

# Bounds on the light quark masses

H. Leutwyler

Institut für theoretische Physik der Universität Bern  
 Sidlerstr. 5, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland and  
 CERN, CH-1211 Geneva, Switzerland

January 1996

## Abstract

The corrections to the current algebra mass formulae for the pseudoscalar mesons are analyzed by means of a simultaneous expansion in powers of the light quark masses and powers of  $1/N_c$ . The relative magnitude of the two expansion parameters is related to the mass ratio  $M^2/M_\pi^2$ , which represents a quantity of order  $N_c m_s$ . A set of mass formulae is derived, including an inequality, which leads to bounds for the ratios  $m_u/m_d$  and  $m_s/m_d$ .

The low energy properties of QCD are governed by an approximate, spontaneously broken symmetry, which originates in the fact that three of the quarks happen to be light. If  $m_u; m_d; m_s$  are turned off, the symmetry becomes exact. The spectrum of the theory then contains eight strictly massless pseudoscalar mesons, the Goldstone bosons connected with the spontaneous symmetry breakdown. Their properties may be analyzed by means of an effective Lagrangian, which describes the low energy structure of the theory in terms of an expansion in powers of momenta and quark masses [1, 2].

If the number of colours is taken large, the quark loop graph which gives rise to the anomaly in the divergence of the singlet axial current is suppressed. In the limit  $N_c \rightarrow \infty$ , QCD thus acquires an additional  $U(1)$  symmetry, whose spontaneous breakdown gives rise to a ninth Goldstone boson, the  $\eta'$  [3, 4, 5]. The implications for the effective Lagrangian are extensively discussed in the literature [6] and the leading terms in the expansion in powers of  $1/N_c$  have been worked out. The purpose of the present paper is to extend this analysis to first nonleading order and to discuss the consequences for the mass spectrum of the pseudoscalars.

The relevant dynamical variable is the Goldstone field  $U(x)$ , which lives on the quotient  $G/H$ , where  $G$  and  $H$  are the (approximate) symmetry groups of the Hamiltonian and of the ground state, respectively. Since I wish to study the large  $N_c$  limit,  $G$  is the group  $U(3)_R \times U(3)_L$  and  $H = U(1) \times U(3)$ . The unimodular part of the field  $U(x)$  contains the degrees of freedom of the pseudoscalar octet, while the phase  $\det U(x) = e^{i\phi(x)}$  describes the  $\eta'$ .

The effective Lagrangian is formed with the field  $U(x)$  and its derivatives,  $L_{\text{eff}} = L_{\text{eff}}(U; \partial U; \partial^2 U; \dots)$ . The low energy analysis relies on the symmetry properties of this function, which follow from the fact that the Lagrangian of QCD is invariant under independent  $U(3)$  rotations of the right- and lefthanded components of the quark fields (except for the  $U(1)$  anomaly which ruins the conservation of the axial singlet current and for the explicit symmetry breaking due to the quark masses). In an arbitrary chiral basis, the quark mass term is of the form  $\bar{q}_L m q_L + \bar{q}_R m^Y q_R$ . Using the projectors  $P_R = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_5)$ ,  $P_L = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma_5)$ , the Dirac operator may be written as  $D = i \not{D} + P_L m + P_R m^Y$ . The chiral rotation  $q_R \rightarrow V_R q_R$ ,  $q_L \rightarrow V_L q_L$ ,  $V_R, V_L \in U(3)$  takes this operator into  $D' = V D V^\dagger$ , with  $V = P_R V_R + P_L V_L$ ,  $V^\dagger = V^{\dagger Y} = P_L V_R^\dagger + P_R V_L^\dagger$ . While the kinetic term is invariant under the operation, the mass term transforms according to  $m' = V_R m V_L^Y$ .

The path integral over the quark degrees of freedom is given by the deter-

invariant of the Dirac operator. The singlet axial current is anomalous because the determinant does not remain the same under the above operation, but picks up a phase,  $\det D^0 = e^{i\theta} \det D$ , where  $\theta$  is the angle of the  $U(1)$  rotation,  $e^{i\theta} = \det V_R V_L^\dagger$ , and

$$\theta = \int d^4x \frac{1}{32\pi^2} G^a G^a \quad ; \quad \theta = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \int d^4x G^a G^a \quad :$$

In euclidean space,  $\theta$  is the winding number of the field configuration. Note that I am absorbing the coupling constant in the gluon field,  $D = \partial - iG$ .

The change in the Dirac determinant in effect adds a term to the Lagrangian proportional to  $\theta$ . So, if a term of this form is allowed for to start with,  $\bar{L}_{QCD} = L_{QCD} + \theta$ , the form of the Lagrangian remains the same under the full set of chiral transformations, but both the quark mass matrix and the vacuum angle undergo a change,  $m \rightarrow V_R m V_L^\dagger$ ,  $\theta \rightarrow \theta + \theta$ .

This property of QCD may readily be formulated at the level of the effective theory. The presence of an additional coupling constant,  $\theta$ , also shows up in the effective Lagrangian,  $L_{eff} \rightarrow \bar{L}_{eff} = \bar{L}_{eff}(U; \partial U; \dots; m; \theta)$ . The expression must have the property that the transformation

$$U^0 = V_R U V_L^\dagger \quad ; \quad m^0 = V_R m V_L^\dagger \quad ; \quad \theta^0 = \theta + \theta$$

leaves it invariant,  $\bar{L}_{eff}(U^0; \partial U^0; \dots; m^0; \theta^0) = \bar{L}_{eff}(U; \partial U; \dots; m; \theta)^1$ .

Since the phase of the determinant  $e^{i\theta} = \det U$  transforms according to  $\theta^0 = \theta + \theta$ , the combination  $\theta + \theta$  remains invariant. It is convenient to replace the variable  $\theta$  by this combination,  $\bar{L}_{eff} = \bar{L}_{eff}(U; \partial U; \dots; m; \theta + \theta)$ . The above symmetry relation then implies that the effective Lagrangian is invariant under a simultaneous rotation of the matrices  $U$  and  $m$ , at a fixed value of the last argument. The expansion in powers of derivatives and quark mass matrices yields a sequence of invariants which can be formed with  $m; U; \partial U; \dots$ . There are two differences compared to the corresponding series of terms which occur in the standard framework, where the  $\theta^0$  does not represent a dynamical variable: the determinant of  $U$  differs from one and the coefficients of the expansion are not constants, but functions of the

---

<sup>1</sup>More precisely, the corresponding action is invariant { the effective Lagrangian changes by a total derivative. The phenomenon gives rise to the Wess-Zumino-term. Since the corresponding vertices involve one or more meson fields, they do not contribute to the mass formulae and I therefore disregard the complication.

variable  $\phi_0 + \dots$ . Up to and including terms with two derivatives or one factor of  $m$ , the most general expression consistent with the symmetries of the QCD Hamiltonian reads<sup>2</sup> [2, 6]

$$\bar{L}_{\text{eff}} = V_0 + V_1 \text{tr} U^\dagger U + V_2 \text{tr} U^\dagger \partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U + V_2^2 \text{tr} U^\dagger \partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U + V_3 \text{tr} U \partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U + \dots; \quad (1)$$

with  $V_n = V_n(\phi_0 + \dots)$ . The expression is valid to all orders in  $1/N_c$ . The symmetry does not constrain the form of the coefficient functions, except that  $V_0, V_1, V_3$  must be real and even under parity,  $V_n(\mathbf{x}) = V_n(\mathbf{x})$ , while  $V_2$  obeys  $V_2(\mathbf{x}) = V_2(\mathbf{x})^T$ .

In the large  $N_c$  limit, the coefficients reduce to constants. The reason is that, in this limit, the dependence of the various Green functions and matrix elements on  $\phi$  is suppressed [3]: Compared to the leading contribution of the QCD Lagrangian,  $\text{tr} G^a G^a = 4g^2$ , the term  $\text{tr} G^a \tilde{G}^a = 32\pi^2$  represents a small perturbation of order  $g^2/N_c$ . The vacuum energy density, e.g., is of the form  $\mathcal{E} = N_c^2 g_0(1/N_c) + N_c g_1(1/N_c) + \dots$ . The  $\phi$ -dependence of the coefficients occurring in the effective Lagrangian is similar [2, 6]:

$$V_n(\phi_0 + \dots) = (N_c)^{p_n} f V_n^0(\tilde{\phi}) + N_c^{1-p_n} V_n^1(\tilde{\phi}) + \dots; \quad \tilde{\phi} = (\phi_0 + \dots)/N_c;$$

with  $p_0 = 2; p_1 = p_2 = 1; p_3 = 0$ . In fact, the leading term in the expansion of  $V_0$  coincides with the gluonic contribution to the vacuum energy,  $V_0^0(\mathbf{x}) = g_0(\mathbf{x})$ .

The above representation shows that the Taylor series of the coefficients with respect to  $\phi_0 + \dots$  is accompanied by powers of  $1/N_c$ , so that only the first few terms are needed to a given order of the  $1/N_c$  expansion. The Taylor series of  $V_0$ , e.g., yields  $V_0(\phi_0 + \dots) = \phi_0 + \frac{1}{2} \phi_0^2 + O(1/N_c)$ . The first term  $\phi_0 = O(N_c^2)$  is an irrelevant cosmological constant, while  $\phi_0^2 = O(N_c^0)$  represents the second derivative of the gluonic contribution to the vacuum energy with respect to  $\phi$  and is referred to as the topological susceptibility.

In the present context, the dependence on  $\phi$  is of interest only to incorporate the anomalous Ward identity and to control the expansion in powers of  $1/N_c$ . The vacuum angle has now served its purpose and can be dismissed, setting  $\theta = 0$ . Also, I now choose the chiral basis in such a manner that the quark mass matrix is diagonal and real.

The preceding analysis involves a simultaneous expansion in powers of  $1/N_c$ , powers of momenta  $p$  and powers of the quark mass matrix  $m$ . It is

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that the trace  $\text{tr} U^\dagger U U^\dagger U$  coincides with  $\text{tr} U \partial_\mu U \partial^\mu U$ .

convenient to order this triple series by counting the three expansion parameters as small quantities of order  $1/N_c = O(\epsilon)$ ,  $p = O(\sqrt{\epsilon})$  and  $m = O(\epsilon)$ , respectively. Disregarding the cosmological constant mentioned above, the expansion then takes the form  $L_{\text{eff}} = L_{\text{eff}}^{(0)} + L_{\text{eff}}^{(1)} + \dots$ , where the first term is of order one, while the second collects the corrections of  $O(\epsilon)$ . Setting  $V_1(0) = \frac{1}{4}F^2$ ,  $V_2(0) = \frac{1}{2}F^2B$ , the explicit expression for the leading term reads

$$L_{\text{eff}}^{(0)} = \frac{1}{4}F^2 h \bar{U} \gamma_\mu U + \frac{1}{2}F^2 B \text{tr} (U + U^\dagger) - \frac{1}{2} m \bar{U} U : \quad (1)$$

The first two terms are familiar from the standard effective Lagrangian. They involve the pion decay constant  $F = O(\sqrt{N_c})$  and the constant  $B = O(N_c^0)$ , which is related to the quark condensate. The third term is characteristic of the extension from  $SU(3)_R \times SU(3)_L$  to  $U(3)_R \times U(3)_L$ . It equips the  $U$  with a mass proportional to the square root of the topological susceptibility.

The following calculation also accounts for the corrections of first non-leading order. In addition to the terms arising from the Taylor coefficients  $V_2^0(0) = 2iBK_1$  and  $V_3(0) = K_2$ , which both are of  $O(N_c^0)$ , these also involve contributions from higher orders of the derivative expansion, omitted in eq.(1). Their structure is known from the standard framework, where the corresponding effective coupling constants are denoted by  $L_1; \dots; L_8$ . The first three of these do not play any role in the following, because they multiply invariants of the type  $(\text{tr} U)^4$  and do therefore not contribute to the masses of the pseudoscalars. The term  $L_4 h \bar{U} \gamma_\mu U \text{tr} (U^\dagger U + U U^\dagger)$  contains two traces. Contributions of this structure can only arise from graphs with two fermion quark loops: The term violates the Okubo-Iizuka-Zweig rule and is suppressed by one power of  $1/N_c$ . The same applies to the contributions proportional to  $L_6$  and  $L_7$ . The coupling constants  $L_5$  and  $L_8$ , however, are of  $O(N_c)$  and do contribute to the masses at first non-leading order of the above expansion. Absorbing the constant  $B$  in the quark mass matrix with  $2Bm$ , the effective Lagrangian becomes

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\text{eff}} = & \frac{1}{4}F^2 h \bar{U} \gamma_\mu U + \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} (U + U^\dagger) - \frac{1}{2} m \bar{U} U \\ & + L_5 h \bar{U} \gamma_\mu U \text{tr} (U + U^\dagger) + L_8 h \text{tr} U \text{tr} U^\dagger + \text{tr} U^\dagger U \\ & + iK_1 \text{tr} (U^\dagger - U) + K_2 \text{tr} U \text{tr} U^\dagger + O(\epsilon^2) : \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The first line contains the leading contributions of order  $N_c p^2$ ;  $N_c m$  and  $N_c^0$ , respectively. Their relative size depends on the relative magnitude of

the three expansion parameters  $1/N_c, p/m$ . The second line contains the corrections of order  $N_c p^2/m$  and  $N_c m^2$ , while the third one accounts for those of order  $N_c^0 m$  and  $N_c^0 p^2$ .

The mass spectrum is obtained by setting  $U = \exp i' = F$  and working out the terms quadratic in the matrix field  $'$ . In this notation,  $\phi_0$  is given by the trace  $\text{tr } h' i = F$ , so that the quadratic terms are

$$L_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{4} h \partial' \partial' i + 2L_5 F^2 h \partial' \partial' i + K_2 F^2 h \partial' i h \partial' i \quad (3)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{4} h'^2 i - \frac{1}{2} F^2 h' i^2 - 2L_8 F^2 h' ' + \frac{1}{2} h'^2 i + 2K_1 F^2 h' i h' i :$$

For those fields which carry electric charge or strangeness, this expression is diagonal and yields

$$M_{K^+}^2 = (m_u + m_d) B f^2 + 8(m_u + m_d) (2L_8 - L_5) B F^2 g ; \quad (4)$$

and analogously for  $M_{K^0}^2, M_{K^+}^2$ . These relations agree with those of chiral perturbation theory [2], with two simplifications: (i) The coupling constants  $L_4$  and  $L_6$  do not occur here, because they are suppressed by one power of  $N_c$ . (ii) For the same reason, the chiral logarithms generated by the one loop graphs are absent. Since these graphs are inversely proportional to  $F^2$ , they only show up at the next order of the expansion under consideration.

The above mass formulae imply that the corrections in the two ratios<sup>3</sup>

$$\frac{M_{K^0}^2}{M_K^2} = \frac{m_s + \hat{m}}{2\hat{m}} f_1 + \frac{1}{2} g$$

$$\frac{M_{K^0}^2}{M_K^2} - \frac{M_{K^+}^2}{M_K^2} = \frac{m_d - m_u}{m_s - \hat{m}} f_1 + \frac{1}{2} g$$

are the same. Eliminating the quark masses in favour of  $M_{K^0}, M_{K^+}$ , the explicit expression for the correction becomes

$$\frac{1}{M_K^2} = \frac{8}{F^2} (M_{K^0}^2 - M_{K^+}^2) (2L_8 - L_5) ; \quad (5)$$

In the double ratio

$$Q^2 = \frac{M_{K^0}^2}{M_K^2} - \frac{M_{K^+}^2}{M_{K^0}^2} - \frac{M_K^2}{M_{K^+}^2} ;$$

---

<sup>3</sup>The quantity  $\hat{m}$  denotes the mean mass of u and d,  $\hat{m} = \frac{1}{2} (m_u + m_d)$

the correction drops out. Accordingly, the corresponding ratio of quark masses is determined by the masses of the pseudoscalars

$$\frac{m_s^2 - \frac{1}{4}(m_u + m_d)^2}{m_d^2 - m_u^2} = Q^2 ; \quad (6)$$

up to and including first order corrections [2]. Note that I have disregarded the electromagnetic interaction. Evaluating the corresponding self energies with the Dashen theorem [7], one finds  $Q^2 \approx 24$ . The theorem holds only in the chiral limit. The corrections of higher order are discussed in [8, 9]. The corresponding uncertainty in the value of  $Q$  is of order 10 %.

In the neutral sector, the contributions from  $L_5$  and  $K_2$  introduce off-diagonal elements into the kinetic term. These are removed with the change of variables  $\phi \rightarrow \phi' + 4f\pi/gL_5 B F^2 - 2h' i K_2 F^2$ . The operation reduces the first line in eq.(3) to the term  $\frac{1}{4}h\phi' \partial_\mu \phi'$  and replaces the coefficients of the quadratic form in the second line by

$$\bar{M}^2 = (1 - 12K_2 F^2) ; \quad \bar{L}_8 = L_8 - \frac{1}{2}L_5 ; \quad \bar{K}_1 = K_1 + \frac{1}{2}K_2 + 2L_5 F^2 ;$$

The masses of the neutral particles are thus obtained by diagonalizing this form. The mixing angles between the  $\pi^0$  and  $\eta^0$  are proportional to the isospin breaking mass difference  $m_d - m_u$ . These angles are small, but play a crucial role e.g. for the transition  $\pi^0 \rightarrow 3\gamma$ . In the masses of the neutral particles, however, isospin breaking only generates contributions of order  $(m_d - m_u)^2$ , which are negligibly small. Disregarding these, the  $\pi^0$  is degenerate with  $\eta$  and the only mixing is with the  $\eta'$ . Setting  $\phi' = \phi_8/\sqrt{3} + \phi_9/\sqrt{3}$ , the quadratic part of the Lagrangian becomes

$$L_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2}(\phi_8' \partial_\mu \phi_8' + \phi_9' \partial_\mu \phi_9') - \frac{1}{2}(m_1^2 \phi_8'^2 - 2\phi_8' \phi_9' + M_1^2 \phi_9'^2) ;$$

The mass formulae for the charged particles may be used to eliminate the quark masses in favour of  $M_K^2, M^2$ . The coefficients then take the form

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2 &= \frac{1}{3}(4M_K^2 - M^2) + \frac{4}{3}(M_K^2 - M^2) - M \\ &= \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{1}{2}(M_K^2 - M^2) \right) + M \\ M_1^2 &= 6\frac{M^2}{F^2} + \frac{1}{3}(2M_K^2 + M^2)(1 - 2N) + \frac{2}{3}(M_K^2 - M^2) - M \end{aligned}$$

Remarkably,  $m_1^2$  only involves the same correction  $\delta_M$  which also occurs in the mass formulae for  $\pi$  and  $K$ . The term  $\delta_N = 12\bar{K}_1 F^2$ , which describes the Zweig rule violating contributions of order  $1/N_c$ , only affects the quantities  $\pi_1$  and  $M_1^2$ .

The eigenvalues  $M^2 = (M^2; M_0^2)$  obey  $(m_1^2 - M^2)(M_1^2 - M^2) = \pi_1^2$ . Eliminating  $M_1^2$ , this yields  $(m_1^2 - M^2)(M_0^2 - m_1^2) = \pi_1^2$  or, equivalently,

$$M^2 = m_1^2 - \frac{\pi_1^2}{M_0^2 - m_1^2} : \quad (7)$$

The relation states that the Gell-Mann-Oakes formula,  $M^2 = \frac{1}{3}(4M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)$ , receives two categories of SU(3) breaking corrections: While the first is governed by the same parameter  $\delta_M$  which also determines the corrections in the masses of the charged particles and is accounted for in the term  $m_1^2$ , the second arises from the  $\pi^0$  transition matrix element of the operator  $\bar{q}m q$  and is proportional to  $\pi_1^2$ .

The consequences of these mass formulae are the following. I first recall that the relation (6) constrains the two ratios  $x = m_u/m_d$  and  $y = m_s/m_d$  to an ellipse. Since  $Q^2$  is very large, the ellipse is well approximated by  $x^2 + y^2 = Q^2 = 1$ , i.e. the center is at the origin and  $Q$  represents the large semiaxis, while the small one is equal to 1. To determine the individual ratios  $x; y$  one needs to know the quantity  $\delta_M$ , which describes the strength of SU(3) breaking in the mass formulae and involves the two effective coupling constants  $L_5; L_8$ . The former is known from the observed asymmetry in the decay constants  $F_\pi; F_K$ , but, as pointed out by Kaplan and Manohar [10],  $L_8$  cannot be determined on purely phenomenological grounds. The scattering of the chiral perturbation theory results for the mass ratios  $m_u/m_d$  and  $m_s/m_d$  encountered in the literature [11]–[20] originates in this problem: Treating  $L_8$  as a free parameter, one may obtain any value for  $\delta_M$  and thus reach any point on the ellipse. In particular, the possibility that the mass of the lightest quark might vanish is widely discussed in the literature, because this would remove the strong CP problem [22]. This possibility corresponds to  $m_u/m_d = 0; m_s/m_d = Q$  and requires that the correction is large and negative,  $\delta_M = M_K^2 - M^2 = (Q + \frac{1}{2})^{-1} \approx -0.45$ .

I now wish to show that the framework specified above leads to a lower bound on  $\delta_M$  which requires  $m_u$  to be different from zero. The bound arises



because the relation (7) only admits a solution for  $M^2 < m_1^2$ , or

$$M^2 > \frac{4M_K^2 - 3M^2 - M^2}{4(M_K^2 - M^2)} = 0.07 : \quad (8)$$

The inequality is an immediate consequence of the fact that  $\gamma^0$  mixing leads to a repulsion of the two levels. Admittedly, the hypothesis that the first two terms of the  $1=N_c$  expansion yield a decent approximation for the theory of physical interest,  $N_c = 3$ , goes beyond solid phenomenology. This hypothesis, however, represents the only coherent explanation of the fact that the Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka-rule holds to a good approximation and I see no reason to doubt its reliability in the present case.

The large negative value of  $\gamma_M$  required if  $m_u$  were to vanish violates the above bound. The  $1=N_c$  expansion thus corroborates the conclusion that  $m_u$  is different from zero. As is well-known, the quantity  $e^i \det m$  then represents a physically significant parameter of the QCD Lagrangian. Why the mechanism which generates  $m$  and  $\gamma$  happens to be such that, to a high degree of accuracy, this quantity is real, represents a well-known puzzle [22]. It cannot be solved the easy way, with  $m_u = 0$ .

A similar inequality also holds for the  $1=N_c$  correction,

$$N^2 > 3 \frac{(\sqrt{3} + 1)M^2 - (\sqrt{3} - 1)M_0^2 - 2M^2}{8(M_K^2 - M^2)} = 0.18 :$$

This indicates that Zweig rule violating effects are not entirely negligible.

As it stands, the mass formula (7) only determines the magnitude of the SU(3) asymmetry  $\gamma_M$  ( $m_s - \hat{m}$ ) if the size of the Zweig rule violation  $N^2 - 1=N_c$  is known and vice versa. One may, e.g., choose a value for  $N^2$ , such that  $\gamma_M$  saturates the inequality (8). This is the case, however, only if  $\gamma_1$  vanishes, i.e. if  $1 + \gamma_N \gamma_M = 0$ . In other words, the corrections would have to cancel the leading term. It is clear that in such a situation, the above formulae are meaningless. A coherent picture only results if both  $|\gamma_M|$  and  $|\gamma_N|$  are small compared to unity. The mass formula (7) shows that a negative value of the SU(3) asymmetry  $\gamma_M$  requires exorbitant  $1=N_c$  corrections. Even  $\gamma_M = 0$  calls for large Zweig rule violations,  $N^2 \sim \frac{1}{2}$ . The term  $(1 + \gamma_M \gamma_N)^2$ , which corrects the contribution generated by the singlet-octet transitions for effects of first nonleading order, would then instead

modify this contribution by a factor of 4 if evaluated as it stands, eliminating it altogether if expanded to first order in the "corrections". The condition

$$M > 0 \quad (9)$$

thus represents a generous lower bound for the region where a truncated  $1=N_c$  expansion leads to meaningful results. It states that the current algebra formula, which relates the quark mass ratio  $m_s/m$  to the meson mass ratio  $M_K^2/M^2$  represents an upper limit,  $m_s/m < 2M_K^2/M^2 - 1$ . The corresponding bounds on the two ratios  $m_u/m_d$  and  $m_s/m_d$  depend on the value of  $Q$ ,

$$\frac{m_u}{m_d} > \frac{M^4 Q^2 - M_K^4 + M_K^2 M^2}{M^4 Q^2 + M_K^4 - M_K^2 M^2} ; \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{m_s}{m_d} < \frac{M^2 (2M_K^2 - M^2) Q^2}{M^4 Q^2 + M_K^4 - M_K^2 M^2} ; \quad (11)$$

If  $Q$  is taken from the Dashen theorem, these relations state that the Weinberg ratios [12] correspond to the limiting case where the bounds are saturated,  $m_u/m_d > 0.55$ ;  $m_s/m_d < 20.1$ . Lowering the value of  $Q$  to  $Q = 22$ , the bound on  $m_u/m_d$  becomes slightly weaker,  $m_u/m_d > 0.48$ , while the one for  $m_s/m_d$  decreases to  $m_s/m_d < 19.2$ . The estimate  $m_u/m_d = 0.3 - 0.1$  obtained in ref.[17, 20] from a multipole analysis of the transitions  $0^+ \rightarrow 0^+, 0^+$  is outside this range and is thus not consistent with the above arguments (see also ref.[21]).

To demonstrate that the observed mass pattern is perfectly consistent with the hypothesis that the corrections of order  $1=N_c$  as well as those of order  $m$  are small, I note that the contribution from the second term in eq.(7) is small, because it is suppressed by a factor of order  $M^2/M_0^2$ . The corrections to that term are reduced by the same factor. The only new contribution in the second order formula which does not get suppressed is the one responsible for the difference between  $m_1^2$  and the value of  $M^2$  which follows from the Gell-Mann-Okubo formula. Retaining only this term, the second order formula simplifies to

$$M = \frac{4M_K^2 - M^2 - 3M^2}{4(M_K^2 - M^2)} + \frac{2(M_K^2 - M^2)}{3M_0^2 + M^2 - 4M_K^2} ;$$

Numerically, this gives  $M = 0.18$ , thus requiring a breaking of  $SU(3)$  symmetry in the mass formulae of the same order of magnitude as in the decay

constants. The corresponding value for the  $1/N_c$  correction is also quite small,  $\alpha_N = 0.24$ . I repeat, however, that the above framework does not predict the values of the two corrections individually, but only correlates them. In particular, the truncated large  $N_c$  expansion is also consistent with a somewhat smaller breaking of  $SU(3)$  symmetry and a correspondingly larger violation of the Zweig rule.

## References

- [1] S. Weinberg, *Physica A* 96 (1979) 327.
- [2] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Nucl. Phys. B* 250 (1985) 465.
- [3] G. 'tHooft, *Nucl. Phys. B* 72 (1974), B 75 (1974) 461;  
G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys. B* 117 (1974) 519, B 159 (1979) 213;  
R. J. Crewther, *Phys. Lett.* 70B (1977), 349 and in "Field Theoretical Methods in Particle Physics", ed. W. Ruhl (Plenum, New York, 1980);  
E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B* 156 (1979) 213, B 117 (1980) 57;  
P. DiVecchia, *Phys. Lett.* 85B (1979) 357;  
P. Nath and R. Arnowitt, *Phys. Rev. D* 23 (1981) 473.
- [4] S. Coleman and E. Witten, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 45 (1980) 100.
- [5] P. Minkowski, *Phys. Lett. B* 237 (1990) 531, discusses an alternative picture, where the topological susceptibility diverges in the large  $N_c$  limit.
- [6] P. DiVecchia and G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys. B* 171 (1980) 253;  
C. Rosenzweig, J. Schedter and T. Trahern, *Phys. Rev. D* 21 (1980) 3388;  
E. Witten, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* 128 (1980) 363.
- [7] R. Dashen, *Phys. Rev.* 183 (1969) 1245.
- [8] J. Donoghue, B. Holstein and D. Wyler, *Phys. Rev. D* 47 (1993) 2089;  
J. Bijnens, *Phys. Lett. B* 306 (1993) 343.
- [9] R. Urech, *Nucl. Phys. B* 433 (1995) 234;  
R. Baur and R. Urech, "On the corrections to Dashen's theorem", preprint hep-ph/9508393.
- [10] D. Kaplan and A. Manohar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56 (1986) 2004.
- [11] H. Leutwyler, *Phys. Lett. B* 48 (1974) 431; *Nucl. Phys. B* 76 (1974) 413;  
J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Nucl. Phys. B* 94 (1975) 269.

- [12] S.W einberg, in A Festschrift for I.I.Rabi, ed.L.M otz (New York Acad. Sci., 1977) p. 185.
- [13] J.G asser and H .Leutwyler, Phys. Rep. 87 (1982) 77.
- [14] M .D .Scadron, Rep.P rog.Phys. 44 (1981) 213;  
J.Stem, H .Sazdjan and N.H .Fuchs, Phys. Rev. D 47 (1993) 3814;  
M .Knecht et al., Phys. Lett. B 313 (1993) 229.
- [15] K .Choi, C W .Kim and W .K .Sze, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61 (1988) 794;  
K .Choi and C W .Kim , Phys. Rev. D 40 (1989) 890;  
K .Choi, Nucl. Phys. B 383 (1992) 58; Phys. Lett. B 292 (1992) 159.
- [16] H .Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. B 337 (1990) 108.
- [17] J.D onoghue, B .Holstein and D .W yler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 3444.
- [18] H .Leutwyler, in Proc.XXV I Int.Conf.on High Energy Physics, Dallas, Aug. 1992, ed. J.R .Sanford (AIP Conf. Proc.No. 272, 1993) and in "Yukawa couplings and the origin of mass", Proc.2nd IFT Workshop, University of Florida, Gainesville, Feb. 1994, ed. P.R amond (International Press, Cambridge MA , 1995).
- [19] J.D onoghue, Lectures given at the Theoretical Advanced Study Institute (TASI), Boulder, Colorado (1993).
- [20] D .W yler, Proc.XV IK azimierz Meeting on Elementary Particle Physics, eds. Z.A jluk et al., World Scientific (1994).
- [21] M .Luty and R .Sundrum , Phys. Lett. B 312 (1993) 205.
- [22] R .Peccei, in "CP violation", ed.C .Jarlskog (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989). For recent work, see e.g.  
H .Banerjee, Resolution of the strong CP and U (1) problems, preprint hep-th/9508065.