

The Pion-Nucleon Coupling Constant in QCD Sum Rules

H. Shimoi¹ and T. Hatsuda^{1,2}

¹ Institute of Physics, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305, Japan

² Institute for Nuclear Theory, NK-12, Univ. of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

(March 26, 2022)

Abstract

The pion-nucleon coupling constant g_N is studied on the basis of the QCD sum rules. Both the Borel sum rules and the finite energy sum rules for g_N are used to examine the effects of higher dimensional operators (up to dim. 7) and α_s corrections in the operator product expansion. Agreement with the experimental number is reached only when $S = S_N$ is greater than one, where $S = S_N$ is the continuum threshold for the g_N (nucleon) sum rule.

I. INTRODUCTION

The pion-nucleon coupling constant g_N is one of the most fundamental quantities in hadron physics. $g_N = 13.4 \pm 0.1$ is obtained empirically using the $N \rightarrow N$ scattering data, $N \rightarrow N$ scattering data and the deuteron properties [1]. From the theoretical point of view, it is a great challenge to reproduce this value from the first principle namely the quantum chromodynamics (QCD). So far, there have been two attempts; one is based on the lattice QCD simulations (see ref. [2]) and the other is based on the QCD sum rules (QSR) [3,4]. The latter approach for g_N , however, has not been explored in great detail beyond the leading order of the operator product expansion (OPE) [5,4] within the authors' knowledge.¹ The purpose of this paper is to reexamine the problem using the currently available information on the higher dimensional operators in OPE and the α_s corrections to the Wilson coefficients.

To study g_N in QSR, two methods have been proposed so far: (i) method based on the two point function $\langle 0 | T(\chi(x) \bar{\chi}(0)) | 0 \rangle$, and (ii) method based on the three point function $\langle 0 | T(\chi(x) q_5(y) \bar{\chi}(0)) | 0 \rangle$, where $\chi(x)$ is the nucleon interpolating field. We will take the first approach (i) throughout this paper, since OPE in (ii) is problematic when the four momentum of the pion becomes soft. The lowest non-trivial order of OPE in (i) is known to give $g_N^{\text{lowest}} = M_N = f$ when the continuum threshold is neglected [4,5]. The origin of the 25% disagreement of g_N^{lowest} from the Goldberger-Treiman (GT) relation $g_N = g_A M_N = f$ may originate either from the higher dimensional operators, α_s corrections and the continuum threshold. We will examine g_N with all these ingredients.

In section II, we will examine QSR for the nucleon mass by adopting OPE up to dimension 7 operators with $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$ corrections, which is essential for the discussions in later sections. In section III, QSR for g_N is studied in close analogy with that for the nucleon mass. In section IV, Borel analyses for g_N are made, and the effect of the α_s corrections, higher dimensional operators and the continuum thresholds are studied. Section V is devoted to summary and concluding remarks.

II. SUM RULES FOR THE NUCLEON

Let's consider the two point function,

¹There is a QSR study of the axial charge g_A , which can be related to g_N assuming the Goldberger-Treiman (GT) relation [6]. In the present paper, however, we will study g_N directly.

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle q \rangle &= i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle \bar{h}(x) \Gamma(x) (0) \rangle \\
&= \langle \hat{q} \rangle + \langle \hat{1} \rangle ;
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with $\hat{q} = \hat{q}$. For interpolating nucleon current, we use the Ioffe current [7]

$$\langle x \rangle = \langle \bar{u}^a(x) C u^b(x) \rangle \delta_{ab} \langle d^c(x) \rangle ; \tag{2}$$

where a, b and c are color indices and C is the charge conjugation operator.

The operator product expansion (OPE) at $q^2 \ll 1$ has a general form

$$\int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle \bar{h}(x) \Gamma(x) (0) \rangle = \sum_n C_n(q; \mu) O_n(\mu) ; \tag{3}$$

where C_n denote the Wilson coefficients and O_n are the local gauge invariant operators. They depend on the renormalization scale μ which separates the short distance dynamics in C_n and the long distance dynamics in O_n . If one takes the vacuum expectation value of (3), it can be used for the sum rules of the nucleon, while if one takes the vacuum to pion matrix element, it can be used for the sum rules of g_N .

The Lorentz structure of O_n depends on the states one chooses to sandwich (3). For the nucleon sum rules, only the scalar operators contribute. OPE up to dimension 7 with α_s corrections in the chiral limit can be extracted from refs. [8] and [9];

$$\text{Re} \langle Q^2 \rangle = \langle \hat{1} \rangle + \langle \hat{1} \rangle + \langle \hat{1} \rangle \langle \hat{q} \rangle + \langle \hat{2} \rangle + \langle \hat{2} \rangle + \langle \hat{2} \rangle ; \tag{4}$$

$$\langle \hat{1} \rangle(Q^2) = \frac{1}{64} Q^4 \ln \frac{Q^2}{2} \left[1 + \frac{71}{12} \alpha_s + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_s^2 \ln \frac{Q^2}{2} \right] ; \tag{5}$$

$$\langle \hat{1} \rangle(Q^2) = \frac{1}{32} h^2 G^2 i \ln \frac{Q^2}{2} ; \tag{6}$$

$$\langle \hat{1} \rangle(Q^2) = \frac{2 h u i^2}{3 Q^2} \left[1 - \alpha_s \left(\frac{1}{3} \ln \frac{Q^2}{2} + \frac{5}{6} \right) \right] ; \tag{7}$$

$$\langle \hat{2} \rangle(Q^2) = \frac{h d i}{4 Q^2} Q^2 \ln \frac{Q^2}{2} \left[1 + \frac{3}{2} \alpha_s \right] ; \tag{8}$$

$$\langle \hat{2} \rangle(Q^2) = 0 ; \tag{9}$$

$$\langle \hat{2} \rangle(Q^2) = \frac{1}{18 Q^2} h^2 G^2 i h d d i ; \tag{10}$$

where $Q^2 \ll \hat{q}^2 \ll 1$ and h^i denotes the vacuum expectation value. The argument of α_s is Q^2 which is not written explicitly. The diagrammatic illustration of $\langle \hat{1} \rangle$ and $\langle \hat{2} \rangle$ is shown in Fig. 1.

Several remarks are in order here.

(a) We take the chiral limit ($m_q = 0$) throughout this paper. Small u, d quark mass does not change the essential conclusion of this paper.

(b) The fact that the Wilson coefficient of the dimension 5 operator $g\bar{q}Gq$ vanishes in \mathcal{L}_2 is a unique property of the baryon current [7]. Since this operator is already $\mathcal{O}(g)$, we do not consider the $\mathcal{O}(g_s)$ correction to it.

(c) A small discrepancy between the formula in [9] and that in [10] for \mathcal{L}_2 has been recently resolved (see [11]) and the final result boils down to the form given in the above.

(d) We always assume the vacuum saturation when evaluating matrix elements of higher dimensional operators.

The correlation function (1) satisfies the standard dispersion relation

$$\text{Re } \chi_{1/2}(Q^2) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{\text{Im } \chi_{1/2}(s)}{s + Q^2} ds + \text{subtraction:} \quad (11)$$

In QSR, $\text{Re } \chi(Q^2)$ in the left hand side of (11) is calculated by OPE at large Q^2 as given in (4), while $\text{Im } \chi(s)$ in the right hand side is parametrized by the nucleon pole and the phenomenological continuum. The pole part reads

$$\hat{Q} \text{Im } \chi_1^{\text{pole}}(s) + \text{Im } \chi_2^{\text{pole}}(s) = \frac{2}{N} (\hat{Q} + M_N) (s - M_N^2); \quad (12)$$

where χ_N is defined as $\langle \bar{h} \chi_N h \rangle = \langle \bar{N} u(\mathbf{p}) \rangle$ with $u(\mathbf{p})$ being the nucleon Dirac spinor. We assume that, when $s > S_N$, the hadronic continuum reduces to the same form with that obtained by an analytic continuation of OPE;

$$\text{Im } \chi_1^{\text{cont}}(s) = (s - S_N) \frac{s^2}{64} \left(1 + \frac{s}{12} \log\left(\frac{s}{2}\right) \right) + \frac{1}{32} h^{-s} G^2 i; \quad (13)$$

$$\text{Im } \chi_2^{\text{cont}}(s) = (s - S_N) \frac{h d d i}{4} s \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s}{2} \right); \quad (14)$$

Substituting (4) and (12,13,14) into the dispersion relation (11), one can generate sum rules for the resonance parameters. We will write here the Borel transformed version of the sum rules in which the higher dimensional operators and the effect of the continuum can be relatively suppressed. (See Appendix A for useful formula.)

$$4^{-4} \frac{2}{N} e^{M_N^2/M^2} = \frac{M^6}{8} E_2(x) \left(1 + \left(\frac{53}{12} + \frac{1}{E} \right) \frac{s(M^2)}{M^2} \right) + \frac{hM^2}{32} E_0(x) + \frac{a_u^2}{6} \left(1 + \left(\frac{5}{6} + \frac{1}{3E} \right) \frac{s(M^2)}{M^2} \right); \quad (15)$$

$$4^{-4} \frac{2}{N} M_N e^{M_N^2/M^2} = \frac{a_d}{4} M^4 E_1(x) \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s(M^2)}{M^2} \right) + \frac{a_d b}{72}; \quad (16)$$

Here M^2 is the Borel mass, $E_n = \frac{1}{n!} \int_0^1 (1+x)^n e^{-x} dx$ with $x = S_N/M^2$, γ_E is the Euler constant (0.5772...) and

$$a_q = 4^2 h q q i; \quad b = 4^2 h - G^2 i; \quad (17)$$

Note that we chose μ^2 to be M^2 which is a typical scale of the system after the Borel transform. We call eq. (15) (eq. (16)) as "even" ("odd") sum rule since it contains only even (odd) dimensional operators. As for the running coupling constant, we use a simplest one-loop form,

$$g_s(M^2) = \frac{4}{9 \log(M^2 = \mu^2)}; \quad (18)$$

with $\mu^2 = (0.174 \text{ GeV})^2$ which is obtained to reproduce $g_s(1) \approx 0.4$ [12].

Eq.(15) and Eq. (16) will be used when we analyse the sum rules for g_N . One can derive formula for M_N as a function of M in three ways; (i) the ratio of (15) and (16), (ii) the ratio of (15) and its logarithmic derivative with respect to M^2 and (iii) the ratio of (16) and its logarithmic derivative with respect to M^2 . We have made an extensive Borel stability analyses for these three cases. We found that the higher dimensional operator and the g_s corrections improve the Borel stability as well as the prediction for M_N . However, there is a wide range of S_N which can reproduce the experimental nucleon mass in the Borel analyses. In later sections, we will use the finite energy sum rules (FESR) to fix S_N .

In Fig.1, shown are the Borel curves for three cases (i)-(iii) with $S_N = 1.601 \text{ GeV}^2$ obtained by the FESR with $h q q i = (0.2402 \text{ GeV})^3$ and $h - G^2 i = 0.012 \text{ GeV}^4$. The solid, dashed and dash-dotted curves correspond to cases (i), (ii) and (iii), respectively. The curve in case (iii) is the most stable of three cases and reproduces the experimental value. The others do not show good stability. Also, three curves are rather sensitive to the change of S_N .

III. SUM RULES FOR THE g_N COUPLING CONSTANT

In this section, we look at the two-point correlation function,

$$\chi(q) = i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} h 0 | T(x) (0) j^0(p=0) i; \quad (19)$$

where $j^0(p=0)$ is a neutral pion state with vanishing four momentum (the soft pion). Since we are working in the chiral limit, this soft pion is simultaneously on shell.

Since we are taking the matrix element between the vacuum and the soft pion in (19), only the pseudo-scalar operator $q_5 q$ survives in OPE for $T(x) (0)$. The pseudo-vector operator $q_5 j^0$ vanishes since $h 0 | j^0_5 q^0(p) i / p \neq 0$. Thus the relevant terms in OPE read as follows:

$$\langle Q^2 \rangle = \langle \text{dim } 3(Q^2) \rangle + \langle \text{dim } 5(Q^2) \rangle + \langle \text{dim } 7(Q^2) \rangle; \quad (20)$$

$$\langle \text{dim } 3(Q^2) \rangle = \langle i_5 \frac{h_0 j_i i_5 d_j i}{4^2} \rangle \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s}{Q^2} \ln \frac{Q^2}{2} \right); \quad (21)$$

$$\langle \text{dim } 5(Q^2) \rangle = 0; \quad (22)$$

$$\langle \text{dim } 7(Q^2) \rangle = \langle i_5 \frac{1}{18 Q^2} h^{-s} G^2 i h_0 j_i i_5 d_j i \rangle; \quad (23)$$

² dependence of s is again implicit in the above equations.

The diagrams corresponding to (21), (22) and (23) are Fig.1 (d), 1 (e) and 1 (f) respectively. The Wilson coefficients with $O(s)$ corrections in (21), (22) and (23) turn out to be identical to (8), (9) and (10) respectively. This can be explicitly checked by carrying out OPE with the background field method in the fixed point gauge. An alternative way to see this is the plain wave method. As an illustration, let's consider dimension 3 operator (Fig.1 (d)) and expand eq.(1) in terms of dd and $di_5 d$;

$$i \int d^4 x e^{iq \cdot x} T(\psi(x) \psi(0)) = C_s(1) dd + C_{ps}(i_5) di_5 d + \quad (24)$$

where $C_{s,ps}$ is the Wilson coefficient with $s(ps)$ denoting scalar (pseudoscalar). Note that dd are vector, pseudovector and tensor operators. Note also that unphysical diagrams do not arise for the Is current. We sandwich eq.(24) by free quark states to extract the Wilson coefficients. Applying the projections 1 and (i_5) to eq.(24), one gets

$$C_s = \frac{L_1(q^2, 1)}{h p j d p i}; \quad L_1 = \frac{i^Z}{4} \int d^4 x e^{iq \cdot x} h p j T(\psi(x) \psi(0)) p i \quad (25)$$

$$C_{ps} = \frac{L_{i_5}(q^2, 1)}{h p j i_5 d p i}; \quad L_{i_5} = \frac{i^Z}{4} \int d^4 x e^{iq \cdot x} h p j T(\psi(x) i_5 \psi(0)) p i \quad (26)$$

with $p i$ being a quark state with momentum p . Since massless QCD does not break chirality in perturbation theory, $h p j d p i$, $h p j i_5 d p i$ and L_1 , L_{i_5} except for trivial kinematical factors. Thus $C_s = C_{ps}$ is obtained even when s corrections are included.

$\langle Q^2 \rangle$ satisfies the dispersion relation

$$\text{Re} \langle Q^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{\text{Im} \langle s \rangle}{s + Q^2} ds + \text{subtraction}; \quad (27)$$

The hadronic imaginary part $\text{Im} \langle s \rangle$ has a nucleon pole and the continuum. The pole part is parametrized by assuming the $N \bar{N}$ vertex $L_{nt} = g_N N i_5 \sim \bar{N}$ as was done in [4,5]. The continuum part is extracted from the analytic continuation of OPE. In total,

$$\text{Im } (s) = i_5 \frac{2}{N} g_N (s - M_N^2) \quad (28)$$

$$i_5 \frac{s}{4} \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s}{M^2} \right) (s - S) \langle j_i j_j \rangle^0; \quad (28)$$

where S is the continuum threshold. Note that S does not have to be the same with S_N .

Putting Eq.(28) and Eq.(20) into (27) and making the Borel improvement, one obtains the following sum rule:

$$g_N = \frac{e^{\frac{M_N^2}{2}}}{2} \left(\frac{M^4}{4} E_1 \left(\frac{S}{M^2} \right) \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s}{M^2} \right) \frac{1}{18} \langle j_i j_j \rangle^0 \right) \frac{1}{f} \langle j_i j_j \rangle^0; \quad (29)$$

where f is the pion decay constant (93 MeV), and $\langle j_i j_j \rangle^0$ has been rewritten by the soft pion theorem

$$\langle j_i j_j \rangle^0 (p=0) = \frac{1}{f} \langle j_i j_j \rangle^0; \quad (30)$$

One can get rid of the coefficient $e^{\frac{M_N^2}{2}} = \frac{2}{N}$ in (29) by using the nucleon sum rules (15) or (16). Thus one arrives at two different sum rules for g_N :

$$g_N^{\text{even}} = \frac{\frac{2}{N} M^4 \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s}{M^2} \right) E_1 \left(\frac{S}{M^2} \right) \frac{1}{18} \langle j_i j_j \rangle^0}{\frac{M^6}{8} E_2 \left(\frac{S_N}{M^2} \right) \left(1 + \left(\frac{53}{12} + \frac{1}{E} \right) \frac{s}{M^2} \right) + \frac{b M^2}{32} E_0 \left(\frac{S_N}{M^2} \right) + \frac{a^2}{6} \left(1 + \frac{1}{3} \frac{s}{E} \right) \frac{s}{M^2}}; \quad (31)$$

which is obtained from the "even" sum rule (15) for the nucleon, and

$$g_N^{\text{odd}} = \frac{\frac{2}{N} M_N E_1 \left(\frac{S}{M^2} \right) \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s}{M^2} \right) \frac{1}{18 M^4} \langle j_i j_j \rangle^0}{f E_1 \left(\frac{S_N}{M^2} \right) \left(1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s}{M^2} \right) \frac{1}{18 M^4}}; \quad (32)$$

which is obtained from the "odd" sum rule (16) for the nucleon. For M_N in eq.(32), we just take the experimental number instead of reexpressing M_N by the Borel mass M through the nucleon sum rule. Even if one uses $M_N(M)$ in eq.(32), the Borel curve for g_N^{odd} is not affected so much as far as one adopts the odd nucleon sum rule (case (iii) in section II). Note here that, if one assumes $S = S_N$, Eq.(32) gives $g_N^{\text{odd}} = M_N = f$, namely the GT relation with $g_A = 1$.

It is in order here to remark some difference of the present work from that of ref. [4,5]. First of all, we have carried out OPE up to dimension 7 both for g_N and the nucleon mass, while only the lowest dimension operator, namely $q_i q_j$, is taken into account for the g_N sum rules in ref. [4,5]. Secondly, α_s corrections to the Wilson coefficients are not taken into account in [4,5]. Thirdly, the continuum thresholds S and S_N are completely neglected in [4,5] for the g_N sum rules.

IV. BOREL ANALYSIS FOR THE N COUPLING CONSTANT

A. The determination of the thresholds S and S_N

As we have mentioned in section II, it is difficult to determine S_N from the Borel sum rules of the nucleon. In this section, we will utilize the finite energy sum rules (FESR) to give a constraint on S_N as well as S .

The FESR has a general form [13],

$$\int_0^{S_0} ds s^n \text{Im} \rho_{\text{OPE}}(s) = \int_0^{S_0} ds s^n \text{Im} \rho_{\text{phen.}}(s); \quad (33)$$

where $\text{Im} \rho_{\text{OPE}}(s)$ is an imaginary part obtained by the analytic continuation of ρ_{OPE} , $\text{Im} \rho_{\text{phen.}}(s)$ is the phenomenological imaginary part and S_0 is the continuum threshold (either S_N or S). For the nucleon, by using ρ_1 with $n = 0; 1$ and ρ_2 with $n = 0$, one gets [9]

$$64 \rho_1^2 = 1 + \frac{25}{4} \frac{s}{S_N^3} + 2 h^2 G^2 i S_N + \frac{128}{3} h^4 i^2 = 1 + \frac{5}{6} \frac{s}{S_N}; \quad (34)$$

$$64 \rho_1^2 M_N = 8 h^2 i + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s}{S_N^2} + \frac{32}{9} h^4 i h^2 G^2 i; \quad (35)$$

$$64 \rho_2^2 M_N^2 = 1 + \frac{37}{6} \frac{s}{S_N^4} + 2 h^2 G^2 i S_N^2 - \frac{128}{9} h^4 i^2 S_N; \quad (36)$$

The renormalization point here is chosen as $s = S_N$.

By using the standard values of the condensates $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle (1 \text{ GeV}^2) = -(225 \text{ MeV})^3$ and $h^2 G^2 i = 0.012 \text{ GeV}^4$, we solved Eq.(34) - Eq.(36) numerically. Table 1 shows the results for four different values of $h^4 i^2$.

$h^4 i^2$	$(0.250 \text{ GeV})^3$	$(0.240 \text{ GeV})^3$	$(0.225 \text{ GeV})^3$	$(0.200 \text{ GeV})^3$
$S_N (\text{GeV}^2)$	1.77	1.60	1.34	0.887
$\rho_1 (\text{GeV}^3)$	0.0267	0.0235	0.0187	0.0118
$M_N (\text{GeV})$	0.997	0.940	0.845	0.645

Table 1: S_N ; ρ_1 ; M_N obtained from Eq.(34) - (36) with four different values of $h^4 i^2$.

$h^4 i^2 = (0.2402 \text{ GeV})^3$ reproduces the nucleon mass.

From this table, we choose $S_N = 1.34 - 1.77$ as physical range where the nucleon mass is reasonable reproduced within 10% errors. Our S_N is smaller than that usually used in the literatures [6,8,13]. However, the s corrections are not

taken into account in these references. The effect of the s correction to the spectral parameters can be explicitly seen by expanding the solutions of Eq.(34) up to linear in s ;

$$z_N^2 = z_0^2 \left[1 - 26.2 \left(16^2 \langle \bar{q}q \rangle \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} h^{-s} G^2 i \left(1 - 3.08 \frac{s}{f} \right); \right] \quad (37)$$

$$S_N = S_N^0 \left[1 - 21.2 \left(16^2 \langle \bar{q}q \rangle \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} h^{-s} G^2 i \left(1 - 3.26 \frac{s}{f} \right); \right] \quad (38)$$

$$M_N = M_N^0 \left[1 - 18.6 \left(16^2 \langle \bar{q}q \rangle \right)^{\frac{4}{3}} h^{-s} G^2 i \left(1 - 1.94 \frac{s}{f} \right); \right] \quad (39)$$

where $z_0^2 = 4\langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2$, $S_N^0 = (640^4 \langle \bar{q}q \rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ and $M_N^0 = \left(\frac{25}{2} 2\langle \bar{q}q \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{3}}$, which are the solutions when the s corrections and the gluon condensate are neglected. (37)–(39) show that the s corrections tend to reduce the observables by considerable amount particularly in S_N .

Next, we estimate S by taking the $n = 0$ FESR of χ ;

$$z_N^2 g_N = \left(\frac{1}{8} S^2 \left[1 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{s(S)}{f} \right] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{18} h^{-s} G^2 i \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{f} \langle \bar{q}q \rangle \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}; \quad (40)$$

Since the FESR is rather sensitive to the structure of the continuum compared to the Borel sum rule and we do not know much about the detailed structure of the continuum for (19), we just limit ourselves to the $n = 0$ sum rule (local duality relation) for safety. To roughly evaluate the range of S , we simply put $g_N = 13.4$ in (40) with z_N being determined in the nucleon FESR. The result is given in Table 2 for three different values of the condensate:

	$\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$ (GeV ³)	S_N (GeV ²)	S (GeV ²)
set 1	(0.250) ³	1.77	1.98
set 2	(0.240) ³	1.60	1.85
set 3	(0.225) ³	1.34	1.62

Table 2: S_N ; S with three different values of $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$. S is obtained by substituting $g = 13.4$ into (40).

From Table 2, one finds that S is always greater than S_N . This is consistent with the Borel sum rule g_N^{odd} in (32) which tells us that $g_N > M_N = f$ only when $S > S_N$. In subsections below, we will examine the Borel stability of g_N with the parameter sets obtained in Table 2.

B . Borel analysis for g_N^{even}

In Fig.3, g_N^{even} is shown as a function of M^2 . The solid, dashed and dash-dotted curves correspond to set 1, set 2 and set 3 in Table 2, respectively. g_N^{even} in Fig.3 (a) includes the s corrections to the Wilson coefficients, while they are neglected in Fig.3 (b) except for the gluon condensate.

g_N^{even} has a sizable M^2 variation and good Borel stability is not seen in Fig.3. By comparing Fig.3 (a) with Fig.3 (b), one finds that the s corrections improve the Borel stability only slightly. The effect of the higher dimensional operator to the Borel curve is also small. In fact, $\frac{2}{9M^4}h^2G^2i=fE_1(\frac{S}{M^2})(1+\frac{3}{2}h^2)g$, which is a ratio of the dimension 3 term and the dimension 7 term in eq.(29), is about 4% at $M^2=1\text{GeV}^2$. (Note that dimension 5 terms do not arise for the Toe current.)

Although g_N^{even} in eq.(31) is proportional to $hqqi$, three curves in Fig.3, which correspond to different values of $hqqi$, almost overlap with each other. This is because the change of $hqqi$ is compensated by the changes of S_N .

In Fig.4, g_N^{even} for set 2 is shown with S_N being changed by 10%. The solid, dashed and dash-dotted curves correspond to $S_N = 1.85, 1.1; 1.85$ and $1.85, 0.9$, respectively. g_N^{even} increases as S_N increases, which is consistent with the prediction of FESR in eq.(40).

C . Borel analysis for g_N^{odd}

Fig.5 (a), (b) show g_N^{odd} as a function of M^2 . The solid, dashed, dash-dotted curves correspond to set 1, set 2, set 3, respectively. g_N^{odd} in Fig.5 (a) includes s corrections to the Wilson coefficients, while they are neglected in Fig.5 (b) except for the gluon condensate.

g_N^{odd} has apparently better Borel stability than g_N^{even} , but still sizable M^2 variation is seen. The s corrections do not affect the Borel stability much, since the same s correction appears both in numerator and denominator in eq.(32).

g_N^{odd} is rather sensitive to the change of the parameter sets, in particular the $S_N=S_N$. To see the effect of S_N on g_N^{odd} in more detail, we expand eq.(32) up to $O(\frac{1}{M^2})$:

$$g_N^{\text{odd}} = \frac{M_N}{f} \frac{(S^2 - \frac{b}{9})}{(S_N^2 - \frac{b}{9})} \left(1 - \frac{2}{3M^2} \frac{S^3}{S^2 - \frac{b}{9}} - \frac{S_N^3}{S_N^2 - \frac{b}{9}} \right) ; \quad (41)$$

where we have neglected small α_s corrections and used the fact $S_N^2 = 9$. The approximate formula eq.(41) is in good agreement with the exact one eq.(32) in 10% for $M^2 > 1.0 \text{ GeV}^2$.

When $S > S_N$, M^2 independent term in (41) gives $g_N^{\text{odd}} = (S - S_N)^2 (M_N = f)$ which is larger than $M_N = f$. The leading $1/M^2$ correction reduces g_N^{odd} slightly. The experimental value for $g_N = 13.4$ is obtained when $M^2 = 1.6 \text{ GeV}^2$ for the parameter set 3.

In Fig.6, g_N^{odd} for set 2 is shown with S being changed by 10%. The solid, dashed and dash-dotted curves correspond to $S = 1.85, 1.1; 1.85$ and $1.85, 0.9$, respectively. g_N^{odd} increases as S increases, which is consistent with the prediction of FESR in eq.(40) and also with the approximate formula (41).

D. Comparison of g_N^{even} and g_N^{odd}

As we have already mentioned, the Borel stability for g_N^{odd} is better than g_N^{even} . This is consistent with the fact that the Borel curve for M_N is most stable in "odd" sum rule (case (iii) in Fig.2). Also the absolute value of g_N^{odd} is larger than g_N^{even} for appropriate range of M^2 : e.g. $g_N^{\text{odd}} = 11.3, 12.8$ versus $g_N^{\text{even}} = 9.02, 9.10$ at $M^2 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2$.

In previous subsections, $S = 1.85 \text{ GeV}^2$ has been used as a standard value to study the Borel stability. An alternative way to make the Borel analysis is to eliminate S from eq.(31) and eq.(32) using eq.(40), and then to solve g_N self-consistently for each M^2 . By this procedure, we found that there exists no solution satisfying eq.(31) and eq.(40) simultaneously, while there exists solutions of eq.(32) and eq.(40) which are given in Fig.7. This result again confirms that g_N^{odd} is better starting point to study the N coupling constant than g_N^{even} .

V. CONCLUSION

In this article we have made extensive Borel and FESR analyses of g_N by taking into account higher dimensional operators, α_s corrections and the continuum threshold. None of them has been considered in the previous analyses which led to $g_N = M_N = f$ [4,5].

What we have found are summarized as follows:

- (a) The higher dimensional operators up to dim. 7 and the α_s corrections play no crucial role for the Borel stability of g_N .
- (b) g_N^{odd} is more appropriate for examining g_N than g_N^{even} , since the former has better

Borel stability. This fact is also consistent with the fact that "odd" sum rule for M_N has a best stability.

(c) g_N is most sensitive to the ratio $S = S_N$, and both the FESR and Borel sum rules tell us that $S = S_N > 1$ is a crucial ingredient to reproduce the experimental g_N .²

We also found that the Borel stability of g_N^{odd} , even if dim. 7 operator is taken into account, is not satisfactory enough to determine the pion-nucleon coupling constant precisely. For the nucleon sum rule, there have been some attempts to improve the Borel stability such as the modification of the Isospin current [14] and the inclusion of the instantons [15]. In particular, instantons improve the nucleon Borel sum rules considerably at low M^2 region, so it will be an interesting problem to study g_N with instanton contribution in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the Grants-in-Aid of the Ministry of Education (No. 06102004). T.H. thanks Institute for Nuclear Theory at the University of Washington for its hospitality and the Department of Energy for partial support during the completion of this work.

²This point may have some relation to the Adler-Weisberger sum rule [16] which tells us that $g_A > 1$ (or equivalently $g_N > M_N = f$) is obtained only when the continuum contribution in the N channel is taken into account.

APPENDIX A :

The Borel transform is defined as,

$$\hat{B} = \frac{(n-1)! (Q^2)^n}{(n-1)!} \frac{d^{n-1}}{dQ^2} ; \quad Q^2 = q^2 ; \quad (A.1)$$

with $Q^2 \neq 0$; $n \geq 1$; and $\frac{Q^2}{n} = M^2$ being fixed.

When \hat{B} is applied to the correlation function $\langle Q^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{s+Q^2} \text{Im} \frac{(s)}{s+Q^2}$, it leads to

$$\hat{B} \langle Q^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{M^2} \int ds \text{Im} (s) e^{-\frac{s}{M^2}} \quad (A.2)$$

This shows that the Borel transform tends to suppress the high energy contribution.

Some useful formulae are

$$\hat{B} \frac{1}{Q^2} = \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \frac{1}{M^2} ; \quad (A.3)$$

$$\hat{B} (Q^2)^k \log Q^2 = (k-1)^{k+1} (k+1) (M^2)^k ; \quad (A.4)$$

$$\hat{B} \frac{1}{s+Q^2} = \frac{1}{M^2} e^{-\frac{s}{M^2}} ; \quad (A.5)$$

$$\hat{B} \frac{\log Q^2}{Q^2} = \frac{1}{M^2} (\log M^2 - E) ; \quad (A.6)$$

$$\hat{B} (\log Q^2)^2 = -2 \log M^2 + 2 E ; \quad (A.7)$$

$$\hat{B} Q^2 (\log Q^2)^2 = 2M^2 (\log M^2 - E + 1) ; \quad (A.8)$$

$$\hat{B} (Q^2)^2 (\log Q^2)^2 = (M^2)^2 (-4 \log M^2 + 4 E - 6) ; \quad (A.9)$$

Figure Captions

Fig.1

OPE up to dimension 7 operators for the correlation of the current. Wavy lines denote gluon lines, broken lines denote the quark/gluon condensate.

Fig.2

M_N (nucleon mass) as a function of the Borel mass squared M^2 . The solid, dashed, dash-dotted lines correspond to the cases (i), (ii) and (iii), respectively. $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle = (0.240 \text{ GeV})^3$, $\langle \bar{s}s \rangle = 0.012 \text{ GeV}^4$ and $S_N = 1.60 \text{ GeV}^2$ are used.

Fig.3 (a), (b)

g_N^{even} as a function of M^2 . The solid, dashed and dash-dotted lines correspond to set 1, set 2 and set 3, respectively. χ_s corrections are taken into account in Fig.3 (a), while they are neglected in Fig.3 (b) except for gluon condensate.

Fig.4

g_N^{even} with $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle = (0.240 \text{ GeV})^3$ as a function of M^2 . The solid, dashed and dash-dotted lines correspond to $S = 1.85 \quad 1.1; 1.85$ and $1.85 \quad 0.9$, respectively.

Fig.5 (a), (b)

g_N^{odd} as a function of M^2 . The solid, dashed and dash-dotted lines correspond to set 1, set 2 and set 3, respectively. χ_s corrections are taken into account in Fig.5 (a), while they are neglected in Fig.5 (b) except for gluon condensate.

Fig.6

g_N^{odd} with $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle = (0.240 \text{ GeV})^3$ as a function of M^2 . The solid, dashed and dash-dotted lines correspond to $S = 1.85 \quad 1.1; 1.85$ and $1.85 \quad 0.9$, respectively.




Fig.7

g_N as a function of M^2 . S in eq.(40) with M_N being determined in the nucleon FESR is used for S in eq.(32). The solid, dashed and dash-dotted lines correspond to g_N^{odd} with $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle = (0.25 \text{ GeV})^3$; $(0.240 \text{ GeV})^3$ and $(0.225 \text{ GeV})^3$, respectively.


REFERENCES

- [1] T. Ericson and W. Weise, *Pions and Nuclei*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988)
- [2] K. F. Liu, S.-J. Dong and T. Dapper, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 74, 2172 (1995).
- [3] M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein and V. I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys. B* 147, 385, 448 (1979).
- [4] L. J. Reinders, H. Rubinstein, and S. Yazaki, *Phys. Rep.* 127, 1 (1985).
- [5] L. J. Reinders, H. Rubinstein, and S. Yazaki, *Nucl. Phys. B* 213, 109 (1983)
- [6] E. M. Henley, W.-Y. P. Hwang, L. S. Kisslinger, *Phys. Rev. D* 46 431 (1992).
- [7] B. L. Jöres, *Nucl. Phys. B* 188, 317 (1981); *B* 191, 591 (E).
- [8] K. C. Yang, W.-Y. P. Hwang, E. M. Henley, L. S. Kisslinger, *Phys. Rev. D* 47, 3001 (1993)
- [9] A. A. Ovchinnikov, A. A. Pivovarov and L. R. Surguladze, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* 6, 2025 (1991)
- [10] M. Jamín, *Z. Phys. C* 37, 635 (1988)
- [11] A. A. Pivovarov, L. R. Surguladze, *Nucl. Phys. B* 360, 97 (1991)
- [12] Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (1994) 1173.
- [13] N. V. Krasnikov, A. A. Pivovarov and N. N. Tavkhelidze, *Z. Phys. C* 19, 301 (1983)
- [14] H. G. Dosch, M. Jamín and S. Narison, *Phys. Lett. B* 220, 251 (1987)
- [15] H. Forkel and M. K. Banerjee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 71, 484 (1993)
- [16] See e.g. S. Treiman, in *Current Algebra and Anomalies*, ed. S. Treiman, R. Jackiw, B. Zumino and E. Witten, (Princeton Univ. press, New Jersey, 1985).





a)








b)





c)



d)



e)



f)






Fig.1




Fig.2




Fig.3(a)




Fig.3(b)

g_{PNN}




Fig.4




Fig.5(a)




Fig.5(b)

g_{PNN}




Fig.6




Fig.7