

Gerasimov–Drell–Hearn sum rule and nucleon structure

S.Ying

Physics Department, Fudan University

Shanghai 200433, China

(September 17, 2018)

A modification of the Gerasimov–Drell–Hearn sum rule suggested by the current experimental data is presented. Within the conventional theoretical framework, we find it necessary to consider the possibility of the presence of a localized region inside a nucleon, in which the electromagnetic (EM) gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken down, if the constraints of the gauge invariance, Lorentz invariance and the assumption of the commutativity of the EM charge density operator at equal-time are considered. We also discuss the propagation of a virtual photon inside a nucleon under such a scenario. A comment on some of the recent model independent works on the same subject is provided.

PACS: 11.55.Hx 13.60.-r 13.60.Fz 11.15.Ex

I. INTRODUCTION

There are a few sum rules from current algebra that can be subjected to experimental tests. The Gerasimov–Drell–Hearn (GDH) sum rule [1,2], which can be viewed as a superconvergence condition that depends only on the large energy behavior of the scattering amplitude [3], is one of the well founded ones. It is related to the spin structure of a nucleon. Recent analysis [4,5] of the currently available experimental data for the photo-production of pion on a nucleon below the photon energy of 1.7 GeV suggests, however, a violation of the sum rule. If this violation is proven genuine in the future, it would imply that our understanding of the structure of a nucleon is probably incomplete. At the present, it is however still unclear whether the violation is due to the inaccuracy of experimental information or is genuine in nature. This is because the result obtained in Refs. [4,5] are constructed from single pion photoproduction data (together with an estimation of two pion photoproduction contributions) from different charge channels with an upper energy cutoff at 1.7 GeV. Albeit the results seem to be quite stable, they still need to be confirmed by direct measurements of total photon–nucleon cross section $\sigma_{3/2}$ and $\sigma_{1/2}$, which correspond to the ones with photon helicity parallel and antiparallel to the nucleon spin polarization respectively. In the similar energy region, experiments in that direction are planned at the BNL Laser Electron Gamma Source (LEGS), Mainz (MAMI) accelerator facilities. In higher energy regions, they are planned at the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility (CEBAF), the Bonn Electron Stretcher Accelerator (ELSA) and the Grenoble Anneau Accelerator Laser (GRAAL) facility.

By supposing that the above mentioned violation is a possibility, theoretical investigations on how such a violation be explained by an extension of the GDH sum rule can be carried out. The extent to which the GDH sum rule should be extended and what such an extension implies should ultimately be determined by observations. Nevertheless, several schemes were already provided based on 1) the assumption of the existence of a fixed $J=1$ pole in the helicity amplitude of the photon–nucleon Compton scattering [6,7] and 2) the modification of the commutator between electromagnetic (EM) charge density operators at equal-time [8,9]. Since in these schemes, the requirements of Lorentz and local EM gauge invariance are not considered explicitly, a third one is provided in this paper by imposing the constraints of these requirements. Through this study, an extension of the GDH sum rule based on the possibility of a (localized) spontaneous breaking down of the $U(1)$ gauge symmetry corresponding to the electromagnetism is proposed.

In section II, the condition of gauge invariance on the photon–nucleon forward Compton scattering amplitude is studied. Section III contains a discussion of the large energy behavior of the spin dependent covariant amplitudes. The possibility of modifying GDH sum rule is revealed. It is due to a localized spontaneous breaking down of the EM gauge symmetry inside a nucleon, which makes it superconducting. The propagation of a photon inside a nucleon is discussed in section IV, where the resonant response of a nucleon, which contains a superconducting phase, is studied. It also provides more concrete basis for the discussions in section III. Section V contains discussions and a summary. In the appendix, a brief summary of some of the recent developments on the subject.

II. GAUGE INVARIANCE AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE EM CURRENT-CURRENT CORRELATOR

The photon–nucleon forward Compton scattering amplitude is related to the following covariant one photon irreducible correlator between EM current operator J^μ

$$T^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle pS' | T^* J^\mu(x) J^\nu(0) | pS \rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|pS\rangle$ is a nucleon state with 4-momentum p^μ , polarization S_μ and T^* represents time ordering with proper Schwinger terms added. Taking into account of the conservation of parity in the EM interaction, the amplitude can be parameterized by four invariant amplitudes $S_{1,2}$ and $A_{1,2}$ in the following way

$$T^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = S_1 \left(-g^{\mu\nu} + \frac{q^\mu q^\nu}{q^2} \right) + S_2 \left(p^\mu - \frac{m\nu}{q^2} q^\mu \right) \left(p^\nu - \frac{m\nu}{q^2} q^\nu \right) - iA_1 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} q_\alpha S_\beta - im\nu A_2 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} q_\alpha \left(S_\beta - \frac{S \cdot q}{m\nu} p_\beta \right) \quad (2)$$

since the amplitude $T^{\mu\nu}$ satisfies the Ward identity

$$q_\mu T^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = 0 \quad (3)$$

due to the gauge invariance and commutativity of the EM charge density operator at equal-time. Here m is the mass of a nucleon and $\nu = p \cdot q/m$.

The simple form of the above expression is not a suitable one for us to discuss the constraint of the gauge invariance, the natural one is

$$T^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = \frac{1}{2m} \bar{U}(pS) [F_1 g^{\mu\nu} - F_2 q^\mu q^\nu + F_3 p^\mu p^\nu - F_4 (p^\mu q^\nu + p^\nu q^\mu) + iF_5 \sigma^{\mu\nu} + iF_6 (p^\mu \sigma^{\nu\alpha} q_\alpha - p^\nu \sigma^{\mu\alpha} q_\alpha) + iF_7 (q^\mu \sigma^{\nu\alpha} q_\alpha - q^\nu \sigma^{\mu\alpha} q_\alpha) + iF_8 \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} q_\alpha p_\beta \not{q} \gamma^5] U(pS), \quad (4)$$

where $U(pS)$ is the nucleon spinor, $F_{1,\dots,8}$ are invariant amplitudes that are otherwise independent if gauge invariance is not required. The Ward identity Eq. 3 imposes the following constraints on F_i ($i = 1, \dots, 8$), namely,

$$F_1(q^2, \nu) - q^2 F_2(q^2, \nu) - m\nu F_4(q^2, \nu) = 0, \quad (5)$$

$$m\nu F_3(q^2, \nu) - q^2 F_4(q^2, \nu) = 0, \quad (6)$$

$$F_5(q^2, \nu) - m\nu F_6(q^2, \nu) - q^2 F_7(q^2, \nu) = 0. \quad (7)$$

Eqs. 5–7 are regarded as dynamical constraints on invariant amplitudes $F_{1,\dots,8}$, each one of which contains contributions from different parts for the EM current–current correlator. The reduced form, Eq. 2, tends to hide the origin of these amplitudes despite its simplicity.

The reduced set of invariant amplitudes $S_{1,2}$ and $A_{1,2}$ are related to $F_{1,\dots,8}$ through

$$S_1(q^2, \nu) = -F_1(q^2, \nu) = -q^2 F_2(q^2, \nu) - m\nu F_4(q^2, \nu), \quad (8)$$

$$S_2(q^2, \nu) = F_3(q^2, \nu) = \frac{q^2}{m\nu} F_4(q^2, \nu), \quad (9)$$

$$A_1(q^2, \nu) = mF_6(q^2, \nu) + \nu F_8(q^2, \nu), \quad (10)$$

$$A_2(q^2, \nu) = \frac{1}{m} F_7(q^2, \nu) + F_8(q^2, \nu). \quad (11)$$

From crossing symmetry, which requires $T^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = T^{\nu\mu}(p, -q)$, the following constraints

$$F_{1,\dots,3}(q^2, \nu) = F_{1,\dots,3}(q^2, -\nu), \quad F_4(q^2, \nu) = -F_4(q^2, -\nu), \quad (12)$$

$$F_{5,7,8}(q^2, \nu) = -F_{5,7,8}(q^2, -\nu), \quad F_6(q^2, \nu) = F_6(q^2, -\nu) \quad (13)$$

have to be satisfied by $F_{1,\dots,8}$.

III. LARGE ENERGY BEHAVIOR AND THE POSSIBILITY OF MODIFYING THE GDH SUM RULE

The relation between $F_5(q^2, \nu)$, $F_6(q^2, \nu)$ and $F_7(q^2, \nu)$ imposed by gauge invariance is given by Eq. 7. The large ν behavior of F_5 can be obtained quite model independently by using the large ν behavior of the naive time ordered product of two currents.

Let us consider the following naive time-ordered correlator

$$\tilde{T}^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle pS' | T J^\mu(x) J^\nu(0) | pS \rangle. \quad (14)$$

It has the following asymptotic behavior as $q_0 \rightarrow \infty$ and \mathbf{q} kept fixed [10]

$$\lim_{q_0 \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{T}^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = \frac{1}{q_0} \int d^3x e^{-i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \langle pS' | [J^\mu(0, \mathbf{x}), J^\nu(0, 0)] | pS \rangle + O\left(\frac{1}{q_0^2}\right). \quad (15)$$

In the rest frame for a nucleon, $\nu = q_0$. So, in that frame,

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{T}^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = \frac{1}{\nu} \int d^3x e^{-i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \langle pS' | [J^\mu(0, \mathbf{x}), J^\nu(0, 0)] | pS \rangle. \quad (16)$$

Neither Eq. 14 nor the commutator in Eqs. 15 and 16 are in general covariant under Lorentz transformation. They contain Schwinger terms that depend on the spatial components of q^μ and break the Lorentz covariance. Therefore Eq. 16 can not be applied to any frame in general. However, for the covariant parts of Eqs. 14–16, Eq. 16 is correct in any frame. These parts are the ones that are of physical interest. Eq. 15 can in fact be generalized to the case in which q^2 is fixed and ν is let to go to infinity [3] by using an infinite momentum frame in which a sum rule can be obtained for the commutator of the current (GDH sum rule is assumed valid in this paper). Using the form of the EM current operator written in terms of quark fields, we can write down the naive commutator between the currents *in a specific frame*, namely

$$[J^\mu(0, \mathbf{x}), J^\nu(0, 0)] = -2i\epsilon^{0\mu\nu\lambda} \bar{\psi}(0) \gamma^\lambda \gamma^5 Q^2 \psi(0) \delta^{(3)}(\mathbf{x}) + \text{Schwinger terms}, \quad (17)$$

where Q is the charge operator. The naive equal-time commutator in Eq. 17 is not Lorentz covariant. The canonical value of the commutator is defined here to coincide with the naive one in Eq. 17 when its matrix elements are taken between nucleon states at rest. So the matrix element of the canonical equal-time commutator between two EM current density operators can be obtained from the rest frame matrix elements by a proper Lorentz transformation. It is of the following form

$$\langle pS' | \bar{\psi}(0) [J^\mu(0, \mathbf{x}), J^\nu(0, 0)]_C \psi(0) | pS \rangle = -iG_{axial}^N \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \frac{p_\alpha}{m} \bar{U}(pS') \gamma_\beta \gamma^5 U(pS) = G_{axial}^N \bar{U}(pS') i\sigma^{\mu\nu} U(pS), \quad (18)$$

with p_μ the nucleon 4-momentum and G_{axial}^N the finite “charge square weighted axial charge” of a nucleon.

Then the form of Eq. 16 in an infinite momentum frame of the nucleon takes the form

$$\lim_{\substack{\nu \rightarrow \infty \\ q^2 = \text{fixed}}} \tilde{T}^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = \lim_{\substack{\nu \rightarrow \infty \\ q^2 = \text{fixed}}} \left(\frac{1}{\nu} G_{axial}^N \bar{U}(pS') i\sigma^{\mu\nu} U(pS) + \frac{1}{\nu} \langle pS' | \text{Schwinger terms} | pS \rangle \right). \quad (19)$$

The difference between $T^{\mu\nu}$ and $\tilde{T}^{\mu\nu}$ contains only non-covariant Schwinger type of terms, therefore the covariant $T^{\mu\nu}$ and naive $\tilde{T}^{\mu\nu}$ contains the same operator for the canonical part of the commutator term since it is covariant and independent of q^μ . Therefore, in the large ν limit, the asymptotic F_5 behavior can be identified, namely,

$$F_5 \sim \nu^{-1} G_{axial}^N. \quad (20)$$

Eq. 7 acquires more predictive power after the large ν behavior of F_5 is established. Since from Eq. 20, F_5 term can be dropped from Eq. 7 at large ν and finite q^2 ; this leads us to

$$F_6 = -\frac{q^2}{m\nu} F_7. \quad (21)$$

It means that F_6 decreases faster than ν^{-1} at $q^2 = 0$ if F_7 is finite. Actually, for a real photon and F_7 non-singular, $mF_6 = F_5/\nu \sim \nu^{-2}$. It will be discussed in the following that in the large ν limit, F_8 decrease as or faster than $\nu^{\alpha-2}$. It causes no problem. These are part of the theoretical basis for deriving the GDH sum rule. Its validity is intimately related to the gauge invariance.

Are the assumptions that went into the derivation of the GDH sum rule as solid as it sound? The answer is no. This is because F_7 is a contribution from the part of the current-current correlator in which one of the current contributes its longitudinal component. We have learned from our understanding of the spontaneous breaking of gauge invariance due to Higgs mechanism that it can have a massless pole corresponding to world-be Goldstone bosons due to the symmetry breaking. For a gauge symmetry that is spontaneously broken, these massless Goldstone bosons decouple

from physical spectrum. They however have effects in the physical sector of the states. For example, their coupling to the gauge bosons generates finite masses for certain gauge bosons. This point will be discussed in the following section in the context of QED.

It is therefore natural to define the order parameter ρ_∞ for the EM gauge symmetry inside a nucleon in the following limit,

$$\rho_\infty = - \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow 0} \lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q^2 F_7}{\nu}. \quad (22)$$

The first limit $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ is necessary since localized spontaneous gauge symmetry breaking is discussed here. A finite region in space only looks more and more like an infinite system when smaller and smaller distances or higher and higher energies are probed. The physical reason behind this statement will be discussed in the next section. For any finite ν , it is expected that $q^2 F_7 = 0$ at $q^2 = 0$ since the would-be Goldstone boson corresponding to localized EM gauge symmetry breaking is expected to be also localized inside the nucleon; it does not have any effects at low energies. $\rho_\infty \neq 0$ means that for any $q^2 = \epsilon$, with ϵ chosen to be arbitrarily small, there exists a lower bound ν_M for ν beyond which $q^2 F_7$ can be made finite and independent of ϵ . Therefore, the order of the limits in Eq. 22 is important.

It was learned from the hypothetical ‘‘charged photon’’ pion Compton scattering [11,12] that isovector component of the current–current correlator has to contain a $J = 1$ fixed pole in order for the mutual consistency between the Regge phenomenology and current algebra to uphold. The absorptive part of the current–current correlator behaves according to the Regge asymptotics since they relates to the contributions from the physical hadronic states. For the realistic case of photon–nucleon Compton scattering, there is no such a need from the consistency point of view that there should be a $J = 1$ fixed pole since the time component of the EM current operator at equal-time commutes with each other so that the EM current–current correlator satisfies the Ward identity Eq. 3, which is likely to be violated if a fixed $J = 1$ pole is straight forwardly introduced in the same way as that of Refs. [11,12]. The possible modification of the commutator between time component of the EM current at equal-time is proposed in Ref. [8,9]. It is however remains to show how the Lorentz invariance is to be recovered, what are the effects of a modification of the commutation relation between EM charge density operator on the low energy theorem [13] that enters the GDH sum rule [8].

We shall assume that Eq. 3 is true in this paper and try to see how to introduce an equivalent effect consistent with gauge invariance, vanishing of the equal-time commutator between two EM charge density operators and Lorentz invariance summarized by Eq. 3.

Now, the case of $\rho_\infty \neq 0$ is of interest since it would lead to a modification of the GDH sum rule suggested by experimental data. If $\rho_\infty \neq 0$, then the invariant amplitude F_6 contains a constant contribution due to Eq. 21, namely

$$F_6(q^2, \nu) \stackrel{\nu \rightarrow \infty}{\cong} \rho(q^2, \nu)/m. \quad (23)$$

It means that mF_6 asymptotically approaches to ρ in the kinematic region $\nu \rightarrow \infty$, $q^2 \rightarrow 0$. $\rho(q^2, \nu)$ may have different pole and cut structure from $F_6(q^2, \nu)$ in the entire complex ν plane. Due to the crossing symmetry, Eq. 13, $\rho(q^2, \nu) = \rho(q^2, -\nu)$. So it is reasonable to require $\lim_{|\nu| \rightarrow \infty} \rho(q^2 = 0^+, \nu) = \rho_\infty = \text{const}$. It is expected to be a slow varying function of ν at large ν and can be non-analytic in $1/\nu$ in the $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ limit.

In order to study the large ν behavior of $A_1(q^2, \nu)$, the large ν behavior of $F_8(q^2, \nu)$ has to be established. Since $F_8(q^2, \nu)$ is an invariant amplitude that corresponds to a piece in $T^{\mu\nu}$ which is gauge invariant by itself, its large ν behavior is expected to follow the Regge asymptotics [14]. This is due to a fine point connected to a local gauge theory, namely, it is known that in a gauge theory, the physical states are contained in a subspace of the full Hilbert space of the system due to the superselection rule imposed by ‘‘Gauss law’’ [15]. The states outside of this subspace are called unphysical states. For example, the would-be Goldstone boson for the spontaneous EM $U(1)$ symmetry breaking does not lie in the physical subspace [16]. Since F_8 contains only gauge invariant pieces by itself and the EM current is a scalar under the gauge transformation, the corresponding components of the current only connect physical initial or final states to physical intermediate states (due to the generalized Wigner–Eckart theorem); there is no need for the cancellations between contributions of unphysical states to ensure gauge invariance, which is needed for other F_i ($i=1, \dots, 7$). Since it is known that physical scattering amplitudes are bounded by the Regge asymptotics. So our assumption about the large ν behavior of F_8 is safe. In the normal case, the asymptotic behavior of $A_1(q^2, \nu)$ is expected to be $\nu^{\alpha-1}$ with $\alpha < 1$, so $F_8(q^2, \nu)$ decreases as $\nu^{\alpha-2}$ or faster following Eq. 10. Therefore, the large ν behavior of A_1 in this case is entirely determined by F_6 , which approaches a constant at large ν , if $\rho_\infty \neq 0$.

In this case, there is an additional term to the GDH sum rule. It can be derived from the following expression of $A_1(q^2, \nu)$ at sufficiently small q^2 and large radius ν_C for the circle C in Fig. 1




FIG. 1. The integration contour in the complex $\nu \equiv z$ plane.

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_1(q^2, \nu) = & \frac{Res[A_1(q^2, q^2/2m)]}{\nu - q^2/2m} + \frac{Res[A_1(q^2, -q^2/2m)]}{\nu + q^2/2m} + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\nu_0}^{\nu_C} d\nu' \frac{Im A_1(q^2, \nu')}{\nu' - \nu} \\
 & + \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\nu_C}^{-\nu_0} d\nu' \frac{Im A_1(q^2, \nu')}{\nu' - \nu} + \frac{1}{m} \int_C \frac{dz}{2\pi i} \frac{\rho(q^2, z)}{(z - \nu)},
 \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where Res represents the residual of $A_1(q^2, \nu)$ on its Bonn poles and the integration contour is given in Fig. 1 by assuming analyticity of $A_1(q^2, \nu)$ in the complex ν plan off the real ν axis. $2Im A_1(\nu) = A_1(\nu + i\epsilon) - A_1(\nu - i\epsilon)$ in Eq. 24. When the radius of the big circle C in Fig. 1 approaches infinity, considering the crossing symmetry (Eq. 13), the above expression yield the following result of the modification of the GDH sum rule, namely,

$$\int_0^\infty \frac{\sigma_{3/2}(\nu) - \sigma_{1/2}(\nu)}{\nu} d\nu = \frac{2\pi^2\alpha}{m^2} (\kappa^2 + 2m^2\rho_\infty), \tag{25}$$

where the additional term comes from the large circle C in the complex ν plane (see Fig. 1) with $|\nu| \rightarrow \infty$. There is no cut for the function $\rho(q^2, \nu)$ on the real ν axis since the world-be Goldstone boson is not a physical state and it does not couple to the physical intermediate state (in a gauge invariant calculation) directly. Its function is to mix with the massless photon to generate a massive excitation inside the localized superconducting phase. This point will be substantiated in section IV. We therefore expect that the absorptive part of $F_6(q^2, \nu)$ is still strongly convergent at large ν to render an unsubtracted sum rule possible.

This version of the GDH sum rule is effectively like the $J = 1$ fixed pole one given by Refs. [6,7] due to the same asymptotic behavior is assumed. This paper nevertheless discussed the necessity of spontaneous breaking down of the EM gauge symmetry inside a nucleon in order for this scenario to be consistent with gauge invariance, the assumption that the time component of the EM current operator at equal-time commutes with each other and Lorentz invariance. The physical origin of the effect of the “fixed $J=1$ pole” is now clear under the above mentioned assumptions; it is due to the unphysical world-be Goldstone boson inside a nucleon where the EM gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken down and where a localized superconducting phase is formed.

Numerically, the value for ρ_∞^p and ρ_∞^n and their difference can be extracted from the results of the integration of the total photon–nucleon cross sections given in Ref. [5]. They take the value $\rho_\infty^p = 2.9 \times 10^{-2} fm^2$ and $\rho_\infty^n = -2.5 \times 10^{-2} fm^2$. As a final remark for this section, it should be mentioned that $\rho_\infty^{p,n}$ has a dimension of length squared. It can be written as $\rho_\infty^{p,n} = 1/\Lambda^2$. It is interesting to note that $\Lambda \sim 1 GeV$, which correspond to the natural scale of the spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking in strong interaction.

IV. THE PROPAGATION OF A PHOTON INSIDE A NUCLEON

Let's consider the following connected correlator between the EM gauge fields A^μ

$$M^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = i \int d^4x e^{iq \cdot x} \langle pS' | T^* A^\mu(x) A^\nu(0) | pS \rangle \quad (26)$$

in, e.g., Landau gauge. From the Lehmann–Symanzik–Zimmermann (LSZ) reduction formalism, $T^{\mu\nu}(p, q)$ is related to $M^{\mu\nu}(p, q)$ in the following way

$$T^{\mu\nu}(p, q) = \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow 0} Z_\gamma^{-2} q^4 M^{\mu\nu}(p, q), \quad (27)$$

with Z_γ the wave function renormalization constant for a photon. This is true because a photon outside of a nucleon at $q^2 = 0$ can propagate infinite far away from the nucleon to form an asymptotic state.

The problem that is not very well understood is how does the assumed superconducting phase inside a nucleon affect the behavior of a photon propagating in the same nucleon before the photon interacts with valence quarks. Apparently the method used in an infinite system has to be modified when dealing with a system with finite spatial dimension. In order to proceed, let's first write down the formal Schwinger–Dyson equation for the dressed propagator G of a photon inside an infinite medium, namely

$$G = G_0 + G_0 \Pi G, \quad (28)$$

where G_0 is the free propagator for a photon, Π is the proper self-energy of a photon inside the medium and all spin indices are suppressed. It has the following formal solution,

$$G = G_0 \frac{1}{1 - \Pi G_0}. \quad (29)$$

The pole position is at $\Pi G_0 = 1$ when the pole position of G_0 and G differs. The situation in which the pole of G_0 coincide with that of G is not considered in this paper. Eq. 29 can be expanded as an infinite series in certain region of ΠG_0

$$G = G_0 (1 + \Pi G_0 + \Pi G_0 \Pi G_0 + \dots + \underbrace{\Pi G_0 \dots \Pi G_0}_{n \text{ } G_0\text{s}} + \dots). \quad (30)$$

Then, use can be made of the complex continuation to extend the result. This form is the proper one for us to discuss the propagation of a photon inside a nucleon.

Before considering a finite system in which the EM gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken down, it is useful to review the Higgs mechanism in the present context. For QED, the self energy of a photon with explicit indices inserted can be written as

$$\pi^{\mu\nu}(q) = (q^2 g^{\mu\nu} - q^\mu q^\nu) \pi(q^2) \quad (31)$$

due to gauge invariance expressed as $q_\mu \pi^{\mu\nu} = 0$, similar to Eq. 3. The spontaneous breaking down of the EM gauge symmetry manifests itself by having a massless pole in $\pi(q^2)$. In this case, $\pi(q^2)$ can be written as $\pi(q^2) = m_\gamma^2/q^2 + \dots$ and the “...” terms can be ignored for our purposes. The free photon propagator in Landau gauge is

$$G_0^{\mu\nu} = \left(g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{q^\mu q^\nu}{q^2 + i\epsilon} \right) \frac{-i}{q^2 + i\epsilon}. \quad (32)$$

Substituting Eqs. 31 and 32 into Eq. 30, one find the following expression for the component of the full propagator induced by the transverse $G_0^{\mu\nu}$, namely,

$$G_{TT}^{\mu\nu} = \left(g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{q^\mu q^\nu}{q^2 + i\epsilon} \right) \frac{-i}{q^2 - m_\gamma^2 + i\epsilon}, \quad (33)$$

which has a pole at $q^2 = m_\gamma^2$. The pole at $q^2 = 0$ is still present. In fact the pole at $q^2 = 0$ does not exist in the physical excitation. This is because the propagator in Eq. 33 contains only the transverse excitation, the longitudinal component of the same excitation can be obtained by replacing the G_0 in Eq. 30 by the would-be Goldstone boson in

$\pi(q^2)$ and the self-energy Π in the same equation by the free photon propagator coupled to the would-be Goldstone boson. The result is

$$G_{LL}^{\mu\nu} = i \frac{q^\mu q^\nu}{m_\gamma^2(q^2 + i\epsilon)}. \quad (34)$$

So the full propagator of the excitation is

$$G^{\mu\nu} = G_{TT}^{\mu\nu} + G_{LL}^{\mu\nu} = \left(g^{\mu\nu} - \frac{q^\mu q^\nu}{m_\gamma^2} \right) \frac{-i}{q^2 - m_\gamma^2 + i\epsilon}. \quad (35)$$

It corresponds to a massive excitation with mass m_γ . This causes the Meissner effect in such a system, which is also called superconducting.

The essential features of the photon propagation inside a finite system can be learned by considering a spherical cavity of radius R in which Π is significantly different from the outside vacuum. A space-time description is beneficial in this case. The time Δt a photon spend to propagate through a nucleon is finite. In case of non geometric resonance¹, it is $\Delta t = 2R/c$ with $c = 1$ the speed of light. For a geometric resonance case, a photon might be scattered n_G times before it leaves the cavity. If the cavity is of infinite radius, the pole of G is located at $\Pi G_0 = 1$. When the size of the the cavity is reduced to a finite value, the condition $\Pi G_0 = 1$ renders the coherent parts of the infinite series Eq. 30 to become effectively a finite one. In order to see this, we shall recall that the quantity $\Pi G_0 = z(\delta t)$ has a phase factor $e^{-i\omega\delta t}$ with ω the frequency of the photon and δt the time interval between two interactions of the free photon with the medium. The condition $\Pi G_0 = 1$ requires that $\omega\delta t = 2k\pi$ ($k = \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$). So, at the resonance point, which, in an infinite system, corresponds to at the pole position of G , the maximum number of interactions between a photon and the medium inside the cavity is

$$N_{\max} = \frac{\omega\Delta t}{2\pi} = \frac{n_G\omega R}{\pi}, \quad (36)$$

where $c = 1$ has been taken. So, in the region $|\Pi G_0| < 1$, the coherent part of the photon propagator can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} G &\approx G_0(1 + \Pi G_0 + \Pi G_0 \Pi G_0 + \dots + \underbrace{\Pi G_0 \dots \Pi G_0}_{N_{\max} G_0 S}) \\ &= G_0 \frac{1 - (\Pi G_0)^{N_{\max}+1}}{1 - \Pi G_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

It has no pole at $\Pi G_0 = 1$ but turns to $(N_{\max} + 1)G_0$ at that point. When N_{\max} or ωR is let to go to ∞ , it indeed becomes a pole. So, for a finite system, the dynamical resonance peak (due to the interaction with the medium) becomes higher and higher as $\omega \equiv \nu$ becomes larger and larger. In mathematical language, it can be expressed as that for any finite small deviation of q^2 from the pole value m_γ^2 , namely $q^2 - m_\gamma^2 = \epsilon$, there exist a value for ν beyond which $(q^2 - m_\gamma^2)G$ can be made finite and independent of ϵ . At the $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ point, it turns into a pole.

This argument can also be applied to the case of the would-be Goldstone boson discussed in the previous section. It forms the basis for the definition given by Eq. 22 and the discussions following it.

Since $M^{\mu\nu}$ defined in Eq. 26 enters in any forward EM scattering of a charged system with a nucleon, it can be measured in variety of ways. The $q^2 > 0$ region is of interest for the determination of the above mentioned resonant phenomenon of a superconducting nucleon. The q^2 position of the resonant peak, if exists, correspond to the mass of the photon if the size of the nucleon is let to go to infinity. In addition, the hight of the peak would be increased if the energy (in the lab. frame of the nucleon) of the photon is increased. We shall call this phenomenon virtual photon transparency at high energies.

Since a forward scattering experiment is hard to perform, one can use the optical theorem to relate the imaginary part of the forward scattering amplitude to a corresponding total cross section. For example, the total cross section of the reaction

$$\gamma_{e^+e^-}^* + N \rightarrow X, \quad (38)$$

¹The kind of resonance formed due to coherent multiple reflections (or scattering) of a photon on the surface of the cavity.

where $\gamma_{e^+e^-}^*$ is a virtual photon with $q^2 > 0$ originated from an annihilation of electron and positron pair and X denotes any allowed final states, corresponds to the imaginary part of forward scattering

$$\gamma_{e^+e^-}^* + N \rightarrow \gamma_{e^+e^-}^* + N. \quad (39)$$

If a nucleon is superconducting, then there should be a resonant extreme at $q^2 = m_\gamma^2$ in the real part of the forward scattering amplitude corresponding to Eq. 39. It can be shown that the imaginary part of the same amplitude is minimized at the same point. This causes a reduction of the total cross section or particle production for reaction Eq. 38. Contrary to intuition, the higher the virtual photon energy, the better the relative transparency.

Finally, it should be made clear that all of the statements for a nucleon in this section apply to any finite system, including, e.g., a nucleus.

V. DISCUSSIONS

In summary, it is possible to reconcile the GDH sum rule and experimental data if a localized spontaneous breaking down of the EM gauge symmetry inside a nucleon is assumed. Complete experimental measurements should enable us to determine the value of ρ_∞^p and ρ_∞^n . The extension for the GDH sum rule given in this study satisfies the following assumptions, namely, 1) gauge invariance, 2) the assumption of the commutativity of the EM charge density operator at equal-time and 3) Lorentz invariance. These assumptions impose constraints so stringent that it allows very little freedom for us to formulate an extension of the GDH sum rule that can be used to explain the data if a violation of the GDH sum rule is finally established.

The result of this paper is based on the truth of Eq. 3, which is a consequence of our basic assumptions mentioned above, plus a not so explicitly stated assumption that the use of an infinite momentum frame in deriving the fixed q^2 sum rule is legitimate. Without assuming the spontaneous breaking down of the $U(1)$ EM gauge symmetry inside a nucleon, a violation of the GDH sum rule would imply (see also Ref. [7]) either the need for a modification of the commutation relation between EM charge density operator, which has already been attempted in Refs. [8,9], or the use of the infinite momentum frame in the derivation of fixed q^2 sum rule being invalid for the study of the GDH sum rule. The first alternative requires quite drastic changes since the Ward identity Eq. 3 has been assumed in almost all calculations involving real- and virtual- photon interaction with a nucleon. The later possibility has not been explored in a constructive way. It is not expected to be generally true given the success of other fixed q^2 sum rules. How can it fail in deriving GDH sum rule is worthy of study in the future.

Of course the Regge asymptotic behavior argument for F_8 can also be false. If it is indeed the case and $F_8 \sim \nu^{-1}$, then a violation of the GDH sum rule can also be realized without the need of a violation of the Ward identity Eq. 3. This possibility is a natural alternative to the one proposed here. What can cause such an asymptotic behavior for F_8 , which contains the pieces in the current-current correlation that is gauge invariant by themselves, is a worthy topic to be further investigated. It is however a quite unlikely scenario since, as it is discussed in the section III, it violates the requirements of a superselection rule for physical states in the EM gauge theory if the Regge asymptotics is assumed to be correct for physical amplitudes.

What has not been answered in this paper is how can a would-be Goldstone boson corresponding to EM gauge symmetry be dynamically generated in a hadronic system. One possibility was given in Ref. [17], which studied the formation of the β -phase (superconducting) inside a infinitely large massless fermion system possessing chiral $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry. Albeit a non-scalar condensation of diquark is studied in Ref. [17], the qualitative features given in section IV remain true. The quantitative result of section III also applies to the situation of non-scalar diquark condensation discussed in Ref. [17] for a class of specific configuration of the diquark condensate in the nucleon. The photon mass m_γ is estimated to be of order 10 MeV in that reference if the spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking scale is chosen to be around 1 GeV . The possibility of its existence inside a nucleon was investigated in Ref. [18] from chiral symmetry point of view. It was found that empirical facts seem to favor a superconducting nucleon². It is important to push this idea further in future studies.

The next important question is about the q^2 evolution of the sum rule in the $q^2 < 0$ region, especially in the isovector sector (i.e. when the difference between proton and neutron is taken) where, at large q^2 , a sum rule due to Bjorken [10] exists. It agrees well with the experimental data [19]. The Bjorken sum rule applies to the case of deep inelastic scattering (DIS). The rapid transition region between the DIS region where parton model picture

²If the deviation of GDH sum rule from the experimental data is proven true, it could provide additional information about the distribution of diquark condensate in a nucleon under such a scenario.

applies and the essentially non-perturbative region probed by the GDH sum rule is of interest and is the subject of some experiments planned. The existence of the resonance peak in the scattering amplitude proposed here, which is only ~ 10 MeV away from the $q^2 = 0$ point in the positive q^2 region, can provide a dynamical reason for such a quick transition in the negative q^2 region. It is another one of the interesting questions that deserves to be further investigated.

APPENDIX A: RECENT PROGRESSES ON THE SUBJECT

There were two main questions raised in this paper when it was finished in 1995. In the first one, the author posed his doubt about the modification of the GDH sum rule by invoking non-commuting Abelian charge density operator at equal time, the second is about the author's uncertain about the legitimacy of the use of an infinite momentum frame. A constructive study of the infinite momentum limit is called for.

There is a recent work [20,21] by Pantföerder and collaborators, who, apart from others, studied these two problems in the context of electroweak theory in an one loop perturbative scheme. It was found that the effects of the anomalous term in the equal-time charge density commutator can be canceled by an additional term in the process of taking the infinite momentum limit. This work therefore provides a detailed one loop theoretical check on the truth of Eq. 3, which as it was discussed in the summary part of this work, is our the starting point. Although this is a perturbative proof, this part of work partially narrow down the possible alternatives of modifying the GDH sum rule in case that there is indeed a need from observations.

The meaning of the "localized" spontaneous EM symmetry breaking (and chiral symmetry breaking proposed in Ref. [18]) are clarified in another set of papers [22–24]. According to these works, especially Ref. [22], if the violation of the GDH sum rule and/or the results of Ref. [18] are finally experimentally proven, then they imply either the phase of the strong interaction vacuum is actually locally flipped to one of the new phases proposed (also see, e.g., Ref. [26]) inside a nucleon or one of these proposed phases for the strong interaction vacuum is close (in energy density) to the actual phase of the strong interaction vacuum at least inside a nucleon at the present day conditions.

On the observational side, the recently determined sea flavor unsymmetry inside a nucleon by the E866/NuSea collaboration [27] are noticeably smaller than the required unsymmetry derived from the NMC measurement [28] by assuming the validity of the Gottfried sum rule. An explanation of this genuine violation of the Gottfried sum rule was provided long ago [29] based upon the same mechanism as the one proposed in this work. The possibility that the mechanism proposed in this work can be utilized to provide a coherent physical picture for us to understand the violation of the Gottfried sum rule and the seemingly "violation of unitarity" (by the so called "hard pomeron" [30]) in high energy deep inelastic scattering between leptons and nucleons in the small Bjorken x region observed at HERA [31,32] and in high energy proton-proton scattering is under investigation [33] based upon a mechanism of spontaneous partial breaking of local EM gauge symmetry.

APPENDIX B: A ANSWER TO THE CRITICISM OF REF [21]

The comments of Ref. [21] on this work show that its author holds somewhat simplified understanding of this work and the physics of spontaneous gauge symmetry breaking.

First, let us discuss the first erratum that are thought to exist in this work. The alleged mistake is that F_8 in Eq. 4 should be absent because it is not linearly independent. This is not true since the matrix elements between two on shell nucleon/antinucleon states with the same *momentum and spin* is a set of truncated 2×2 matrix actually. But I am talk about the Dirac 4×4 matrix structure for *Compton amplitude* here, it includes not only the *on shell* matrix elements between nucleon/antinucleon states with the same momentum and spin, but also those with the same momentum but *different spin*. Each of the F_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 8$) carry different *dynamical information* of the system. In addition, F_8 is different from F_6 and F_7 in that it contains no non-physical state contributions since it is a gauge invariant piece in itself. This is discussed in length in this paper. Did the author of Ref. [21] notice that the spin quantum numbers for the initial and final states are different in my equations?

The confusion of Ref. [21] starts from my use of the term "canonical commutator" which becomes synonymous to the term "naive commutator", which is not manifestly covariant, there. I admit that the term "canonical" may not be the best choice in this case since, as it is apparent in the context of the discussion around it, it really means the covariant part of it generated from the equal-time naive commutation relation for a nucleon *at rest*. Since its matrix elements between two nucleon states are independent of q^μ and p^μ , the covariant part of the time-ordered products of two current operators and their commutators can be uniquely identified in any frame. Therefore I can boost the rest frame equation 16 to a large momentum frame and finally let the momentum to approach to infinity. The F_5

term coincides with the term derived from the matrix elements of the naive commutator between nucleon states at rest. Since the naive equal-time commutator between fermion fields will lead us to the same form of current-current commutation relation for any frame, they are not related to one another by a Lorentz transformation. In this sense, the “canonical commutator” of this work is different from the naive commutator of Ref. [21]. This is the reason that the piece of the commutator between equal-time EM current operators given in Eq. 17 is called “canonical”. But I admit that the quantity called “tensor charge” of a nucleon in Ref. [25] should actually be axial charge of a nucleon. This is corrected in this version of the paper. But, none of the results of this work is affected by this change.

There is nothing wrong with using the Bjorken-Johnson-Low (BJL) equation [10,34]. The BJL equation relates the high energy behavior of the matrix elements of a naive time-ordered amplitudes between two operators and the equal-time commutator of the same operators. It is a mathematical equation for all linearly independent components on both side of the equation. The use of it is to get the left hand side by knowing the right hand side and vice versa³. In the case of this work, I happen to know one (linearly independent) piece of covariant part of the commutator, which is unique, but do not know the high energy behavior of the corresponding piece in the time-ordered product. But nothing is wrong with it, isn't it? It is not the authentic operational BJL techniques (BJL procedure), but the formal mathematical BJL equation. The BJL techniques defines the q^μ dependent (polynomial) parts of commutator for physical amplitudes. It is actually a well founded assumption. It was applied successfully in the study of anomalies which was experimentally tested.

In a free theory, it can be checked straight forwardly that $F_5 \sim \nu^{-1}$ so the contribution of the *pair states are expected to be suppressed or, in a less favorable case, cancellable, in the infinite momentum limit* in the same way as the one demonstrated in Ref [21]. Therefore, according to the normal procedure, it is safe to take the infinite momentum limit [3]. The author of Ref. [21] uses the discussion concerning f_2 in the section 4.4.4 of that reference to substantiate his claims. But the sum rules that I was talking about is an equation, adding and subtracting the *same quantity* (seagull or Schwinger terms) to an equation does not alter the content of that equation. Is Ref. [21] suggesting that the leading ν dependence involved in the GDH sum rule are generated by F_5 term so that the troubling “pair term” contributions to the naive time-order product and the equal-time commutator are in fact not get canceled (see Ref. [3]) in the infinite momentum limit? This seems to invalid the its main conclusion. I am puzzled and invite a new (formal or informal) paper from its author to clarify this!

The question related to the violation of the Burkhardt–Cottingham (BC) sum rule. The BC sum rule was derived based upon a superconvergence relation

$$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \nu A_2(\nu, q^2) = 0 \quad (\text{B1})$$

with an implicit assumption that the EM gauge symmetry is unbroken. But I am assuming that the EM gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken here! Eq. B1 is not experimentally direct testable, so no one know whether it is correct or not at the present. But the current potentially testable version of the BC sum rule, namely,

$$\int_0^1 dx g_2(x) = 0 \quad (\text{B2})$$

is not expected to be essentially altered by an infinite amount in the deeply inelastic region since Eq. B2 is an equation for the imaginary part of A_2 which suppresses the contributions from the unphysical states in the spontaneously broken phase of EM.

Finally about the question of whether $q^2 \rightarrow 0$ should be taken or $q^2 = 0$ should be taken. From a mathematical sense, the set of points that makes $I_1(0) = -\kappa^2/4$ denoted by $q^2 = 0$ in Ref. [21] has a zero measure. This mathematical isolated point is therefore unphysical and can be removed from the physical q^2 axis. As the author of [21] knows, he never use any quantity with strict $q^2 = 0$ in the above sense in his finite momentum sum rule! In fact his $q^2 = \nu^2/P_0^2$ which approaches to zero in the *infinite momentum limit*.

I would not say anything again about the degenerate massless state with photon. I have discussed this in length in the paper.

In conclusion, the relevant theoretical reasons provided in Ref. [21] in support of its author's disbelief of the modifications of GDH sum rule proposed in this work are either inconsistent with the “good part” of this reference, which actually demonstrated the cancellation of pair state contributions to the GDH sum rule in a perturbative way using the standard electroweak model, or is originated from a misunderstanding of the issue.

³If both sides is unknown, its useless. If, however, both sides are known, its either trivial or wrong and therefore is almost useless.

-
- [1] Gerasimov S B 1965 *Yad. Fiz.* **2** 598 [1966 *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **2** 430]; an earlier related work is given in Lapidus L I and Chou Kuang-chao 1962 *JETP* **14** 357.
- [2] Drell S D and Hearn A C 1966 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **16** 908.
- [3] Adler S L and Dashen R F, *Current Algebra and Applications to Particle Physics*, (W.A. Benjamin Inc., New York, Amsterdam, 1968).
- [4] Workman R L and Arndt R A 1992 *Phys. Rev.* **D45** 1789.
- [5] Sandorfi A M, Whisnant C S, and Khandaker M 1994 *Phys. Rev.* **50** R6681.
- [6] Abarbanel H and Goldberger M 1968 *Phys. Rev.* **165** 1594.
- [7] Fox G and Freedman D 1969 *Phys. Rev.* **182** 1628.
- [8] Kawarabayashi K and Suzuki M 1966 *Phys. Rev.* **152** 1383.
- [9] Chang L N, Liang Y, and Workman R 1994 *Phys. Lett.* **B329** 514.
- [10] Bjorken J D 1966 *Phys. Rev.* **148** 1465.
- [11] Bronzan L B, Gerstein I S, Lee B W and Low F E 1967 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **18** 32.
- [12] Singh V 1967 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **18** 36.
- [13] Low F 1954 *Phys. Rev.* **96** 1428; Gell-Mann M and Goldberger M 1954 *Phys. Rev.* **96** 1433.
- [14] Broadhurst D J, Gunion J F and Jaffe R L 1973 *Phys. Rev.* **D8** 566.
- [15] Gupta S 1950 *Proc. Phys. Soc. Lond.* **A63** 681; Bleuler K 1950 *Helv. Phys. Acta* **23** 567.
- [16] Strocchi F 1977 *Comm. Math. Phys.* **56** 57.
- [17] Ying S 1992 *Phys. Lett.* **283B** 341; Ying S 1996 *Ann. Phys. NY* **250** 69.
- [18] Ying S 1997 *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **28** 301.
- [19] Abe K et al. (E154 Collaboration) 1997 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79** 26.
- [20] Pantförder R, Rollnik H, and Pfeil W 1998 *Eur. Phys. J.* **C1** 585; 1997 Report No. hep-ph/9703368.
- [21] Pantförder R 1998 Report No. hep-ph/9805434.
- [22] Ying S 1997 Report No. hep-ph/9704216.
- [23] Ying S 1998 *Ann. Phys. NY* **266** 295.
- [24] Ying S 1998 Report No. hep-th/9802044.
- [25] Ying S 1996 *J. Phys.* **G22** 293.
- [26] Wilczek F 1998 Report No. hep-ph/9806395.
- [27] Hawker E A et al. (E866/NuSea Collaboration) 1998 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** 3715.
- [28] Melnitchouk W, Speth J, and Thomas A W 1998 Report No. hep-ph/9806255. (Fig. 3).
- [29] Ying S 1994 Report No. nucl-th/9411017.
- [30] Donnachie A and Landshoff P V 1998 Report No. hep-ph/9806344.
- [31] Aid S et al. (H1 Collaboration) 1996 *Nucl. Phys.* **B470** 3.
- [32] M. Derrick M et al. (ZEUS Collaboration) 1996 *Z. Phys.* **C72** 399.
- [33] Ying S Work in progress.
- [34] Johnson K and Low F E 1966 *Supp. Prog. Theor. Phys.* **37/38** 74.