

Effective theories and hadronic bound states ∗

A. Rusetsky

ITP, University of Bern, Sidlerstrasse 5, 3012 Bern, Switzerland, and HEPI, Tbilisi State University, University st. 9, 380086, Tbilisi, Georgia Email: rusetsky@itp.unibe.ch

Abstract: Recent progress in the description of the properties of hadronic atoms on the basis of non-relativistic effective Lagrangian approach and Chiral Perturbation Theory (ChPT) is reported. For the case of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ atom decay, the problem is completely solved, both conceptually and numerically. For the π^-p atom, a general expression for the ground-state energy is obtained in the first non-leading order in isospin breaking, and the numerical analysis is carried out at $O(p^2)$ in ChPT. We briefly consider a possible solution of the "potential model puzzle" in the hadronic atom problem, providing a constructive algorithm for the derivation of the isospin-breaking part of the short-range hadronic potential from field theory.

Below, we shall report on the recent progress achieved in the description of the hadronic bound states - so-called hadronic atoms - within the framework of field theory. The reason why such a report is delivered at the workshop on heavy quark physics, lies in a close similarity of the methods that are employed in these, otherwise very distinct fields. In fact, it turns out that the non-relativistic effective Lagrangian technique that was proposed originally by Caswell and Lepage [\[1](#page-4-0)] to study QED bound states in general, and that is widely used now in the physics of heavy quarks, provides the most elegant and economical approach to the solution of hadronic atom problem. In a latter case, one is faced with a theoretical challenge of producing a merger of the effective non-relativistic theory that implies the expansion in the inverse masses of hadrons (including Goldstone bosons) and, therefore, in the inverse powers of the quark masses, and the ChPT that is based on the expansion in quark masses. Such a merger can indeed be worked out, and the systematic chiral expansion of the observables of the hadronic atoms can be ensured in this theory.

Recent years have seen a growing interest in the study of hadronic atoms. At CERN, the DIRAC collaboration[[2\]](#page-4-0) aims to measure the $\pi^+\pi^-$ atom lifetime to 10% accuracy. This would allow one to determine the difference $a_0 - a_2$ of $\pi\pi$ scattering lengths with 5% precision. This measurement provides a crucial test for the large vs small condensate scenario in QCD: should it turn out that the quantity $a_0 - a_2$ is different from the value predicted in standard ChPT [\[3](#page-4-0)], one has to conclude [\[4](#page-4-0)] that spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking in QCD proceeds differently from the widely accepted picture. In the experiment performed at PSI [\[5](#page-4-0), [6\]](#page-4-0), one has measured the strong energy-level shift and the total decay width of the 1 s state of pionic hydrogen, as well as the 1 s shift of pionic deuterium. These measurements yield isospin symmetric πN scattering lengths to an accuracy which is unique for hadron physics. A new experiment on pionic hydrogen at PSI has recently been approved. It will allow one to measure the decay $A_{\pi^- p} \to \pi^0 n$ to much higher accuracy and thus enable one, in principle, to determine the πN scattering lengths from data on pionic hydrogen alone. This might vastly reduce the model-dependent uncertainties that come from the analysis of the three-body problem in $A_{\pi-d}$. Finally, the DEAR collaboration [\[7](#page-4-0)]

[∗]Review of recent work done in collaboration with A. Gall, J. Gasser, M.A. Ivanov, E. Lipartia, and V.E. Lyubovitskij.

at the DAΦNE facility plans to measure the energy level shift and lifetime of the 1s state in K^-p and K^-d atoms - with considerably higher precision than in the previous experiment carried out at KEK [\[8](#page-4-0)]for K^-p atoms. It is expected [[7\]](#page-4-0) that this will result in a precise determination of the $I = 0, 1$ S-wave scattering lengths. It will be a challenge for theorists to extract from this new information on the $\bar{K}N$ amplitude at threshold a more precise value of e.g. the isoscalar kaonsigma term and of the strangeness content of the nucleon.

In order to carry out the precision experimental tests of QCD mentioned above, on the theoretical side one faces the problem of finding the relation between the measured characteristics of hadronic atoms - energy levels and decay probabilities - and the strong hadronic scattering lengths in the isospin limit. In general, we have the following relations between these quantities

$$
\Delta E_{\rm str} \sim \Psi_0^2 \operatorname{Re} a_{cc} (1 + \delta_{\epsilon}), \qquad (1)
$$

$$
\Gamma_{c0} \sim (\text{phase space}) \times \Psi_0^2 |a_{c0} (1 + \delta_{\Gamma})|^2.
$$

Here $\Delta E_{\rm str}$ denotes the strong energy-level shift in the 1s state from its Coulomb value (total shift minus the pure QED contribution), and Γ_{c0} is the partial decay width into the neutral channel (e.g. $A_{\pi^-p} \to \pi^0 n$; a_{cc} and a_{c0} stand for the particular isospin combinations of the strong scattering lengths (charged and neutral channels are marked by subscripts "c" and "0", respectively), and Ψ_0 denotes the value of the Coulomb wave function at the origin. The quantities δ_{ϵ} and δ_{Γ} stand for the isospin-breaking corrections and, in general, depend on the details of the strong dynamics. In order to extract the scattering lengths from the experiments, these quantities must be known to an accuracy that matches the accuracy of the measurements.

Historically, the potential model was the first one been applied to the calculation of the hadronic atom characteristics. In brief, this model assumes that the Coulomb effects and the mass differences between the charged and neutral particles in the same multiplet are responsible for all isospin-breaking effects in the low-energy hadron physics: the short-range potential that describes strong interactions, is presumed to be isospin-

symmetric. In this manner, one may calculate the isospin breaking corrections δ_{ϵ} and δ_{Γ} [\[5](#page-4-0), [9\]](#page-4-0). The results of these calculations are however in the striking disagreement with the fieldtheoretical evaluations based on ChPT (see below). It turns out that the assumption about the isospin symmetry of the short-range hadronic potential is too restrictive - one should allow for a small isospin-breaking piece in the short-range interactions as well, in order to achieve an agreement with the field-theoretical calculations. In this way - providing a constructive algorithm for the derivation of the isospin-breaking piece from field theory - one may achieve the solution of apparent potential model puzzle.

Recently, using a non-relativistic effective Lagrangian framework, a general expression for the decay width $\Gamma_{A_{2\pi}\to\pi^0\pi^0}$ of the 1s state of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ atom was obtained at next-to-leading order in isospin-breaking[[10\]](#page-4-0). Numerical analysis of this quantity was carried out at order $O(e^2p^2)$ in ChPT [\[11\]](#page-4-0). These investigations have confirmed and generalized the results of earlier studies [\[12](#page-4-0), [13\]](#page-4-0). The expression for the decay width has the form

$$
\Gamma_{A_{2\pi}\to\pi^{0}\pi^{0}} = \frac{2}{9} \alpha^{3} p^{\star} A_{\pi\pi}^{2} (1 + K_{\pi\pi}),
$$

\n
$$
A_{\pi\pi} = a_{0} - a_{2} + O(\alpha, (m_{d} - m_{u})^{2}),
$$

\n
$$
K_{\pi\pi} = \frac{\Delta M_{\pi}^{2}}{9M_{\pi}^{2}} (a_{0} + 2a_{2})^{2} - \frac{2\alpha}{3} (\ln \alpha - 1) \times
$$

\n
$$
\times (2a_{0} + a_{2}) + o(\alpha, (m_{d} - m_{u})^{2}).
$$
\n(2)

Here $p^* = (M_{\pi^+}^2 - M_{\pi^0}^2 - \frac{1}{4}M_{\pi^+}^2\alpha^2)^{1/2}$, and a_I , $(I = 0, 2)$ denote the strong $\pi\pi$ scattering lengths in the channel with total isospin I. The quan-tity $A_{\pi\pi}$ is calculated as follows [[10\]](#page-4-0). One calculates the relativistic amplitude for the process $\pi^+\pi^- \to \pi^0\pi^0$ at $O(\alpha, (m_d - m_u)^2)$ in the normalization chosen so that at $O(1)$ the amplitude at threshold coincides with the difference $a_0 - a_2$ of (dimensionless) S-wave $\pi\pi$ scattering lengths. Due to the presence of virtual photons, the amplitude is multiplied by an overall Coulomb phase θ_c that is removed. The real part of the remainder contains terms that diverge like $|\mathbf{p}|^{-1}$ and $\ln 2|\mathbf{p}|/M_{\pi^+}$ at $|\mathbf{p}| \to 0$ (**p** denotes the relative 3momentum of charged pion pairs). The quantity $A_{\pi\pi}$ is obtained by subtracting these divergent pieces, and by then evaluating the remainder at $\mathbf{p} = 0.$

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(e^{-i\theta_c}t_{\pi\pi}\right) \to \frac{b_1}{|\mathbf{p}|} + b_2 \ln \frac{2|\mathbf{p}|}{M_{\pi^+}} + \frac{8\pi}{3M_{\pi^+}^2} \mathcal{A}_{\pi\pi}
$$
\n
$$
\tag{3}
$$

As it is seen explicitly from Eq.([2\)](#page-1-0), one can directly extract the value of $A_{\pi\pi}$ from the measurement of the decay width, because the correction $K_{\pi\pi}$ is very small and the error introduced by it is negligible. We emphasize that in derivation of Eq.([2\)](#page-1-0), chiral expansions have not been used. On the other hand, if one further aims to extract strong scattering lengths from data, one may invoke ChPT and to relate the quantities $A_{\pi\pi}$ and $a_0 - a_2$ order by order in the chiral expansion. This requires the evaluation of isospin-breaking corrections to the scattering amplitude. At order $O(e^2p^2)$ in chiral expansion we obtain[[11\]](#page-4-0) (for the values of scattering lengths $a_0 = 0.206, a_2 = -0.0443$

$$
A_{\pi\pi} = a_0 - a_2 + \epsilon, \quad \epsilon = (0.58 \pm 0.16) \cdot 10^{-2},
$$

$$
K = 1.07 \cdot 10^{-2}, \qquad \delta_{\Gamma} = 0.058.
$$
 (4)

At this stage, one may recall that the calculations in the potential model with the isospinsymmetric strong potential yields δ_{Γ} being of negative sign and the same order of magnitude [\[9](#page-4-0)].

In the case of the $\pi^- p$ atom, the treatment proceeds along the lines very similar to those for $\pi^+\pi^-$ case [[14\]](#page-4-0). Our investigations are aimed at the derivation of the general expression for the π^-p atom energy-level shift in the 1s state. The total shift is given by a sum of the electromagnetic (pure QED) and strong pieces. Our calculations for the electromagnetic shift within a high accuracy yield the same result as given in Ref.[[5\]](#page-4-0). The final result for the strong shift in the first non-leading order in isospin breaking is given in a form similar to Eq.([2\)](#page-1-0)

$$
\Delta E_{\rm str} = -2\alpha^3 \mu_c^2 \mathcal{A}_{\pi N} \left(1 + K_{\pi N} \right) \tag{5}
$$

$$
K_{\pi N} = 2\alpha\mu_c(1 - \ln \alpha)\mathcal{A}_{\pi N} + o(\alpha, m_d - m_u),
$$

where μ_c denotes the reduced mass of the $\pi^- p$ pair, and the quantity $A_{\pi N}$ is defined analogously

to $A_{\pi\pi}$. To calculate this quantity, one has to evaluate the $\pi^- p \to \pi^- p$ relativistic scattering amplitude at $O(\alpha, m_d - m_u)$, drop all diagrams that are made disconnected by cutting one photon line, and discard the spin-flip piece. The remainder is denoted by $\bar{t}_{\pi N}$. The regular part of $\bar{t}_{\pi N}$ at threshold defines the quantity $\mathcal{A}_{\pi N}$ in analogy to Eq. (3)

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(e^{-2i\theta_c}\,\bar{t}_{\pi N}\right) \to \frac{B_1}{|\mathbf{p}|} + B_2 \ln\frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{\mu_c} - \frac{2\pi}{\mu_c} \mathcal{A}_{\pi N},\tag{6}
$$

and the normalization of the amplitude is chosen so that $A_{\pi N} = b_0 - b_1 + O(\alpha, m_d - m_u)$, where b_0 and b_1 denote the isospin even and odd strong πN scattering lengths.

In order to extract the value of $b_0 - b_1$ from the π^-p measurement, one may again resort to ChPT, to calculate the isospin-breaking corrections to the πN scattering amplitude at threshold. At chiral order $O(p^2)$ where only the tree diagrams contribute, the result looks as follows

$$
\mathcal{A}_{\pi N}^{(2)} = b_0 - b_1 + \epsilon_{\pi N}^{(2)}
$$

$$
\epsilon_{\pi N}^{(2)} = \frac{m_p (8c_1 \Delta_\pi - 4e^2 f_1 - e^2 f_2)}{8\pi (m_p + M_{\pi^+}) F^2}, \quad (7)
$$

where $\Delta_{\pi} = M_{\pi^+}^2 - M_{\pi^0}^2$ denotes the pion mass difference, and c_i (f_i) are the strong (electromagnetic) low-energy constants (LEC's) from the $O(p^2)$ Lagrangian of ChPT [[15\]](#page-4-0). In order to perform the numerical analysis, one has to specify the values of these LEC's. The "strong" constant c_1 can be determined from the fit of the elastic πN scattering amplitude at threshold to KA86 data[[16\]](#page-4-0): $c_1 = -0.925 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. The value of the constant f_2 can be extracted from the protonneutron electromagnetic mass difference [\[17\]](#page-4-0): $e^2 f_2 = (-0.76 \pm 0.3)$ MeV. The determination of the constant f_1 from data is however, problematic. For this reason, in our analysis we have used order-of-magnitude estimate for this constant: $-|f_2| \leq f_1 \leq |f_2|$. With these values of the low-energy constants, we obtain the isospinbreaking correction to be $\delta_{\epsilon} = (-4.7 \pm 2.0) \cdot 10^{-2}$, again in striking disagreement from the potential model prediction [\[5\]](#page-4-0) $\delta_{\epsilon} = (-2.1 \pm 0.5) \cdot 10^{-2}$. It remains to be seen, how the $O(p^2)$ results are altered by the loop corrections in ChPT[[18\]](#page-4-0).

Given a systematic discrepancy of the potential model predictions with the results of calculations based on ChPT, it is natural to seek a derivation of the potentials that are used in the potential model, on the basis of ChPT. In a slightly more restricted context, one may ask, how the isospin-breaking part of the short-range "strong" potential is obtained from ChPT, when the isospin-symmetric part is already known to fit well ChPT predictions (we recall that the isospin-breaking part is assumed to vanish identically in existing potential models[[5](#page-4-0), [9](#page-4-0)]). It is widely presumed that the potential constructed from the field theory will be necessarily singular in the position space and will require some kind of regularization. Based on a simple solvable model, we shall however demonstrate that this is not the case: almost any well-behaved shortrange potential, including those that were used in Refs. [\[5, 9](#page-4-0)], can be generalized to include properly the full content of isospin-breaking effects in ChPT.

The key to the solution of the problem given above, lies in the universality conjecture. This conjecture - completely in spirit of the low-energy effective Lagrangian approach to bound systems - states that the bound-state energies in the field theory, and in the potential model are the same at the first order in isospin breaking, provided the quantities $A_{\pi N}$ calculated in these two theories, coincide. We shall ensure the universality for the case of a simple model where the interaction Hamiltonian is given by a sum of Coulomb and short-range rank-1 separable interactions

$$
U(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{V} = -\frac{4\pi\alpha}{|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{k}|^2} + \lambda v(\mathbf{p})v(\mathbf{k}),
$$

$$
v(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{\beta^2}{\beta^2 + \mathbf{q}^2},
$$
 (8)

where β denotes the cutoff mass. The generalization to the case of generic potentials, multichannel case, inclusion of relativistic effects, is in progress and will be reported elsewhere [\[19](#page-4-0)].

With a given interaction potential, one may evaluate the energy-level shift of the ground state of the bound system. The equation for the position of the bound-state pole in the (complex) energy plane is given by[[10\]](#page-4-0)

$$
z - E_0 - \langle \Psi_0 | \tau(z) | \Psi_0 \rangle = 0, \qquad (9)
$$

$$
\tau(z) = \mathbf{V} + \mathbf{V}(z - \mathbf{H}_0)^{-1} (1 - |\Psi_0\rangle\langle\Psi_0|)\tau(z).
$$

It is straightforward to solve this equation in the perturbation theory. The solution at the first non-leading order in α reads

$$
\Delta E = \Psi_0^2 \tau_0 \left(1 - \frac{4\alpha\mu}{\beta} + \frac{\mu^2 \alpha}{\pi} \tau_0 \left[\ln \alpha - 1 + \ln \frac{4\mu}{\beta} \right] \right),
$$

$$
\tau_0 = \lambda \left(1 + \frac{\mu \lambda \beta}{4\pi} \right)^{-1}, \qquad (10)
$$

and μ stands for the reduced mass.

Next, we calculate the regular part of the elastic scattering amplitude at threshold, with the normalization according to Eq.([6\)](#page-2-0)

$$
\mathcal{A} = -\frac{\mu}{2\pi} \tau_0 \left(1 - \frac{4\alpha\mu}{\beta} \right) - \frac{\alpha\mu^3}{2\pi^2} \tau_0^2 \ln \frac{4\mu}{\beta} \tag{11}
$$

From Eqs. (10) and (11) one immediately obtains that the energy level shift in the potential model is given again by Eq.([5\)](#page-2-0) - that is, the universality holds in that particular case, considered here.

Based on the universality conjecture, we can provide a constructive algorithm for the derivation of the isospin-breaking part of the shortrange potential \bf{V} from ChPT. The amplitude at threshold in the latter is generally given by $A = A_0 + A_1 + \cdots$, where $A_{0(1)}$ denote the isospin-conserving(breaking) parts of the amplitude, and ellipses stand for higher-order terms in isospin breaking. In order to ensure the inclusion of the full content of isospin-symmetry breaking in ChPT into the potential model, it thus suffices to match the amplitude A in both theories. The problem evidently has too much freedom, and we can choose one parameter in the potential - say, the coupling constant λ - to obey the matching condition for the amplitude. Writing $\lambda = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 + \cdots$, the matching condition yields

$$
\lambda_0 = -\frac{2\pi}{\mu} \frac{\mathcal{A}_0}{1 + \frac{\beta}{2}\mathcal{A}_0},
$$
\n(12)

$$
\lambda_1 = -\frac{2\pi}{\mu} \frac{\mathcal{A}_1 + \frac{4\alpha\mu}{\beta} \mathcal{A}_0 + 2\mu\alpha \mathcal{A}_0^2 \ln \frac{4\mu}{\beta}}{(1 + \frac{\beta}{2} \mathcal{A}_0)^2}.
$$

The matching condition [\(12](#page-3-0)) solves our prob[lem completely - the bound-state energies calcu](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB389%2C181)lated with the use of the "corrected" potential coincide, by definition, with those calculated on the basis of ChPT. We hope that - after the suit[able generalization - the approach based on the](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHRVA%2CD58%2C094024) universality might be also useful for the analysis of πN scattering data near threshold, in what concerns the study of the isospin-breaking effects in the πN [amplitude.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB419%2C403)

Acknowledgments. This work was supported in part by the Swiss National Science Foundation, and by TMR, BBW-Contract No. 97.0131 and EC-Contract No. ERBFMRX-CT980169 (EURODAΦNE).

References

- [1] W.E. Caswell and G.P. Lepage, *[Phys. Lett.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB167%2C437)* B 167 [\(1986\) 437.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB167%2C437)
- [2] B. Adeva *et al.*, CERN proposal CERN/SPSLC 95-1 (1995).
- [3] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *[Phys. Lett.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB125%2C325)* B 125 [\(1983\) 325](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB125%2C325); J. Bijnens, G. Colangelo, G. Ecker, J. Gasser, and M.E. Sainio, *[Phys. Lett.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB374%2C210)* B 374 [\(1996\) 210.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB374%2C210)
- [4] M. Knecht, B. Moussallam, J. Stern, and N.H. Fuchs, *[Nucl. Phys.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=NUPHA%2CB457%2C513)* B 457 (1995) 513; *[Nucl. Phys.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=NUPHA%2CB471%2C445)* B 471 (1996) 445.
- [5] D. Sigg, A. Badertscher, P.F.A. Goudsmit, H.J. Leisi, and G.C. Oades, *[Nucl. Phys.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=NUPHA%2CA609%2C310)* A 609 [\(1996\) 310.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=NUPHA%2CA609%2C310)
- [6] H.-Ch. Schr¨oder *et al*., *[Phys. Lett.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB469%2C25)* B 469 [\(1999\) 25](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB469%2C25).
- [7] The DEAR collaboration (S. Bianco et al.), *The DEAR case*, preprint LNF-98/039(P).
- [8] M. Iwasaki *et al.*, *[Phys. Rev. Lett.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PRLTA%2C78%2C3067)* 78 (1997) [3067;](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PRLTA%2C78%2C3067) *[Nucl. Phys.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=NUPHA%2CA639%2C501)* A 639 (1998) 501.
- [9] U. Moor, G. Rasche, and W.S. Woolcock, *[Nucl. Phys.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=NUPHA%2CA587%2C747)* A 587 (1995) 747; A. Gashi, G.C. Oades, G. Rasche, and W.S. Woolcock, *[Nucl. Phys.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=NUPHA%2CA628%2C101)* A 628 (1998) 101.
- [10] A. Gall, J. Gasser, V.E. Lyubovitskij, and A. Rusetsky, *[Phys. Lett.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB462%2C335)* B 462 (1999) 335.
- [11] J. Gasser, V.E. Lyubovitskij and A. Rusetsky, *[Phys. Lett.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB471%2C244)* B 471 (1999) 244.
- [12] H. Jallouli and H. Sazdjian, *[Phys. Rev.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHRVA%2CD58%2C014011)* D 58 [\(1998\) 014011;](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHRVA%2CD58%2C014011) H. Sazdjian, Preprint [hep-ph/9809425](http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/hep-ph/9809425).
- [13] V.E. Lyubovitskij and A.G. Rusetsky, *[Phys.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB389%2C181) Lett.* B 389 (1996) 181; V.E. Lyubovitskij, E.Z. Lipartia, and A.G. Rusetsky, *JETP Lett.* 66 (1997) 783; M.A. Ivanov, V.E. Lyubovitskij, E.Z. Lipartia, and A.G. Rusetsky, *[Phys.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHRVA%2CD58%2C094024) Rev.* D 58 (1998) 094024.
- [14] J. Gasser, V.E. Lyubovitskij, and A. Rusetsky, in preparation.
- [15] U.-G. Meißner *et al*, *[Phys. Lett.](http://www-spires.slac.stanford.edu/spires/find/hep/www?j=PHLTA%2CB419%2C403)* B 419 (1998) 403; T. Becher and H. Leutwyler, *Eur. Phys. J.* C 9 (1999) 643.
- [16] T. Becher and H. Leutwyler, private communication.
- [17] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Phys. Rep.* 87 (1982) 77.
- [18] J. Gasser, M.A. Ivanov, V.E. Lyubovitskij, and A. Rusetsky, work in progress.
- [19] J. Gasser, E. Lipartia, V.E. Lyubovitskij, and A. Rusetsky, work in progress.