

A NEW ESTIMATE OF $\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$

S. Bertolini

INFN, Sezione di Trieste, and
 Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati
 via Beirut 4, I-34013 Trieste, Italy.

Abstract

We discuss a new estimate of $\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ in the kaon system. The present approach is based on the evaluation of the hadronic matrix elements of the $S = 1$ effective quark lagrangian by means of the chiral quark model, with the inclusion of meson one-loop renormalization and NLO Wilson coefficients. The estimate here reviewed is fully consistent with the $I = 1/2$ selection rule in $K \rightarrow \pi \pi$ decays, which is well reproduced within the same framework.

^{*}Talk given at the Workshop on K Physics, Orsay, France, May 30 - June 4, 1996.

1 Introduction

The real part of ϵ' measures direct CP violation in the decays of a neutral kaon in two pions. It is a fundamental quantity which has attracted a great deal of theoretical as well as experimental work. Its determination answers the question of whether CP violation is present only in the mass matrix of the neutral kaons (the superweak scenario) or is also at work directly in the decays.

On the experimental front, the present results of CERN (NA 31) and Fermilab (E 731) are tantalizing insofar as the superweak scenario cannot be excluded and the disagreement between the two outcomes leaves still a large uncertainty.

On the theoretical side, much has been accomplished, although the intrinsic difficulty of a problem that encompasses scales as different as m_t and m_s weights against a decisive progress in the field.

The short distance (perturbative) QCD analysis has greatly profited in recent years from the work done by the Munich [1] and Rome [2] groups who computed the anomalous dimension matrix of the ten relevant operators to the next-to-leading order (NLO), thus reducing the uncertainty related to α_s at the 10% level.

The largest uncertainty arises in the long-distance part of the effective lagrangian, the computation of which involves the evaluation of the hadronic matrix elements of the quark operators.

There exist two complete estimates of such hadronic matrix elements performed by the aforementioned groups, and recently updated in ref. [3] for the lattice (at least for some of the operators). A recent review of $1/N_c$ results is given in ref. [4].

Both groups seem to agree on the difficulty of accommodating within the standard model a value substantially larger than 10^{-3} and obtain 10^{-4} as the preferred scale for ϵ' . This unexpectedly small value is the result of the cancellation between gluonic and electroweak penguin operators [5]. This cancellation, which depletes by an order of magnitude the natural magnitude of ϵ' in the SM, marries any theoretical attempt of predicting direct CP violation with a precision better than a factor two (due solely to the intrinsic short-distance uncertainty).

In view of that, it seems to us that independent estimates of ϵ' , even in phenomenological models, are desirable. In our opinion it is crucial that a reliable evaluation of the hadronic matrix elements first provides a consistent picture of kaon physics, starting from the CP-conserving amplitudes and, in particular, by reproducing the $I = 1/2$ selection rule, which governs most of these amplitudes as well as the quantity ϵ' itself. We also feel that the same evaluation should pay particular attention to the problem of achieving a satisfactory ϵ' -scheme and scale independence in the matching between the matrix elements and the Wilson coefficients, the absence of which undermines any estimate.

In ref. [6], hereafter referred as I, we have completed the study of the hadronic matrix elements of all the ten operators of the $S = 1$ effective quark lagrangian by means of the chiral quark model (QM) [7] and shown in [8], hereafter referred as II, that the inclusion of non-perturbative $O(1/N_c)$ corrections and the SU(3) breaking effects in the one-loop meson

renormalization provided an improved scale independence and, more importantly, a good fit of the $I = 1/2$ selection rule (see also the contribution of M. Fabbrichesi at this workshop).

In a recent paper [9] we presented a new computation of $\langle \pi^0 |$ based on the QM approach. Our estimate takes advantage, as the existing ones, of

NLO results for the Wilson coefficients;

up-to-date analysis of the constraints on the mixing coefficient $\text{Im } \theta$.

Among the new elements introduced, the most relevant are

A consistent evaluation of all hadronic matrix elements of the ten effective quark operators in the QM (including next-to-leading $O(N)$ and $O(\sqrt{s}N)$ contributions).

Inclusion in the $S = 1$ chiral lagrangian of the complete bosonization $O(p^2)$ of the electroweak operators Q_7 and Q_8 . Some relevant $O(p^2)$ terms have been neglected in all previous estimates;

Inclusion of the meson-loop renormalization and scale dependence of the matrix elements;

Consistency with the $I = 1/2$ selection rule in kaon decays;

Matching-scale and β -scheme dependence of the results below the 20% level.

Our prediction of $\langle \pi^0 |$ depends most sensitively on the value of the quark condensate, the input parameter that controls penguin-diagram physics. For this reason, we discuss a inclusive estimate based on a conservative range of $\langle \bar{q}q \rangle$, as well as the variations of all the other inputs: m_t , $\text{Im } \theta$ (which depends, beside m_t and m_c , on \hat{B}_K and other mixing angles) and α_{QCD} . Such a procedure provides us with the range of values for $\langle \pi^0 |$ that we consider to be the unbiased theoretical prediction of the standard model. Unfortunately, this range turns out to be rather large, spanning from $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ to $1.4 \cdot 10^{-3}$. On the other hand, it is as small as we can get without making some further assumptions on the input parameters, assumptions that all the other available estimates must make as well.

Such uncertainty notwithstanding, we agree in the end with refs. [3, 4] that it is difficult to accommodate within the standard model a value of $\langle \pi^0 |$ larger than 10^{-3} . As a matter of fact, our analysis points to definitely smaller values, when not negative. This can be understood not so much as a peculiar feature of the QM prediction as the neglect in other estimates of a class of contributions in the vacuum saturation approximation (VSA) of the matrix elements of the leading electroweak operators, which enhance the destructive interference between gluonic and electroweak penguins. This problem is discussed in detail in I and in ref. [10]. These new contributions are responsible for the onset of the superweak regime for values of m_t smaller than 200 GeV. In our computation, it is the meson loop renormalization that in the end brings back $\langle \pi^0 |$ to positive values.

2 Hadronic Matrix Elements and B_i Factors

The quark effective lagrangian at a scale $\mu < m_c$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{S=1} = \frac{G_F}{2} V_{ud} V_{us} \sum_i^h z_i(\mu) + \sum_i^i y_i(\mu) Q_i(\mu) - \frac{G_F}{2} \sum_i^X C_i(\mu) Q_i(\mu) : \quad (2.1)$$

The Q_i are four-quark operators obtained by integrating out in the standard model the vector bosons and the heavy quarks t, b and c . A convenient and by now standard basis includes ten quark operators. The functions $z_i(\mu)$ and $y_i(\mu)$ are the Wilson coefficients and V_{ij} the Kobayashi-Maskawa (KM) matrix elements; $V_{td} V_{ts} = V_{ud} V_{us}$. Following the usual parametrization of the KM matrix, in order to determine θ , we only need the $y_i(\mu)$, which control the CP-violating part of the amplitudes.

In paper I we have computed all hadronic matrix elements of the ten effective quark operators in eq. (2.1) in the framework of the QM. The matrix elements of the first six operators were first computed in the QM in ref. [11]. The matrix elements are obtained by the integration of the constituent quarks by means of dimensional regularization. The loop integration leads to results that depend on the scheme employed to deal with ϵ but are scale independent. The renormalization-scale dependence is introduced in our approach by the meson-loop renormalization of the amplitudes, as explained in I. The meson-loop corrections together with the gluon-condensate contributions are the most relevant ingredients in reproducing the $I = 1=2$ selection rule in $K \rightarrow \pi \pi$ decays, (as discussed in II).

The QM results are expressed in a double power expansion on $M^2 = \mu^2$ and $p^2 = \mu^2$, where M is a dimensionful parameter of the model which can be interpreted as the constituent quark mass in mesons, p is a typical external momentum, and $\mu \sim 1 \text{ GeV}$ is the chiral symmetry breaking scale.

The value of M is constrained [12] by experimental data on the decay of π^0 and η to be $M = 223 \pm 9 \text{ MeV}$ ($243 \pm 9 \text{ MeV}$ if higher order corrections are included). Comparable values are found by using vector-meson dominance, or fitting all input parameters in the extended Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model [13].

The integration of the fermion degrees of freedom leads naturally to an effective bosonic representation of the $S = 1$ quark lagrangian with the desired chiral properties. In I we have constructed the complete $O(p^2)$ chiral representation of the lagrangian in eq. (2.1), where the local quark operators Q_i are represented by a linear combination of bosonic operators B , namely $Q_i = \sum_P G_P(Q_i) B_P$. The effective quark lagrangian is therefore replaced by

$$\mathcal{L}_{S=1} = \frac{G_F}{2} \sum_i^X C_i(\mu) G_P(Q_i) B_P : \quad (2.2)$$

As discussed at length in I, the chiral coefficients G_P determined via the QM approach are ϵ -scheme dependent. While the ϵ -scheme dependence arises in the QM from the integration of the chiral fermions, the explicit ϵ -dependence is entirely due to the chiral loop renormalization of the matrix elements:

$$B_P^D \mathcal{L}_{S=1} B_P^E = \frac{G_F}{2} \sum_i^X C_i(\mu_{SD}) G_P(Q_i) B_P^E \mathcal{L}_{SD} : \quad (2.3)$$

where we have labeled by a and b the initial and final bosonic states. We remark that in our approach the μ -dependence of the chiral loops is not cancelled by higher order counterterms, as it is usually required in the strong chiral lagrangian.

The renormalization scale dependence is therefore determined order by order in the energy expansion of the chiral lagrangian. In this respect there is no direct counterpart to the expansion in strong and electromagnetic couplings on which the short-distance analysis is based and, accordingly, we refer to the explicit μ -dependence in the matrix elements as to the long-distance (LD) or "non-perturbative" scale dependence. A purely perturbative renormalization scale dependence is introduced in the matrix elements by the NLO running of the quark condensate, which we include whenever a comparison between values at different scales is required. Otherwise, quark and gluon condensates are considered in our approach as phenomenological parameters.

Physical observables must not depend on the chosen scheme for handling ϵ in dimensional regularization and the value of the renormalization scale μ . Our aim is to test whether the estimate of observables is consistently improved by matching the "long-distance" ϵ -scheme and μ dependences so obtained with those present in the short-distance analysis (in particular we identify μ_{SD} with μ_{LD}). Whether and to what extent such an improvement is reproduced for any observables and for a consistent set of parameters, might tell us how well low-energy QCD is modelled in the QM-chiral lagrangian approach that we have devised.

In II, we have shown that minimizing the ϵ -scheme dependence of the physical isospin $I = 0$ and 2 amplitudes determines a range for the parameter M between 160 and 220 MeV. In II, it was also found that the μ dependence induced by the Wilson coefficients is substantially reduced by that of the hadronic matrix elements.

These issues become crucial for $\mu^0 = \mu$ where the ϵ -scheme dependence induced by the Wilson coefficients determines an uncertainty as large as 80% when using the $1/N_c$ hadronic matrix elements (see for instance ref. [1]) which are scheme independent.

In order to test the μ independence of $\mu^0 = \mu$ we vary the matching scale between 0.8 and 1.0 GeV, the highest energy up to which we trust the chiral loop corrections computed in I. We find that, in spite of the fact that some of the Wilson coefficients vary in this range by up to 50%, the matching with our matrix elements reduces the μ -dependence in $\mu^0 = \mu$ below 20% in most of the parameter space. We consider this improved stability a success of the approach.

In order to discuss our results for the hadronic matrix elements it is convenient to introduce the effective factors $B_i^{(0;2)} = \frac{h_{i;0;2}^{QM}}{h_{i;0;2}^{VSA}}$; which give the ratios between our hadronic matrix elements and those of the VSA. They are a useful way of comparing different evaluations.

In table 1 we collect the B_i factors for the ten operators in the isospin 0 and 2 channels. The values of the B_i depend on the scale at which the matrix elements are evaluated, the input parameters and M ; moreover, in the QM they depend on the ϵ -scheme employed. We have given in table 3 a representative example of their values and variations.

The values of $B_1^{(0)}$ and $B_2^{(0)}$ show that the corresponding hadronic matrix elements in the QM are, once non-factorizable contributions and meson renormalization have been included, respectively about ten and three times larger than their VSA values. At the same time, $B_1^{(2)}$

| | HV | | NDR | |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | = 0.8 GeV | = 1.0 GeV | = 0.8 GeV | = 1.0 GeV |
| $B_1^{(0)}$ | 10.6 | 11.1 | 10.6 | 11.1 |
| $B_2^{(0)}$ | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.0 |
| $B_1^{(2)}$ | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.55 |
| $B_2^{(2)}$ | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.55 |
| B_3 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| B_4 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 |
| $B_5 = B_6$ | 1.7 0.61 | 1.8 0.64 | 1.0 0.38 | 1.1 0.40 |
| $B_7^{(0)}$ | 3.0 2.2 | 3.3 2.4 | 2.9 2.2 | 3.2 2.3 |
| $B_8^{(0)}$ | 3.3 2.2 | 3.6 2.4 | 3.2 2.2 | 3.5 2.4 |
| $B_9^{(0)}$ | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.6 |
| $B_{10}^{(0)}$ | 4.4 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 5.9 |
| $B_7^{(2)}$ | 2.7 1.5 | 3.0 1.5 | 2.7 1.4 | 2.9 1.5 |
| $B_8^{(2)}$ | 2.1 1.4 | 2.3 1.5 | 2.1 1.4 | 2.3 1.5 |
| $B_9^{(2)}$ | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.55 |
| $B_{10}^{(2)}$ | 0.52 | 0.55 | 0.52 | 0.55 |

Table 1: B_i factors in the $\overline{\text{QM}}$ (including meson-loop renormalizations) at two different scales: $\mu = 0.8$ and 1.0 GeV and in the two $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -schemes. The results shown are given for $M_\pi = 220$ MeV and $\langle \bar{s}s \rangle_{\text{GGI}} = (376 \text{ MeV})^4$, while the range given for $B_{5,8}$ corresponds to varying the quark condensate between $(-200 \text{ MeV})^3$ and $(-280 \text{ MeV})^3$.

and $B_2^{(2)}$ turn out to be at most half of what found in the VSA. These features make it possible for the selection rule to be reproduced in the $\overline{\text{QM}}$, as extensively discussed in II.

For comparison, in the $1=N_c$ approach of ref. [14], the inclusion of meson-loop renormalization through a cutoff regularization, leads, at the scale of 1 GeV, to $B_1^{(0)} = 5.2$, $B_2^{(0)} = 2.2$ and $B_1^{(2)} = B_2^{(2)} = 0.55$, a result that is not sufficient to reproduce the $I = 1=2$ rule. The similarity of the values $B_1^{(2)} = B_2^{(2)} = 0.55$ obtained in the $\overline{\text{QM}}$ with the corresponding $1=N_c$ results is remarkable, and yet a numerical coincidence, since the suppression originates from gluon condensate corrections in the $\overline{\text{QM}}$, whereas it is the effect of the meson loop renormalization (regularized via explicit cutoff) in the analysis of ref. [14].

The values of the penguin matrix elements $\langle \bar{Q}_3 \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{Q}_4 \rangle$ in the $\overline{\text{QM}}$ lead to rather large B_i factors. In the case of \bar{Q}_3 , the $\overline{\text{QM}}$ result has the opposite sign of the VSA result and B_3 is negative. This is the effect of the large non-perturbative gluon correction.

Regarding the gluon penguin operator \bar{Q}_6 (and \bar{Q}_5), we find that the $\overline{\text{QM}}$ gives a result consistent with the VSA (and the $1=N_c$ approach), B_6 (B_5) being approximately equal to two for small values of the quark condensate and one-half at larger values. It is the quadratic dependence (to be contrasted to the linear dependence in the $\overline{\text{QM}}$) of the VSA matrix element for the penguin operators that is responsible for the different weight of these operators at different values of the quark condensate. The lattice estimate at $\mu = 2$ GeV for these operators gives $B_5 = B_6 = 1.0 \pm 0.2$ [3].

The electroweak B_i factors are all larger in the \overline{MS} than in the VSA, except for $B_{9,10}^{(2)}$ that are about 1/2 in the HV and in the NDR schemes. The lattice estimate at $\mu = 2 \text{ GeV}$ in this case yields $B_{7,8}^{(2)} = 1.0 \pm 0.2$ and $B_9^{(2)} = 0.62 \pm 0.10$ [3]. For new preliminary lattice results see the contribution of G. Kilcup at this workshop.

The most relevant result for $"0"$ is the value of $B_8^{(2)}$ which ranges from 1.5 to 2 times that of the VSA. This increase is due to two independent reasons. On the one hand, we found two new terms in the chiral lagrangian that have not been included so far in the VSA estimate of the $Q_{7,8}$ matrix elements. The chiral coefficients of these terms are computed in the \overline{MS} approach as discussed in detail in I.

From this point of view, what we have referred to as VSA and used in table 1 as normalization for the $Q_{7,8}$ operators is not the complete VSA result. The inclusion of the new terms amounts up to a 60% increase of $B_{7,8}^{(2)}$ for small values of $|\arg(\mu)|$ in the chosen range and down to about 10% for large values; smaller effects are found in the case of $B_{7,8}^{(0)}$. On the other hand, the meson-loop renormalization associated with the new chiral terms is large (see I) and adds up to reproduce the results shown in table 1. The increase in importance of the operator Q_8 with respect to Q_6 turns into a more effective cancellation between the two operators for large values of the quark condensate while at smaller values the gluon penguin contribution prevails.

3 Anatomy of $"0"$ in the \overline{MS}

The quantity $"0"$ can be written as

$$\frac{"0"}{"} = \frac{G_F}{2} \frac{1}{\text{Re} A_0} \text{Im} \tau_0 - \frac{1}{2} \tau_2 ; \quad (3.1)$$

where, referring to the $S = 1$ quark lagrangian of eq. (2.1),

$$\tau_0 = \sum_i y_i h_{i1} i_0 ; \quad \tau_2 = \sum_i y_i h_{i1} i_2 + \sum_i y_i h_{i1} i_0 + \tau_0 ; \quad (3.2)$$

and $\text{Im} \tau_0 = \text{Im} V_{td} V_{ts}^*$:

The quantity $\tau_0 + \tau_2$ includes the effect of the isospin-breaking mixing between $"0"$ and the τ_2 terms.

A range for $\text{Im} \tau_0$ is determined from the experimental value of $"$ as a function of m_t and the other relevant parameters involved in the theoretical estimate. We will use the most recent NLO results for the QCD correction factors $\alpha_{s,2,3}$ (see the contribution of U. Nierste at this workshop) and vary the $S = 2$ hadronic parameter \hat{B}_K in the rather conservative range $\hat{B}_K = 0.55 \pm 0.25$; that encompasses both the \overline{MS} model prediction [15] and other current determinations [16].

This procedure gives two possible ranges for $\text{Im} \tau_0' = \text{Im} V_{us} V_{cb}^*$, which correspond to having the KM phase in the I or II quadrant (positive or negative, respectively). For example, for $m_t^{\text{pole}} = 180 \text{ GeV}$ ($m_t(m_W) = 183 \text{ GeV}$) and $\alpha_{QCD}^{(4)} = 350 \text{ MeV}$ we find

$$1.1 \cdot 10^{-4} \leq \text{Im} \tau_0' \leq 1.9 \cdot 10^{-4} \quad \text{and} \quad 0.75 \cdot 10^{-4} \leq \text{Im} \tau_0' \leq 1.9 \cdot 10^{-4} \quad (3.3)$$




Figure 1: Histograms of the partial contributions to ϵ'/ϵ of the height relevant operators for $\mu_{\text{qq}}(0.8 \text{ GeV}) = (200 \text{ MeV})^3$, $m_t^{\text{pole}} = 180 \text{ GeV}$, $\text{Im } \tau = 1.3 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and $\alpha_{\text{QCD}}^{(4)} = 350 \text{ MeV}$. Grey (black) histograms represent the contribution of each operator without (with) meson-loop renormalization. The last two histograms correspond to the sum of all contributions.

in the first and second quadrant respectively. For the range of \hat{B}_K considered, varying all the other parameters (including m_t and α_{QCD}) affects the above limits on $\text{Im } \tau$ by less than 20%. In particular, the upper bound on $\text{Im } \tau$ is stable, becoming a sensitive function of the input parameters only if we consider $\hat{B}_K > 0.5$. In other words, we agree with ref. [16] that it is the theoretical uncertainty on the hadronic $S = 2$ matrix element that controls the uncertainty on the determination of $\text{Im } \tau$.

It is useful to consider the individual contribution to ϵ'/ϵ of each of the quark operators. We have depicted them as histograms, where the grey (black) one stands for the contribution before (after) meson-loop renormalization. Henceforth all results are given for $M = 220 \text{ MeV}$ in the HV scheme.

It is clear from the histograms of Fig. 1, 2 and 3 that the two dominating operators are Q_6 and Q_8 . Yet, since they give contributions approximately of the same size and opposite in sign, the final value turns out to be relatively small and of size comparable to that of most of the other operators. This result is at the origin the large theoretical uncertainty as well as the unexpected smallness of ϵ'/ϵ .

The same histograms serve the purpose of showing that the meson-loop renormalizations are crucial not only in the overall size of each contribution but also in determining the sign of the final result (see Fig. 2). These corrections are here consistently included in the estimate for the first time.

The role of the operator Q_4 turns out to be marginal in our approach. In comparing this result with that of the $1=N_c$ framework [4] (see also the final tables in ref. [17] where we reproduce the individual $1=N_c$ contributions for the standard ten operators), it should be recalled that in the above analysis the Q_4 operator is written in terms of Q_1 , Q_2 and Q_3 and that its values is therefore influenced by the B_i factors assigned to the former matrix elements. In particular, while B_1 and B_2 are in ref. [4] requested to be large in order to account for




Figure 2: Same as Figure 1 for $\mu(0.8 \text{ GeV}) = (240 \text{ MeV})^3$.




Figure 3: Same as Figure 1 for $\mu(0.8 \text{ GeV}) = (280 \text{ MeV})^3$.

the $I = 1/2$ rule, B_3 is assigned the value of 1. Such a procedure produces a rather large value for the matrix element of Q_4 . In our approach, we see that in fact also B_3 is large (and negative!) and that Q_4 , once written in terms of the other operators, is small, as found in the direct estimate.

We hope that this discussion has convinced the reader that the quantity " ϵ'/ϵ " is difficult to estimate even with a factor two uncertainty. We think that only the order of magnitude can be predicted in a reliable manner. The reason is very simple: the final value is the result of the cancellation between two, approximately equal in size, contributions. Accordingly, any uncertainty is most likely amplified by an order of magnitude and we are unfortunately dealing with rather large ones. It is also important to understand that these considerations hold for any theoretical approach.

Keeping this in mind, by varying all parameters in the allowed ranges and, in particular, taking the quark condensate, which is the major source of uncertainty, between $(200 \text{ MeV})^3$

and $(280 \text{ MeV})^3$ we find

$$27 \cdot 10^4 < \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle < 9 \cdot 10^4 ; \quad (3.4)$$

where we have kept $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_{\text{QCD}}^{(4)}$ fixed at its central value. A larger range,

$$50 \cdot 10^4 < \langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle < 14 \cdot 10^4 ; \quad (3.5)$$

is obtained by varying $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle_{\text{QCD}}^{(4)}$ as well.

It should be stressed that the large range of negative values that we obtain is a consequence of two characteristic features of the matrix elements: i) the enhancement of the size of the electroweak matrix elements $\langle Q_{8,7} \rangle$ due to the coherent effects of the additional $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ contributions so far neglected (see discussion in sect. 5) and the chiral loop corrections; ii) the linear dependence on $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ of the leading gluon penguin matrix elements compared to the quadratic dependence of the leading terms in the electroweak matrix elements, which makes the latter prevail for large values of the quark condensate. The effect of i) represents an enhancement of the leading electroweak matrix elements up to a factor two with respect to the vacuum insertion approximation and present $1=N_c$ estimates (see table 3), while feature ii) is absent in the $1=N_c$ approach, the quark condensate dependence being always quadratic.

To provide a somewhat more restrictive estimate we may assume for the quark condensate the QCD Sum Rules improved PCAC result [18], namely $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = (221 \pm 17 \text{ MeV})^3$ at our matching scale $\mu = 0.8 \text{ GeV}$, and thus find

$$\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = \begin{cases} < 4.5^{+4.1}_{-5.4} \cdot 10^4 & \text{quadrant I} \\ : 3.9^{+5.0}_{-4.5} \cdot 10^4 & \text{quadrant II:} \end{cases} \quad (3.6)$$

whose average gives $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = (4 \pm 5) \cdot 10^4$.

The range of the quark condensate on which the above estimate is based, is not favorite by our analysis of the $I = 1/2$ selection rule in the QM. Higher values accommodate more naturally the rule, at least for a constituent mass $M' \gtrsim 220 \text{ MeV}$ | the value at which we also find μ -scheme independence of $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$. For values of the quark condensate in the range of Figs. 2 and 3 the central value of $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ shifts toward the superweak regime, and the role of meson loop corrections becomes crucial. For instance, by taking the simple PCAC result for the strange quark condensate, $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = (244 \pm 9 \text{ MeV})^3$ at $\mu = 0.8 \text{ GeV}$, we find

$$\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle = \begin{cases} < 1.4^{+6.5}_{-5.5} \cdot 10^4 & \text{quadrant I} \\ : 1.2^{+9.3}_{-4.0} \cdot 10^4 & \text{quadrant II:} \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

Actually, for such a range of $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$, negative central values of $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ in both quadrants are obtained due to the extra terms of the bosonization of the electroweak operators Q_7 and Q_8 neglected in the previous estimates. Only after the inclusion of the meson-loop renormalization $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ turns to the positive central values of eq. (3.7).

To have an overview of the present theoretical status for $\langle \bar{\psi}\psi \rangle$ in Fig. 4 we have summarized the predictions of three theoretical approaches and compared them with the present experimental results (labeled bands).

The smaller error in the lattice estimate originates in the Gaussian treatment of the uncertainty in the input parameters with respect to the ± 1 error included in the other estimates.




Figure 4: Present status of theoretical predictions and experimental values for ϵ'/ϵ (in units of 10^{-4}). The most recent $1=N_c$ [4] and lattice [3] estimates are compared to (a) our unbiased estimate (3.5), (b) our more restrictive estimate (3.6).

4 Outlook

Our phenomenological analysis, based on the simplest implementation of the QM and chiral lagrangian methods, takes advantage of the observation that the $I = 1=2$ selection rule in kaon decays is well reproduced in terms of three basic parameters (the constituent quark mass M and the quark and gluon condensates) in terms of which all hadronic matrix elements of the $S = 1$ lagrangian can be expressed.

We have used the best fit of the selection rule to constrain the allowed ranges of M , $\langle\bar{q}q\rangle$ and $\langle\bar{G}G\rangle$ and we have fed them in the analysis of ϵ'/ϵ .

Nonetheless, the error bars on the prediction of ϵ'/ϵ remain large. This is due to two conspiring features: 1) the destructive interference between the large hadronic matrix elements of Q_6 and Q_8 which enhances up to an order of magnitude any related uncertainty in the final prediction (this feature is general and does not depend on the specific approach); 2) the fact that large quark-condensate values are preferred in fitting the isospin zero $K^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ amplitude at $O(p^2)$ (which is a model dependent result).

Whereas little can be done concerning point 1) which makes difficult any theoretical attempt to predict ϵ'/ϵ with a precision better than a factor two, an improvement on 2) can be pursued within the present approach.

Two lines of research are in progress. On the one hand, we are extending the analysis to $O(p^4)$ in the chiral expansion to gain better precision on the hadronic matrix elements and to determine in a self-consistent way the polynomial contributions from the chiral loops; preliminary results indicate that the $I = 1=2$ rule is reproduced for smaller values of the gluon and quark condensates, thus reducing our error bar, in the direction shown by our more restrictive estimate. On the other hand, we are studying the $S = 2$ sector to determine at the same order of accuracy \hat{B}_K and the $K_L \rightarrow \pi\pi$ mass difference by including in the latter the interference with long-distance contributions that can be self-consistently computed in the

present approach.

Whether this program is successful may better determine how much of the long range dynamics of QCD is embedded in the present approach and increase our confidence on the predictions of unknown observables.

References

- [1] A.J. Buras, M. Jamín and M.E. Lautenbacher, Nucl. Phys. B 408 (1993) 209.
- [2] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli and L. Reina, Nucl. Phys. B 415 (1994) 403; Phys. Lett. B 301 (1993) 263.
- [3] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli and L. Reina, in The Second DA NE Physics Handbook, eds. L. Maiani et al. (Frascati, 1995); Z. Phys. C 68 (1995) 239 and references therein.
- [4] G. Buchalla, A.J. Buras and M.E. Lautenbacher, Weak Decays beyond Leading Logarithms, hep-ph/95112380, to appear in Rev. Mod. Phys.
- [5] J. Flynn and L. Randall, Phys. Lett. B 224 (1989) 221; Erratum, Phys. Lett. B 235 (1990) 412; M. Lusignoli, Nucl. Phys. B 325 (1989) 33; G. Buchalla, A.J. Buras and M.K. Harlander, Nucl. Phys. B 337 (1990) 313.
- [6] V. Antonelli, S. Bertolini, J.O. Eeg, M. Fabbrichesi and E.I. Lashin, Nucl. Phys. B 469 (1996) 143.
- [7] K. Nishijima, Nuovo Cim. 11 (1959) 698; F. Gursey, Nuovo Cim. 16 (1960) 230 and Ann. Phys. (NY) 12 (1961) 91; J.A. Cronin, Phys. Rev. 161 (1967) 1483; S. Weinberg, Physica 96A (1979) 327; A. Manohar and H. Georgi, Nucl. Phys. B 234 (1984) 189; A. Manohar and G. Moore, Nucl. Phys. B 243 (1984) 55.
- [8] V. Antonelli, S. Bertolini, M. Fabbrichesi and E.I. Lashin, Nucl. Phys. B 469 (1996) 181.
- [9] S. Bertolini, J.O. Eeg and M. Fabbrichesi, SISSA 103/95/EP, to appear in Nucl. Phys. B (1996).
- [10] M. Fabbrichesi and E.I. Lashin, preprint SISSA 74/96/EP.
- [11] A. Pich and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B 358 (1991) 311.
- [12] J. Bijnens, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 8 (1993) 3045.
- [13] J. Bijnens, Ch. Bruno and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B 390 (1993) 501.
- [14] W.A. Bardeen, A.J. Buras and J.-M. Gerard, Phys. Lett. B 192 (1987) 138; W.A. Bardeen, A.J. Buras and J.-M. Gerard, Nucl. Phys. B 293 (1987) 787.
- [15] Ch. Bruno, Phys. Lett. B 320 (1994) 135; V. Antonelli, S. Bertolini, M. Fabbrichesi and E.I. Lashin, preprint SISSA 20/96/EP.
- [16] A. Pich and J. Prades, Phys. Lett. B 346 (1995) 342.
- [17] S. Bertolini, J.O. Eeg and M. Fabbrichesi, Nucl. Phys. B 449 (1995) 197.
- [18] S. Narison, hep-ph/9504333.