

The Pion-Nucleon Sigma Term and the Goldberger-Treiman Discrepancy

James V. Steele¹, Hidenaga Yamagishi² and Ismail Zahed¹

¹*Department of Physics, SUNY, Stony Brook, New York 11794, USA;*

²*4 Chome 11-16-502, Shimomeguro, Meguro, Tokyo, Japan. 153*

(March 26, 2022)

The pion-nucleon sigma term is shown to be equal to the Goldberger-Treiman discrepancy at tree level. Its value estimated this way is very sensitive to the pion-nucleon coupling constant $g_{\pi NN}$. This relation, when combined with the pion-nucleon S-wave scattering lengths, yields a new determination of $g_{\pi NN}$ at tree level. The results of a one-loop analysis are also summarized determining an allowed range for the induced pseudoscalar coupling constant g_P .

Pion-nucleon interactions have been extensively investigated using dispersion relations and chiral symmetry. Most of the studies using chiral symmetry have relied on unphysical limits such as the soft pion limit [1] or the chiral limit [2]. A typical example is the pion-nucleon sigma term [3], the fraction of the nucleon mass due to the explicit breaking of chiral $SU(2) \times SU(2)$. The scattering amplitude is analytically continued to the unphysical Cheng-Dashen point [4], and chiral perturbation theory is applied.

An important exception to the above is Weinberg's formula for pion-nucleon scattering [5], which yields the Tomozawa-Weinberg relations for the S-wave scattering lengths on shell [6]. Recently, we have been able to extend this result to processes involving an arbitrary number of on-shell pions and nucleons [7,8]. In this way, the pion-nucleon sigma term can be directly assessed. In particular, we find that at tree level the pion-nucleon sigma term is simply given by the Goldberger-Treiman discrepancy. The purpose of this letter is to give a derivation of this result, and discuss some of its quantitative aspects. We also review Weinberg's formula in light of our result, and briefly discuss the effects of one-loop corrections.

The approach discussed in [7,8] requires an extended S matrix analysis for a concise quantum formulation that enforces both chiral symmetry and unitarity. However, since we are primarily interested here in a tree level result, we will use an equivalent but shorter route in terms of effective Lagrangians with some supplemental rules following from the complete analysis [7,8].

For the $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ symmetric part, we take the standard effective Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 = & \frac{f_\pi^2}{4} \text{Tr} (\partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U^\dagger) \\ & + \bar{\Psi} i \not{\partial} \Psi - m_{\text{inv}} (\bar{\Psi}_R U \Psi_L + \bar{\Psi}_L U^\dagger \Psi_R) \\ & + \frac{i}{2} (g_A - 1) \bar{\Psi}_R (\not{\partial} U) U^\dagger \Psi_R \end{aligned}$$

$$-\frac{i}{2} (g_A - 1) \bar{\Psi}_L U^\dagger (\not{\partial} U) \Psi_L \quad (1)$$

where U is a chiral field, $\Psi = (\Psi_R, \Psi_L)$ is the nucleon field, and $\not{\partial} = \gamma^\mu \partial_\mu$. In the low-energy limit, the scattering amplitude given by (1) is essentially unique, given that the isospin of the nucleon is $\frac{1}{2}$ [9].

Ignoring isospin breaking and strong CP violation, the term which explicitly breaks chiral symmetry must be a scalar-isoscalar. The simplest non-trivial representation of $SU(2) \times SU(2)$ which contains such a term is $(2, 2)$, since $(2, 1) \oplus (1, 2)$ contains only isospinors, and $(1, 3) \oplus (3, 1)$ contains only isovectors. We therefore have,

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \frac{1}{4} f_\pi^2 m_\pi^2 \text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger) - \frac{m_\pi^2}{\Lambda} \bar{\Psi} \Psi \quad (2)$$

We assume that Λ is non-vanishing as $m_\pi \rightarrow 0$, so that (2) vanishes in the chiral limit. The nucleon mass is $m_N = m_{\text{inv}} + m_\pi^2/\Lambda$. The second term in (2) is usually dropped (*e.g.* in chiral perturbation theory), but it is essential to keeping the nucleons on shell and so we will retain it here.

From (1-2) it follows that the vector current is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_\mu^a(x) = & i \frac{f_\pi^2}{8} \text{Tr} ([\tau^a, U^\dagger] \partial_\mu U) + h.c. \\ & + \bar{\Psi} \gamma_\mu \frac{\tau^a}{2} \Psi \\ & - \frac{1}{4} (g_A - 1) \bar{\Psi}_L \gamma_\mu U^\dagger [\tau^a, U] \Psi_L \\ & + \frac{1}{4} (g_A - 1) \bar{\Psi}_R \gamma_\mu [\tau^a, U] U^\dagger \Psi_R \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

the axial current is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x) = & i \frac{f_\pi^2}{8} \text{Tr} (\{\tau^a, U^\dagger\} \partial_\mu U) + h.c. \\ & + \bar{\Psi} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2} \Psi \\ & - \frac{1}{4} (g_A - 1) \bar{\Psi}_L \gamma_\mu U^\dagger \{\tau^a, U\} \Psi_L \\ & + \frac{1}{4} (g_A - 1) \bar{\Psi}_R \gamma_\mu \{\tau^a, U\} U^\dagger \Psi_R \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and the scalar density is

$$\sigma(x) = \frac{1}{m_\pi^2 f_\pi} \mathcal{L}_2 = \frac{f_\pi}{4} \text{Tr}(U + U^\dagger) - \frac{1}{f_\pi \Lambda} \bar{\Psi} \Psi. \quad (5)$$

We also introduce the PCAC pion field

$$\begin{aligned}\pi^a(x) &= \frac{1}{m_\pi^2 f_\pi} \partial^\mu \mathbf{A}_\mu^a \\ &= -i \frac{f_\pi}{4} \text{Tr}(\tau^a (U - U^\dagger)) + \frac{1}{f_\pi \Lambda} \bar{\Psi} i \gamma_5 \tau^a \Psi\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

and the one-pion reduced axial current

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a &= \mathbf{A}_\mu^a + f_\pi \partial_\mu \pi^a \\ &= g_A \bar{\Psi} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2} \Psi + \frac{1}{\Lambda} \partial_\mu (\bar{\Psi} i \gamma_5 \tau^a \Psi) + \mathcal{O}(\pi^3)\end{aligned}\quad (7)$$

Between nucleon states of momentum p_i and an implicit spin dependence s_i ,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle N(p_2) | \mathbf{A}_\mu^a(x) | N(p_1) \rangle &= e^{i(p_2 - p_1) \cdot x} \\ &\times \bar{u}(p_2) (\gamma_\mu \gamma_5 G_1(t) + (p_2 - p_1)_\mu \gamma_5 G_2(t)) \frac{\tau^a}{2} u(p_1)\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\langle N(p_2) | \mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x) | N(p_1) \rangle &= e^{i(p_2 - p_1) \cdot x} \\ &\times \bar{u}(p_2) (\gamma_\mu \gamma_5 G_1(t) + (p_2 - p_1)_\mu \gamma_5 \bar{G}_2(t)) \frac{\tau^a}{2} u(p_1)\end{aligned}\quad (9)$$

with $t = (p_2 - p_1)^2$ and \bar{G}_2 is free of pion poles.

From (6-7), we also have $\partial^\mu \mathbf{j}_{A\mu} = f_\pi (\square + m_\pi^2) \pi$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle N(p_2) | \pi^a(x) | N(p_1) \rangle &= \langle N(p_2) | \pi_{\text{in}}^a(x) | N(p_1) \rangle \\ &- \frac{1}{f_\pi} \int d^4 y \Delta_R(x - y) \langle N(p_2) | \partial^\mu \mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(y) | N(p_1) \rangle \\ &= -\frac{1}{f_\pi} \frac{1}{t - m_\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) (2m_N G_1(t) + t \bar{G}_2(t)) \\ &\times i \gamma_5 \frac{\tau^a}{2} u(p_1) e^{i(p_2 - p_1) \cdot x}\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

where π_{in}^a is the incoming pion field, and we have used $\langle N(p_2) | \pi_{\text{in}}^a(x) | N(p_1) \rangle = 0$. This is a non-trivial requirement if the nucleon is a chiral soliton. This point will not be pursued further here.

It follows from (7-10) that

$$G_2(t) = \frac{1}{m_\pi^2 - t} (2m_N G_1(t) + m_\pi^2 \bar{G}_2(t)). \quad (11)$$

Also by definition, eq. (10) is equal to

$$-g_{\pi NN}(t) \frac{1}{t - m_\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) i \gamma_5 \tau^a u(p_1) e^{i(p_2 - p_1) \cdot x} \quad (12)$$

and hence

$$f_\pi g_{\pi NN}(t) = m_N G_1(t) + \frac{t}{2} \bar{G}_2(t) \quad (13)$$

where $g_{\pi NN} = g_{\pi NN}(m_\pi^2)$ is the pion-nucleon coupling constant. Extrapolating from $t = m_\pi^2$ to $t = 0$ gives the standard Goldberger-Treiman relation $g_A m_N \sim f_\pi g_{\pi NN}$, where $g_A = G_1(0)$. However one can do better. Substituting (7) at tree level into (9) gives

$$\begin{aligned}G_1(t) &= g_A \\ \bar{G}_2(t) &= -\frac{2}{\Lambda}.\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

Inserting (14) into (13) at $t = m_\pi^2$ gives the desired relation

$$\sigma_{\pi N} \equiv \frac{m_\pi^2}{\Lambda} = g_A m_N - f_\pi g_{\pi NN} \quad (15)$$

between the pion-nucleon sigma term and the Goldberger-Treiman discrepancy. The one-loop corrections to (16) are of order $m_N m_\pi^2 / (4\pi f_\pi)^2$. They will be discussed below.

Numerically, there is a huge cancellation in the right hand side, and the value of $\sigma_{\pi N}$ is very sensitive to $g_{\pi NN}$. Using the central values for all experimentally measured quantities with $(m_N, f_\pi) = (940, 92.4)$ MeV [10] and $g_A = 1.2650(16)$ [11], we have $\sigma_{\pi N} = -62$ MeV for the value $g_{\pi NN}^2/4\pi = 14.6(3)$ [12], whereas we have $\sigma_{\pi N} = 17$ MeV for the value $g_{\pi NN}^2/4\pi = 12.80(36)$ [13].

Unfortunately, this sensitivity means that we cannot directly extract a reliable value of the sigma term from the existing data, although the tree level result (15) suggests a low value for the pion-nucleon coupling constant, in view of the current value $\sigma_{\pi N} = 45 \pm 8$ MeV [14]. We therefore turn to the relation with Weinberg's formula for the pion-nucleon scattering amplitude $i\mathcal{T}$ [5]. Taking (k_1, a) as the incoming pion, and (k_2, b) as the outgoing pion, with $p_1 + k_1 = p_2 + k_2$, the formula reads

$$i\mathcal{T} = i\mathcal{T}_V + i\mathcal{T}_S + i\mathcal{T}_{AA} \quad (16)$$

where

$$i\mathcal{T}_V = -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} k_1^\mu \epsilon^{bac} \langle N(p_2) | \mathbf{V}_\mu^c(0) | N(p_1) \rangle \quad (17)$$

$$i\mathcal{T}_S = -\frac{i}{f_\pi} m_\pi^2 \delta^{ab} \langle N(p_2) | \sigma(0) | N(p_1) \rangle_{\text{conn.}} \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned}i\mathcal{T}_{AA} &= -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} k_1^\mu k_2^\nu \int d^4 x e^{-k_1 \cdot x} \\ &\times \langle N(p_2) | T^* \mathbf{j}_{A\mu}^a(x) \mathbf{j}_{A\nu}^b(0) | N(p_1) \rangle_{\text{conn.}}.\end{aligned}\quad (19)$$

Substitution of (3,5,7) at tree level yields

$$\mathcal{T}_V = \frac{1}{f_\pi^2} i \epsilon^{bac} \bar{u}(p_2) \not{k}_1 \frac{\tau^c}{2} u(p_1) \quad (20)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_S = \frac{m_\pi^2}{f_\pi^2 \Lambda} \delta^{ab} \bar{u}(p_2) u(p_1) \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{T}_{AA} &= -\frac{1}{f_\pi^2} \bar{u}(p_2) \left(g_A \not{k}_2 + \frac{2m_\pi^2}{\Lambda} \right) \frac{\tau^b \tau^a}{4} \\ &\times \frac{1}{\not{p}_1 + \not{k}_1 + m_N} \left(g_A \not{k}_1 + \frac{2m_\pi^2}{\Lambda} \right) u(p_1) \\ &+ (k_1, a \leftrightarrow -k_2, b).\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

The isospin structure is decomposed as $\mathcal{T}^{ba} = \delta^{ab} \mathcal{T}^+ + i \epsilon^{bac} \tau^c \mathcal{T}^-$ to give

$$\mathcal{T}^+ = \mathcal{T}_S^+ + \mathcal{T}_{AA}^+ \quad \mathcal{T}^- = \mathcal{T}_V^- + \mathcal{T}_{AA}^- \quad (23)$$

At threshold in the center of mass frame, the amplitudes \mathcal{T}^\pm can be extrapolated from data and written as scattering lengths a^\pm . Taking (23) at threshold,

$$4\pi \left(1 + \frac{m_\pi}{m_N}\right) a^+ = \frac{\sigma_{\pi N}}{f_\pi^2} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\pi N}}{m_N}\right) - \frac{1}{f_\pi^2 m_N} \frac{m_\pi^2}{4m_N^2 - m_\pi^2} (g_A m_N - \sigma_{\pi N})^2 \quad (24)$$

$$4\pi \left(1 + \frac{m_\pi}{m_N}\right) a^- = \frac{m_\pi}{2f_\pi^2} (1 - g_A^2) + \frac{m_\pi}{f_\pi^2} \frac{2}{4m_N^2 - m_\pi^2} (g_A m_N - \sigma_{\pi N})^2 \quad (25)$$

showing the corrections to the Tomozawa-Weinberg formula are small. Eqs. (15) and (25) give a direct relation between a^- and $g_{\pi NN}$, which is

$$4\pi \left(1 + \frac{m_\pi}{m_N}\right) a^- = \frac{m_\pi}{2f_\pi^2} (1 - g_A^2) + \frac{2m_\pi}{4m_N^2 - m_\pi^2} g_{\pi NN}^2. \quad (26)$$

Using $a^- = (9.2 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-2}/m_\pi$ [15], we find $g_{\pi NN}^2/4\pi = 14.4$. In terms of (25), eq. (24) can be resolved into

$$4\pi \left(1 + \frac{m_\pi}{m_N}\right) \left(a^+ + \frac{m_\pi}{2m_N} a^-\right) = \frac{\sigma_{\pi N}}{f_\pi^2} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_{\pi N}}{m_N}\right) + \frac{m_\pi^2}{4f_\pi^2 m_N} (1 - g_A^2). \quad (27)$$

Using $a^+ = -(8 \pm 4) \times 10^{-3}/m_\pi$ [15] and the above value for a^- gives $\sigma_{\pi N} = 2$ MeV. (The other root $\sigma_{\pi N} \sim m_N$ has been discarded). In (15), this corresponds to the value $g_{\pi NN}^2/4\pi = 13.1$, to be compared with 14.4.

The present analysis can be extended to one-loop by using power counting in $1/f_\pi$ [7,8]. In this context we have analyzed one-loop corrections to the above and they require a new subtraction constant in \overline{G}_2 . The extra piece of data necessary to fix this constant is $g_p = m_\mu G_2(-0.88m_\mu^2) = 8.2 \pm 2.4$ available from muon capture in hydrogen [16]. The loop corrections are in general small as can be seen in Fig. 1 by the shift from the tree level (dotted line) to the one-loop result at $\sigma_{\pi N} = 0$. The exception is \overline{G}_2 due to the large cancellation at tree level, since it is proportional to $\sigma_{\pi N}$ in this case (eq. (14)). If we require that $\sigma_{\pi N}$ is positive, the one-loop correction does not exceed 50%, and $g_{\pi NN}$ is larger than the lower bound from [13], we then obtain an inequality between $\sigma_{\pi N}$, $g_{\pi NN}$ and g_p , as indicated by the shaded area of Fig. 1. We therefore have,

$$12.4 \leq \frac{g_{\pi NN}^2}{4\pi} \leq 13.15 \quad \text{and} \quad 8.30 \leq g_p \leq 8.55 \quad (28)$$

with $0 \leq \sigma_{\pi N} \leq 70$ MeV, to one-loop. Our allowed range for g_p is to be compared with 8.44 ± 0.16 from [17].

The justification of the supplementary rules, and details of the one-loop calculation will be given elsewhere [8].




FIG. 1. The dependence of the pseudoscalar coupling constant (g_P) on the πN -sigma term. The horizontal lines have $g_{\pi NN}^2/4\pi = 12.4, 12.8$, and 13.2 respectively. The dotted line is the tree result for g_P . Constraining the loop corrections of \overline{G}_2 to be 50% or less gives the shaded region. See the text for further discussion.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the US DOE grant DE-FG-88ER40388.

-
- [1] S.L. Adler, Phys. Rev. B 139 (1965) 1638; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 17 (1966) 616.
 - [2] R.F. Dashen, Phys. Rev. 133(1969)1245; R. Dashen and M. Weinstein, Phys. Rev. 133 (1969) 1291; H. Pagels, Phys. Rep. 16 (1975) 219; J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler,

- Ann. Phys. 158 (1984) 142.
- [3] J. Gasser, M.E. Sainio, and A. Švarc, Nucl. Phys. B 307 (1988) 779, and references therein.
 - [4] T.P. Cheng and R.F. Dashen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 26 (1971) 594.
 - [5] S. Weinberg, “Lectures on Elementary Particles and Quantum Field Theory,” Brandeis Summer Institute 1970, S. Deser, M. Grisaru, and H. Pendleton, MIT Press, 1970.
 - [6] Y. Tomozawa, Nuovo Cim. (Ser. X) 46A (1966) 707; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 17 (1966) 616; 18 (1967) 188, 507.
 - [7] H. Yamagishi and I. Zahed, Ann. Phys. to be published.
 - [8] J.V. Steele, H. Yamagishi, and I. Zahed, in preparation.
 - [9] C.G. Callan, S. Coleman, J. Wess, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. 177 (1969) 2247.
 - [10] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 1173.
 - [11] D. Dubbers, W. Mampe, and J. Döhner, Europhys. Lett. 11 (1990) 195.
 - [12] T.E.O. Ericson, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75 (1995) 1046.
 - [13] F. Bradamante, *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B 343 (1995) 431.
 - [14] J. Gasser, H. Leutwyler, and M.E. Sainio, Phys. Lett. B 253 (1991) 260.
 - [15] R. Koch, Nucl. Phys. A 448 (1986) 707.
 - [16] J. Bernabéu, Nucl. Phys. A 374 (1982) 593c.
 - [17] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser, and U.G. Meissner, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 6899.