we deduce the scale independent quark-mass ratio: $m_b = m_s = 34 \pm 4$.

1 Introduction

The determination of the strange quark running mass is of prime importance for low-energy phenomenology, for CP-violation and for SUSY-GUT or other model-buildings. A large number of efforts have been devoted to the determinations of the light quark masses in the past since the time of current algebra where one has succeeded to fix the light quark mass ratios [1]. With the advent of QCD, one has also been able to give a precise meaning for the definition of the running quark masses within the \overline{MS} -scheme [2] and to predict their absolute values using QCD spectral sum rules [3] a la SVZ [4], in the pseudoscalar to two-[5, 1, 6] and three-[7]-[9], [3] loops, the scalar [10, 11, 12] and in the vector [13, 3] channels, while more recently the strange quark mass has been obtained from lattice simulations [14]. The advantage of the (pseudo)scalar channels with respect to the vector one is clearly the fact that the light quark masses are leading couplings in the sum rules analysis, which make a priori their determinations quite reliable. However, one has to work at some large values of the sum rules scale in order to escape advocated instanton contributions [15], which effects are not under good control and even controversial. Unfortunately, at this large scale the contributions of the higher state mesons to the sum rules analysis become important and model-dependent, as we do not yet have complete data in these channels before the running of the b -charm factory machine, where there is a hope to measure the up and down quark masses from an interference between the pseudoscalar and axial-vector channels [16]. The most recent and updated sum rule determination of the strange quark mass comes from the scalar channel [12], while the vector sum rule [13, 3] leads to a smaller and inaccurate result. In the following, we shall reconsider the vector channel by proposing a new method for determining the strange quark mass. We shall also use the result for an update of the estimates of different chiral symmetry breaking parameters from the (pseudo)scalar sum rules. In so doing, we exploit the present unexpected success of the B -decay inclusive process for determining accurately the value of the QCD coupling α_s [17, 18, 19] and the stability of the results obtained for arbitrary low mass-hypothetical heavy lepton by using the e^+e^- into hadrons data at low-energy [20]. The power of B -decays compared with existing QCD spectral sum rules resides mainly on the existence of the threshold factor $(1 - s/M^2)^2$, which gives a double zero suppression near the time-like axis where QCD is inaccurate and on the particular s -structure of the expression of the decay rate which suppresses to leading order the contribution of the dimension $D = 4$ condensates appearing in the Operator Product Expansion (OPE). Therefore, for the determination of the strange quark mass, we shall simulate B -like inclusive decays for the processes e^+e^- into $I = 0$ and $I = 1$ hadrons, which have the advantage to be model-independent as we have complete data of the spectral function in the region of interest.

2 The method and the QCD expressions

We shall be concerned with the two-point correlator:

$$\langle \langle \int d^4x e^{iqx} \bar{h}_0 \Gamma^J(x) J^Y(0) \rangle \rangle_i = \frac{1}{q^2} \frac{1}{q^2} g^2 \quad (q^2) \quad (1)$$

built from the SU (3)- flavour components of the electromagnetic current:

$$J(x) = V^{(3)}(x) + \frac{1}{3}V^{(8)}(x); \quad (2)$$

where:

$$V^{(a)} = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_a(x); \quad a = 3;8; \quad (3)$$

and λ_a are the diagonal flavour SU (3) matrices:

$$\lambda_3 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \lambda_8 = \frac{1}{6} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 2 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (4)$$

acting on the basis of the up, down and strange quarks:

$$\begin{pmatrix} u & d & s \\ \bar{u} & \bar{d} & \bar{s} \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

The trace over the colour degree of freedom of the quark fields is understood. At the one-photon approximation, the e^+e^- into hadrons total cross-section is related to the absorptive part of the correlator, via the optical theorem, as:

$$\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}) = \frac{4\pi^2}{q^2} e^2 \text{Im} \Pi(q^2); \quad (6)$$

where:

$$\Pi(q^2) = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x e^{iqx} \langle 0 | T [J(x); J^\dagger(0)] | 0 \rangle; \quad (7)$$

and:

$$\alpha = 1/137.04 \quad (8)$$

is the electromagnetic structure constant. It is also convenient to introduce the ratio of cross-section:

$$R^{(I)} = \frac{\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow I \text{ hadrons})}{\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons})} \quad (9)$$

where:

$$\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}) = \frac{4\pi^2}{3q^2}; \quad (10)$$

Using CVC, we also know that the vector component of the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ semi-inclusive width can be related to the isovector $I = 1$ component of the e^+e^- cross-section as [21]:

$$R_{I=1} = \frac{3 \cos^2 \theta_c}{2} S_{EW} \int_0^1 ds \left[1 - \frac{s}{M^2} \right]^2 + \frac{2s}{M^2} \frac{1}{M^2} R^{(I)}_{e^+e^- \rightarrow I}; \quad (11)$$

where $S_{EW} = 1.0194$ is the electroweak correction from the summation of the leading-log contributions [22]. In the following, we shall generalize this expression and propose a β -like sum rule

for the $I = 0$ channel. The QCD expression of the $I = 1$ rate has been already derived [17] and reads:

$$R_{;I} = \frac{3}{2} \cos^2 \theta_{EW} c_{EW} \left[1 + \delta_{EW}^{(0)} + \sum_{D=2;4;\dots}^X \delta_{ud;I}^{(D)} \right] A; \quad (12)$$

$\delta_{EW}^{(0)} = 0.0010$ is the electroweak correction coming from the constant term [23]. The perturbative corrections read [17]:

$$\delta_I^{(0)} = a_s \frac{\delta_I^{(0)}(M)}{1} + 5.2023a_s^2 + 26.366a_s^3 + \dots; \quad (13)$$

where the expression of the running coupling to three-loop accuracy is:

$$a_s(\mu) = a_s^{(0)} \left[1 - \frac{a_s^{(0)}}{4\pi} \log^2 \frac{\mu}{M} + \frac{a_s^{(0)2}}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{2}{3} \log^2 \frac{\mu}{M} - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{\mu}{M} + \frac{2}{3} \right] + O(a_s^3) \right]; \quad (14)$$

with:

$$a_s^{(0)} = \frac{4\pi}{\beta_0 \log(\mu/M)} \quad (15)$$

and β_i are the $O(a_s^i)$ coefficients of the β -function in the \overline{MS} -scheme for n_f flavours:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_0 &= \frac{11}{2} + \frac{1}{3}n_f \\ \beta_1 &= \frac{51}{4} + \frac{19}{12}n_f \\ \beta_2 &= \frac{1}{64} \left[2857 + \frac{5033}{9}n_f - \frac{325}{27}n_f^2 \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

For three flavours, we have:

$$\beta_0 = 9; \quad \beta_1 = 8; \quad \beta_2 = 20.1198; \quad (17)$$

In the case of flavour-neutral current of interest here, the m_s^2 -term of the D -function is given by [17, 24]:

$$(Q^2)^{-1} \delta_{ii;V}^{(2)} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{\overline{m}_i^2}{Q^2} \left[1 + \frac{8}{3}a_s + 25.6a_s^2 \right]; \quad (18)$$

which leads to the mass corrections:

$$\delta_{ii;V}^{(2)} = \frac{3}{4} \frac{\overline{m}_i^2}{Q^2} \left[1 + \frac{8}{3}a_s + K_3 a_s^2 \right]; \quad (19)$$

where $K_3 = 20$ contains not only the a_s^2 -coefficient of the correlator but also terms induced from the Cauchy integration of lower order terms; \overline{m}_i is the running mass of the quark of flavour i evaluated at M . The expression of the running quark mass in terms of the invariant mass \hat{m}_i is [2]:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{m}_i(\mu) &= \hat{m}_i(\mu) \left[1 - \frac{a_s(\mu)}{4\pi} \log^2 \frac{\mu}{M} + \frac{a_s(\mu)^2}{16\pi^2} \left[\frac{2}{3} \log^2 \frac{\mu}{M} - \frac{2}{3} \log \frac{\mu}{M} + \frac{2}{3} \right] + O(a_s^3) \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where c_i are the $O(a_s^i)$ coefficients of the quark-mass anomalous dimension for n_f flavours:

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= 2; \\ c_2 &= \frac{101}{12} - \frac{5}{18}n_f; \\ c_3 &= \frac{1}{96} \left[3747 - 160(3) + \frac{2216}{9}n_f - \frac{140}{27}n_f^2 \right]; \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

and $\zeta(3) = 1.2020569\dots$ is the Riemann zeta function. For three flavours, we have:

$$c_1 = 2; \quad c_2 = 91/12; \quad c_3 = 24.8404; \quad (22)$$

The $D = 4$ contributions read [17]:

$$\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{ii\bar{i}}^{(4)} = \frac{11}{4} a_s^2 \frac{h_s G^2 i}{M^4} - 36 a_s^2 \frac{h_{ii\bar{i}i}}{M^4} - 8 a_s^2 \sum_k \frac{h_{kk\bar{k}k}}{M^4} + 36 \frac{\bar{m}_i^4}{M^4}; \quad (23)$$

which due to the Cauchy integral and to the particular s -structure of the inclusive rate, the gluon condensate and the linear terms in m_i starts at $O(a_s^2)$. This is a great advantage compared with the ordinary sum rule for the vector current discussed in [13, 3] as in that case there is a strong correlation between these two terms. We shall use [17, 3]^{1, 2}:

$$\begin{aligned} h_s G^2 i &= (0.06 \pm 0.03) \text{ GeV}^4 \\ (m_u + m_d) h_{uu} + d d i &= 2m^2 f^2 \\ (m_s + m_u) h_{ss} + u u i &= 2(0.5 \pm 1)m_K^2 f_K^2; \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where: $f = 93.3 \text{ MeV}$, $f_K = 1.2f$ and we have taken into account a possible violation of kaon PCAC of about 50% as suggested by the QSSR analysis [8, 3] and which we shall test later on. However, due to the a_s^2 suppression of the $D = 4$ contributions, our results will not be affected in a sensible way by the exact value of these condensates. The $D = 6$ contributions read [17]:

$$\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{ii\bar{i}}^{(6)} = 7 \frac{256}{27} \frac{h_{ii\bar{i}i^2}}{M^6}; \quad (25)$$

where μ measures the deviation from the vacuum saturation estimate of the four-quark condensate. We shall use [17, 3]:

$$h_{ii\bar{i}i^2} = (3.8 \pm 2.0) 10^4 \text{ GeV}^6; \quad (26)$$

In our next analysis, we allow that $h_{ss} i^2 = (\frac{1}{4} \pm 1) h_{uu} i^2$, consistently with the previous possible violation of kaon PCAC. The contribution of the $D = 8$ operators in the chiral limit reads [17]:

$$\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_{ii\bar{i}}^{(8)} = \frac{39}{162} \frac{h_s G^2 i^2}{M^8}; \quad (27)$$

which can be safely neglected due to the high-power suppression in the m -mass.

¹A forthcoming analysis [25] gives a more precise value of the gluon and four-quark condensates: $h_s G^2 i = (7.1 \pm 0.9) 10^2 \text{ GeV}^4$; $h_{ii\bar{i}i^2} = (5.8 \pm 0.9) 10^4 \text{ GeV}^6$. However, for the quantities which we shall use, their contributions will vanish to leading order in the chiral symmetry breaking expansion.

²Here and in the following: $h_{ii\bar{i}} = h_{ii\bar{i}i}$.

Table 1: Different contributions to R_{j0}

M [GeV]	π (782)	ρ (1019)	ω (1419)	continuum
1.0	0.160	0.01		0.003
1.2	0.205	0.01	0.19	0.011
1.4	0.189	0.01	0.33	0.008
1.6	0.160	0.01	0.36	0.012

3 Model-independent determination of \overline{m}_s

In so doing, we can work with the ρ -like rate into $I = 0$:

$$R_{j0} \quad (28)$$

or with the ratio of the $I = 0$ over the $I = 1$ rates or with their difference:

$$10 R_{j1} - 3R_{j0} \quad (29)$$

This sum rule vanishes in the flavour SU(3)-limit $m_i = m_j$ and $h_{ij} = h_{ji}$. In this respect, it is historically very similar to the old Das-Mathur-Okubo sum rule [26] and its QCD version [27]. The main advantage of these new ρ -like sum rules, compared with the previous ones, is the presence of the ρ -threshold factor which suppresses the contribution near the time-like axis where the QCD expression is inaccurate. Here, one has also a suppression of the leading order $D = 4$ condensate contributions, such that one can have a clean effect from the quark mass corrections. The QCD expression of R_{j0} and of $10 R_{j1} - 3R_{j0}$ can be deduced from the previous formulae. However, in order to have a faster convergence of the perturbative series at the scale we shall work, we shall instead expand the width R_{jI} in terms of the contour coupling [18]³:

$$A^{(n)} = \frac{1}{2i} \int_{\gamma_j} \frac{ds}{s} \left[1 - 2\frac{s}{M^2} + 2\frac{s^3}{M^6} - \frac{s^4}{M^8} \right] a_s^n \quad (30)$$

The DMO-like sum rule reads:

$$10 = \frac{3}{2} \cos^2 \theta_c S_{EW} \frac{2}{3} \sum_{D=2,4,\dots} X_{uu}^{(D)} - X_{ss}^{(D)} \quad (31)$$

The phenomenological parametrization of R_{j0} and $10 R_{j1} - 3R_{j0}$ is done using the available data of the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{hadrons}$ total cross-section below 1.6 GeV, where the $I = 0$ part is measured with a quite good accuracy thanks to the clean separation of the $I = 1$ (even number of pions) over the $I = 0$ (odd numbers) and of the KK states originating from the ρ or the ω resonances.

³We shall see in [25] that, in the case of ρ -decays, this procedure gives a good approximation of the optimized perturbative series if higher order terms are resummed.

Table 2: Phenomenological estimates of $R_{;I}$ and Γ_{10}

M [GeV]	$R_{;0}$		$R_{;1}$		Γ_{10}	
1.0	0.160	0.010	1.608	0.064	1.128	0.071
1.2	0.406	0.014	1.900	0.075	0.682	0.086
1.4	0.527	0.022	1.853	0.072	0.272	0.098
1.6	0.542	0.023	1.793	0.070	0.167	0.098

For the $I = 0$, we take the parameters of the narrow ρ and ω -resonances from PDG 94 [28] to which we add the contribution of the $\rho(1419)$. The narrow width approximation gives an accurate estimate of these resonance effects:

$$\langle e^+ e^- \rightarrow V \rangle = 12 \frac{v \cdot e^+ e^-}{M_V^2} \quad (s \sim M_V^2): \quad (32)$$

Threshold effects due to 3π can be incorporated by using a Breit-Wigner form of these narrow resonances or chiral perturbation theory similarly to the one done for the 3π in the case of the pseudoscalar channel [9], but these effects are negligible here. We have also estimated the continuum contribution outside the resonances by using a least-square fit of the data compiled in [29], where we take the largest range of experimental errors in order to have a conservative estimate. For $0.83 \text{ GeV} < \sqrt{s} < 0.99 \text{ GeV}$, the continuum effect to $R_{;0}$ is much smaller than the errors induced by the resonance contributions. The same feature also happens for the continuum in the range $1.11 \text{ GeV} < \sqrt{s} < 1.40 \text{ GeV}$. We give in Table 1 our estimate of the different contributions to $R_{;0}$. $R_{;1}$ will be estimated in the same way as in [20] and will be the same data points as the ones in the Fig. 1 of that paper. We give the results for $R_{;1(0)}$ and Γ_{10} in Table 2. Using the phenomenological values of $R_{;0}$ and Γ_{10} given in Table 2 and their QCD expressions presented previously, we extract the value of the running masses for each value of M . The analysis from $R_{;0}$ is not conclusive. This is mainly due to the competition between the perturbative radiative and quark mass corrections. The analysis from Γ_{10} is given in Table 3, where we show the value of the invariant mass \hat{m}_s obtained at different energy scale for a given value of β_3 for three flavours. We consider as a final value of \hat{m}_s , the average of these different numbers and its relative error the one coming from the most accurate determination around 1.2 GeV. The reason for this choice of the error is mainly due to the fact that the average would have been obtained in the compromise region around 1.2-1.3 GeV, where the higher state mesons and the non-perturbative contributions, which are the main sources of uncertainties are both small, while for lower (higher) energies the uncertainties due to the non-perturbative (higher state mesons) are large. Using the previous value of \hat{m}_s and Eq. (20), we finally deduce in Table 3 the value of the running mass evaluated at 1 GeV to three-loops. One should notice that if we have used the usual a_s -expansion but not the one of [18] for $R_{;1}$, we would have obtained value of about 7% higher. We consider this difference as intrinsic systematic uncertainties of the approach. Therefore, for $\beta_3(M_Z) = 0.118 \pm 0.006$ [30, 28] which corresponds to order a_s^2 to $\beta_3 = 375^{+105}_{-85} \text{ MeV}$, we deduce including the a_s^2 -corrections:

$$\bar{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV}) = (196.7 \pm 24.7 \pm 14.8 \pm 4.0) \text{ MeV}; \quad (33)$$

Table 3: Estimates of \hat{m}_s and of $\overline{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV})$ to three-loops from 10

$\beta_3 [\text{M eV}]$	\hat{m}_s to three-loop accuracy							
	290		375		480		540	
$M [\text{GeV}]$								
1:0	208:7	43:8	155:8	32:7	94:00	19:7	59:10	12:4
1:2	222:2	28:0	179:5	22:6	131:3	16:5	104:4	13:2
1:4	177:1	35:8	149:2	30:2	118:1	23:9	101:2	20:4
1:6	169:9	47:6	146:5	41:0	121:1	33:9	107:5	30:1
$h\hat{m}_s i$	200:6	25:4	163:2	20:5	116:9	14:7	85:4	10:8
$\overline{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV})$	208:7	26:3	196:7	24:7	176:9	22:3	156:7	19:7

where the first error is due to the data and to the dimension-six condensates which contribute about 50% each, the second one is due to the choice of the order parameter in the expansion of perturbative series and to a guess of the unknown higher order terms, while the last small error is due to the value of β_3 . Therefore, we deduce as a final estimate:

$$\overline{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV}) = (196:7 \quad 29:1) \text{ M eV}; \quad (34)$$

One can also notice that the inclusion of the a_s^2 -terms has reduced by about 10% the two-loop result. We consider this result as an improvement of the earlier inaccurate results [13, 3] from the meson sum rule. Moreover, as pointed out in [3], the sum rule analysis suffers from the competition between the quark mass corrections and the dimension four-quark condensate contribution linear in m_s where the uncertainties in the value of $h\overline{ss}i$ and gluon $h_s G^2 i$ condensates mask them a part of the quark mass corrections. This value is in agreement within the errors with the available estimates from the (pseudo) scalar sum rules [3], [5]–[12]⁴ and from lattice calculations [14]⁵.

⁴However these results depend on the appreciations of the high meson mass contributions to the spectral function (see e.g. [31] for a different realization of chiral symmetry not used in the previous papers).

⁵If one uses the most recent value from the scalar sum rule [12]: $\overline{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV}) = (189 \quad 32) \text{ M eV}$, and the lattice result [14] rescaled at 1 GeV: $\overline{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV}) = (180 \quad 25 \quad 25) \text{ M eV}$, where the last error is a conservative guess of the systematic uncertainties of the approach, it is informative to deduce the average: $\overline{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV}) = (190:3 \quad 18:4) \text{ M eV}$.

4 Implications for the SB parameters

Values of \overline{m}_d , \overline{m}_u and of the associated condensates

In the following, we combine the previous value of \overline{m}_s from the vector channel with the value of the sum of the up and down quark masses determined recently from the pseudoscalar sum rule to three-loop accuracy [9]:

$$(\overline{m}_d + \overline{m}_u) (1 \text{ GeV}) = (12.0 \pm 2.5) \text{ MeV} ; \quad (35)$$

One can deduce:

$$r_3 \frac{m_s}{1=2(m_u + m_d)} = 32.8 \pm 8.4 ; \quad (36)$$

which is compatible within the errors, but slightly higher than the standard current algebra determination [1]:

$$r_3^{CA} \frac{m_s}{1=2(m_u + m_d)} = 25.7 \pm 2.6 ; \quad (37)$$

Although less accurate, our result is not affected by the uncertainties of the current algebra value pointed out in [32], but, as mentioned previously, the result from the pseudoscalar sum rule relies strongly on the parametrization of the 3 contribution to the spectral function which depends on the realization of chiral symmetry due to the absence of the data for this channel. We combine the previous value of \overline{m}_s with the current algebra relation [1]⁶:

$$r_2^{CA} \frac{(m_d - m_u)}{(m_d + m_u)} = \frac{m^2}{M_K^2} \frac{(M_{K^0}^2 - M_{K^+}^2)_{QCD}}{M_K^2 - m^2} \frac{m_s^2 - \hat{m}^2}{(m_u + m_d)^2} = (0.52 \pm 0.05) 10^3 (r_3^2 - 1) ; \quad (38)$$

where $2\hat{m} = m_u + m_d$; the QCD part of the $K^+ - K^0$ mass-difference comes from the estimate of the electromagnetic term using the Dashen theorem including next-to-leading chiral corrections [33]. Using our previous value of r_3 in Eq. (36) and the pseudoscalar sum rule result, we obtain to three-loop accuracy:

$$(\overline{m}_d - \overline{m}_u) (1 \text{ GeV}) = (6.7 \pm 3.4) \text{ MeV} ; \quad (39)$$

Using again the pseudoscalar sum rule result, we finally obtain:

$$\overline{m}_d (1 \text{ GeV}) = (9.4 \pm 2.1) \text{ MeV} ; \quad \overline{m}_u (1 \text{ GeV}) = (2.7 \pm 2.1) \text{ MeV} ; \quad (40)$$

If we use, instead, the previous values of the ratios r_3^{CA} and r_2^{CA} from current algebra and the previous value of m_s , we obtain:

$$(\overline{m}_d + \overline{m}_u) (1 \text{ GeV}) = (15.3 \pm 2.7) \text{ MeV} ; \quad (\overline{m}_d - \overline{m}_u) (1 \text{ GeV}) = (5.2 \pm 1.4) \text{ MeV} ; \quad (41)$$

and then:

$$\overline{m}_d (1 \text{ GeV}) = (10.3 \pm 1.5) \text{ MeV} ; \quad \overline{m}_u (1 \text{ GeV}) = (5.0 \pm 1.5) \text{ MeV} ; \quad (42)$$

⁶One could instead use the value of the quark mass difference determined from the scalar sum rule [10, 6], but this channel is not well-known experimentally as the true nature of the $a_0(980)$ is not yet well-understood.

showing that the two alternative approaches lead to consistent values of m_d and m_u , though one can notice that the value of m_d is almost unaffected by the change of the ratio r_3 once r_2 is given, while m_u becomes smaller for a larger value of r_3 . These values are in good agreement with the previous estimates [5, 3, 8, 9], which have been, however, obtained for smaller values of μ . The reason is that, contrary to the invariant mass \hat{m}_s , the running mass is not very sensitive to the μ -values in the (pseudo)scalar sum rules analysis. We consider as a final estimate the average of the two previous results:

$$\bar{m}_d(1 \text{ GeV}) = (10.0 \pm 1.2) \text{ MeV}; \quad \bar{m}_u(1 \text{ GeV}) = (4.2 \pm 1.2) \text{ MeV}; \quad (43)$$

Using the pion PCAC relation in Eq. (24), one can deduce:

$$\frac{1}{2} \langle \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d \rangle(1 \text{ GeV}) = [(228.6 \pm 9.1) \text{ MeV}]^3; \quad (44)$$

$K^0(146)$ and $K_0(143)$ decay constants

An earlier QCD spectral sum rule analysis of the (pseudo)scalar current [34, 8, 3] has provided an estimate of the decay constants of the $K^0(146)$ and $K_0(143)$ mesons in the scheme where the spectral function is represented by the usual duality ansatz: lowest narrow resonances plus a QCD continuum from a threshold t_c . In our approach the decay constant will be an effective coupling including into it all corrections due to finite widths and to threshold effects. For our purpose, we come back again to the familiar (pseudo)scalar sum rule [3]–[9] in the strange quark channel, where we shall consider the Laplace sum rule:

$$L_0 \int_0^1 dt e^{-t} \frac{1}{t} \text{Im} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^u = \frac{N_c}{8} \frac{1}{2} (\bar{m}_s + \bar{m}_u)^2 \sum_{D=0,2,\dots}^8 \left(1 + \sum_{D=0}^9 \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^{(D)} \right); \quad (45)$$

where $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^u$ is the two-point correlator associated to the (pseudo)scalar current:

$$\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^u(x) = (\bar{q}_s(x) q_u(x))_{s::}; \quad (46)$$

$\langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^{(D)}$ are the (non)perturbative corrections of the correlator. They read:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^{(0)} &= 4.82a_s - 9.69a_s^2 \\ \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^{(2)} &= 2 \frac{\bar{m}_s^2}{n} (1 + 6.87a_s) \\ \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^{(4)} &= \frac{2}{3} h_s G^2 i \int_0^1 dx (1-x)^2 (1+x) \langle \bar{u}u + \bar{s}s \rangle \\ \langle \bar{q}q \rangle_s^{(6)} &= \frac{896}{81} a_s^3 \langle \bar{u}u \rangle_s^2; \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

We use the duality ansatz parametrization of the pseudoscalar spectral function with the two resonances $K; K^0(146)$ in the sum rule L_0 for extracting the $K^0(146)$ decay constant which is controlled by the ratio:

$$r_K = \frac{M_{K^0}^4 f_{K^0}^2}{M_K^4 f_K^2}; \quad (48)$$

Using m_s and the correlated values of r_3 given in Table 3, we study, as usual, the stability of the result with respect to the sum rule variable μ and the QCD continuum threshold t_c . The

-dependence of the sum rule is quite flat in a large range of t_c smaller than 0.8 GeV^2 , while the optimal result corresponds to $t_c \approx 0.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ and for the QCD continuum threshold t_c of about $6-7 \text{ GeV}^2$, a set of parameters consistent with the one obtained recently [12]. Taking into account the correlations between m_s ; t_c and r_K , we deduce:

$$r_K = 7.0 \pm 2.5; \quad (49)$$

which we consider as an update of the result $r_K = 7.1$ obtained in [3, 8]. We perform a similar analysis in the scalar channel in order to fix the decay constant of the $K_0(1430)$ resonance and the correlated value of the QCD continuum. The optimal stability is again obtained for $t_c \approx 6-7 \text{ GeV}^2$ and for $r_K = 0.4 \text{ GeV}^2$. We obtain:

$$f_{K_0} = (40.2 \pm 6.2) \text{ MeV}; \quad (50)$$

which is again an update of the result in [3, 8].

Test of kaon PCAC and value of $h_{ss} = h_{uu}$

We use the previous results in order to extract the value of the subtraction constants $(^{(D)}_1(0)_s^u)$ from which we can test the deviation from kaon PCAC. Using as in [3, 3], the Laplace sum rule L_1 obeyed by these quantities:

$$L_1 = \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} e^{-t} \frac{1}{t} \text{Im} (^{(D)}_1(t)_s^u) = (^{(D)}_1(0)_s^u) + \frac{N_c}{8} \frac{(\overline{m}_s - \overline{m}_u)^2}{2} \left[1 + \sum_{D=0,2,\dots} (^{(D)}_1(0)_s^u) \right]; \quad (51)$$

where $(^{(D)}_1(0)_s^u)$ are the (non)perturbative corrections, we find that the analysis is not conclusive as the result does not have a clear stability and increases with t_c . We therefore use the FESR proposed in [6]. Expressing:

$$(^{(D)}_1(0)_s^u) = 2M_K^2 f_K^2 (1 - r_K); \quad (52)$$

one has the sum rule [6]:

$$r_K = \frac{3}{16} \frac{\overline{m}_s^2 t_c}{f_K^2 M_K^2} \left[1 + \frac{23}{3} a_s + O(a_s^2) \right] \frac{M_K}{M_{K_0}^2}; \quad (53)$$

which gives, after using the correlated values of the input parameters:

$$r_K = 0.34_{-0.17}^{+0.23}; \quad (54)$$

confirming a large violation of kaon PCAC [3, 3]. In terms of the normal-ordered condensates, one has:

$$(^{(D)}_1(0)_s^u) = (\overline{m}_u - \overline{m}_s) h_{ss} - h_{uu}; \quad (55)$$

Therefore, we deduce⁸:

$$h_{ss} = h_{uu} = 0.71_{-0.42}^{+0.59}; \quad (56)$$

⁷The flatness of the sum rule prediction in this large range of t_c values can also be interpreted as a strong evidence for the negligible effect of the instanton effects for $M_1 = \sqrt{t_c} \approx 1.2 \text{ GeV}$.

⁸We have checked that an extraction of this ratio from the meson sum rule is not conclusive.

One can do a similar analysis for the scalar channel. The corresponding FESR is:

$$(0)_s^u = 2M_{K_0}^2 f_{K_0}^2 \left[\frac{3}{16} \bar{m}_s^2 t_c \left(1 + \frac{23}{3} a_s + O(a_s^2) \right) \right]; \quad (57)$$

which gives:

$$(0)_s^u = 7.8_{-2.7}^{+5.5} 10^4 \text{ GeV}^4; \quad (58)$$

in agreement with previous results [3, 8]. Taking the ratio of the scalar over the pseudoscalar subtraction constants, one can deduce:

$$h_{ss} = h_{uu} = 0.68_{-0.29}^{+0.15}; \quad (59)$$

which we consider as an update of the previous results in [8, 3]. This result supports the SU(3) breaking of the condensates from the baryon sum rules [35] and agrees with the one from chiral perturbation theory [1] around 0.72–0.76. If one instead works with the non-normal ordered condensate, one should add to the expression in Eq. (55) a small perturbative piece first obtained by Becchi et al [5] (see also [3, 36, 12]):

$$P = \frac{3}{2} \frac{2}{2} \frac{1}{7} \frac{1}{a_s} \frac{53}{24} \bar{m}_s^4; \quad (60)$$

This leads to the ratio of the non-normal ordered condensates:

$$h_{ss} = h_{uu} = 0.87_{-0.28}^{+0.03}; \quad (61)$$

Determination of the ratio $m_b = m_s$

Finally, we combine the previous value of m_s with the running mass of the b-quark evaluated to two-loop accuracy from the sum rules [37]. For consistency, we use the two-loop version of the result in Eq. (34), which corresponds to the two-loop running mass:

$$\bar{m}_s(1 \text{ GeV}) = (222 \pm 22) \text{ MeV}; \quad (62)$$

In so doing, we run the strange quark mass until the b-pole mass where the b-quark one has been evaluated. We take care on the different threshold effects by using the relation between the running mass evaluated for a flavour f and $f-1$ [38]:

$$\bar{m}_i^{(f-1)}(\mu) = \bar{m}_i^{(f)}(\mu) \left[1 + \frac{1}{12} x^2 + \frac{5}{3} x + \frac{89}{36} a_s^2(\mu) \right]; \quad (63)$$

where $x = 2 \ln M(\mu) = \ln \frac{M(\mu)}{m_b}$; $M(\mu)$ is the mass of the excited heavy quark at the matching point. At the two-loop accuracy where the b-quark running mass has been estimated [37], one can have:

$$\bar{m}_i^{(f-1)}(\mu) = \bar{m}_i^{(f)}(\mu) \left[1 + O\left(\frac{2}{s}\right) \right] \quad (64)$$

at the heavy quark thresholds. We use this relation together with the matching conditions for the coupling constant [38, 39]:

$$a_s^{(f-1)} = a_s^{(f)} + O\left(\frac{3}{s}\right); \quad (65)$$

We take to two-loop accuracy [37]:

$$\overline{m}_c^{(4)}(M_c) = (1.23 \pm 0.05) \text{ GeV}; \quad \overline{m}_b^{(5)}(M_b) = (4.23 \pm 0.04) \text{ GeV}; \quad (66)$$

where the index (4), (5) indicates the number of excited flavours and we use [37]:

$$M_c = (1.42 \pm 0.03) \text{ GeV}; \quad M_b = (4.62 \pm 0.02) \text{ GeV}; \quad (67)$$

We multiply the quoted errors by a factor 10 in order to have a large overestimate of the error in the following analysis. Then, we deduce the running strange quark mass for 5 flavours at M_b :

$$\overline{m}_s^{(5)}(M_b) = (125 \pm 15) \text{ MeV}; \quad (68)$$

where the errors due to the thresholds are much smaller than the ones induced by the determination of m_s . By combining this result with $\overline{m}_b^{(5)}(M_b)$ in Eq. (66), one can deduce the scale independent mass ratio:

$$r_5 = m_b/m_s = 34 \pm 4; \quad (69)$$

which is an useful quantity for model-buildings, and where it is amusing to notice that we have $r_3 \approx r_5$!

5 Conclusion

We have estimated the running strange quark mass of the \overline{MS} -scheme using a tau-like decay-moment version of the old DMO sum rule relating the $I = 0$ and $I = 1$ component of the e^+e^- hadrons total cross-section, which, contrary to the existing approaches, has the great advantage to be model-independent and to be free from the less-controlled instanton contributions. Our final result is given in Eq. (34). By combining this result with the existing estimate from the pseudoscalar sum rules and/or current algebra based on the standard realization of chiral symmetry (dominance of the linear term in the quark mass expansion of the pseudoscalar meson mass squared), we have deduced the value of the up and down running masses in Eq. (43) and the values of the quark condensates in Eqs. (44). We use our previous value of m_s into the (pseudo)scalar sum rules in order to extract without theoretical prejudices the decay constants of the $K^0(1.46)$ and $K_0(1.43)$ mesons which can absorb into them all possible different hadronic corrections to the spectral functions. Our results are given in Eqs. (49) and (50) and compare previous findings from QCD spectral sum rules [8, 3]. We use the previous results in order to extract the size of the (pseudo)scalar two-point function subtraction constants. As a consequence, we obtain a deviation of about 40% from kaon PCAC (Eq.(54)) and a large SU(3) breaking of the ratio of the normal-ordered quark condensates (Eq. (59)), which compare again the QSSR results in [8, 3]. Finally by combining the strange quark result with the estimate of the running b-quark mass determined directly from the sum rules, we deduce the ratio $r_5 = m_b/m_s = 34 \pm r_3 \approx 2m_s = (m_u + m_d)$ given in Eq. (69). We expect that the almost equal value between r_5 and r_3 is not only an accident of nature but may be due to a richer symmetry which could be explained from the theory of unification of interaction forces.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank A. Pich for exchanges and for carefully reading the manuscript.

References

- [1] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Phys. Rep.* 87 (1982) 77; *Ann. Phys.* 158 (1984) 142; *Nucl. Phys. B* 250 (1985) 539; H. Leutwyler, *Bern preprint BUTP-94/8* (1994).
- [2] E. G. Floratos, S. Narison and E. de Rafael, *Nucl. Phys. B* 155 (1979) 115.
- [3] S. Narison, *QCD spectral sum rules Lecture notes in physics*, Vol 26 (1989).
- [4] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys. B* 147 (1979) 385, 448.
- [5] C. Becchi, S. Narison, E. de Rafael and F. J. Yndurain, *Z. Phys. C* 8 (1981) 335; S. Narison and E. de Rafael, *Phys. Lett. B* 103 (1981) 57; C. A. Dominguez and M. Loewe, *Phys. Rev. D* 31 (1985) 2930; C. Ayala, E. Bagan and A. Bramon, *Phys. Lett. B* 189 (1987) 347.
- [6] C. A. Dominguez and E. de Rafael, *Ann. Phys.* 174 (1987) 372.
- [7] S. Gorishny, A. L. Kataev and S. A. Larin, *Phys. Lett. B* 135 (1984) 457.
- [8] S. Narison, *Riv. Nuov. Cim.* 10 (1987) 1; *Phys. Lett. B* 216 (1989) 191.
- [9] J. Bijens, J. Prades and E. de Rafael, *Marseille preprint CPT-94/PE 3097* (1994).
- [10] S. Narison, N. Paver, E. de Rafael and D. Treleani, *Nucl. Phys. B* 212 (1983) 365.
- [11] C. A. Dominguez, C. van Gend and N. Paver, *Phys. Lett. B* 253 (1991) 241; K. G. Chetyrkin, C. A. Dominguez, D. Pirjol and K. Schilcher, *Mainz preprint MZ-TH/94-21* (1994).
- [12] M. Jamin and M. Munz, *CERN-TH/94-21* (1994).
- [13] L. J. Reinders and H. Rubinstein, *Phys. Lett. B* 145 (1984) 108.
- [14] C. R. Allton et al., *CERN-TH 7256/94* (1994).
- [15] B. V. Geshkenbein and B. L. Io e, *Nucl. Phys. B* 166 (1980) 340; E. Gabrielli and P. Nason, *Phys. Lett. B* 313 (1993) 430.
- [16] J. Stern, N. H. Fuchs and M. Knecht, *Orsay preprint IPNO/TH 93-38* (1993), *Proc. of the Third Workshop on the Charm Factory*, Marbella-Spain (1993).
- [17] E. Braaten, S. Narison and A. Pich, *Nucl. Phys. B* 373 (1992) 581.
- [18] F. Le Diberder and A. Pich, *Phys. Lett. B* 286 (1992) 147 and *B* 289 (1992) 165.
- [19] ALEPH collaboration: D. Buskulic et al., *Phys. Lett. B* 307 (1993) 209; L. Du ot, talk given at the QCD 94 Workshop, 7-13th July 1994, Montpellier, France; R. Stroynowski, talk given at TAU 94 Sept. 1994, Montreux, Switzerland; A. Pich, talk given at the QCD 94 Workshop, 7-13th July 1994, Montpellier, France; S. Narison, talk given at TAU 94 Sept. 1994, Montreux, Switzerland.
- [20] S. Narison and A. Pich, *Phys. Lett. B* 304 (1993) 359.

- [21] F.J. Gilman and S.H. Rhee, *Phys. Rev. D* 31 (1985) 1066; F.J. Gilman and D.H. Miller, *Phys. Rev. D* 17 (1978) 1846; F.J. Gilman, *Phys. Rev. D* 35 (1987) 3541.
- [22] W. Marciano and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 61 (1988) 1815 and 56 (1986) 22.
- [23] E. Braaten and C.S. Li, *Phys. Rev. D* 42 (1990) 3888.
- [24] K.G. Chetyrkin and A. Kwiatkowski, *Z. Phys. C* 58 (1993) 525; K.G. Chetyrkin, J.H. Kuhn and A. Kwiatkowski, Preprint LBL-36678 (1994).
- [25] S. Narison, Montpellier preprint PM 95/07 (1995) (to appear).
- [26] T. Das, V.S. Mathur and S. Okubo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 19 (1967) 470.
- [27] S. Narison and E. de Rafael, *Nucl. Phys. B* 169 (1980) 253.
- [28] PDG 94, L. Montanet et al. *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (1994), Part 1, 1175.
- [29] S.I. Dolinsky et al., *Phys. Rep.* 202 (1991) 99.
- [30] S. Bethke, talk given at the QCD 94 Workshop, 7-13th July 1994, Montpellier, France and references therein; I. Hinchli, talk given at the 1994 Meeting of the American Physical Society, Albuquerque (1994); B. Weber, talk given at the IHEP-Conference, Glasgow (1994).
- [31] M. Knecht, talk given at the QCD 94 Workshop, 7-13th July 1994, Montpellier, France; N. Fuchs, H. Sazdjian and J. Stem, *Phys. Lett. B* 269 (1991) 18; B. Moussalam, M. Knecht and J. Stem, Orsay preprint, IPNO-TH 94-08 (1994).
- [32] D.B. Kaplan and A. Manohar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56 (1986) 2004; H. Georgi and I. MacArthur, Harvard preprint HUTP-81/A011 (1994).
- [33] J.F. Donoghue, B.R. Holstein and D. Wyler, *Phys. Rev. D* 47 (1993) 2089; J. Bijnens, *Phys. Lett. B* 306 (1993) 343.
- [34] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett. B* 104 (1981) 485.
- [35] Y. Chung et al., *Z. Phys. C* 25 (1984) 151; H.G. Dosch, M. Jamnitsch and S. Narison, *Phys. Lett. B* 220 (1989) 251.
- [36] D.J. Broadhurst and S.C. Generalis, Open University preprint, OUT 4102-8 (1982) (unpublished); A. Pich and E. de Rafael, *Phys. Lett. B* 158 (1985) 477.
- [37] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett. B* 341 (1994) 73.
- [38] W. Bemreuther and W. Wetzel, *Nucl. Phys. B* 197 (1982) 228; W. Bemreuther, *Ann. Phys.* 151 (1983) 127; talk given at the QCD-LEP meeting on π_0 (published by S. Bethke and W. Bemreuther as Aachen preprint PTHA 94/33) and private communication.
- [39] G. Rodrigo and A. Santamaria, *Phys. Lett. B* 313 (1993) 441; A. Peterman, CERN-TH.6487/92 (1992) (unpublished).