

# On a possible estimation of the constituent–quark parameters from Jefferson Lab experiments on pion form factor

A.F.Krutov\*

Samara State University, 443011, Samara, Russia

V.E.Troitsky†

Nuclear Physics Institute, Moscow State University, 119899, Moscow, Russia

(August 1998)

The charge form factor of the pion is calculated for momentum transfer range of Jefferson Lab experiments. The approach is based on the instant form of the relativistic Hamiltonian dynamics. It is shown that the form-factor dependence on the choice of the model for quark wave function in pion is weak, while the dependence on the constituent–quark mass is rather significant. It is possible to estimate the mass of constituent quark and the sum of anomalous magnetic moments of  $u$ - and  $\bar{d}$ - quarks from the JLab experiments.

PACS numbers: 12.39, 12.60.R, 13.40.G

At present time the constituent quark model (CQM) is widely and successfully used for the description of hadron properties at low and intermediate energies [1–13]. The reasons for this are well known: first, CQM uses the physically adequate degrees of freedom; second, CQM describes nonperturbative effects. These facts give a possibility to use CQM for the investigation of the so called "soft" structure of hadrons, e.g. in exclusive processes, in contrast to QCD (see, e.g. [14]).

The main feature of CQM *versus* QCD is the extraction of finite number of the most important degrees of freedom needed to describe the hadron. All dynamical effects of QCD are incorporated in CQM through the effective (constituent) quark mass and internal quark structure in terms of quark form factors. So, in the framework of CQM constituent quarks have all the material properties of free particles and interact with each other through the confinement potential. This means that constituent quark is characterized by an effective mass, a mean–square–radius (MSR) and an anomalous magnetic moment. Let us remark that the concept of extended constituent quarks also appears in some quantum field theory models, for example, in Nambu–Jona–Lasinio model with spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking [15]. In this context one can imagine that CQM is initiated by QCD. However, it is very important to remind ourselves that CQM is not a direct consequence of QCD, but a very

successful phenomenological model [16].

For the description of electroweak properties it is necessary to take into account the relativistic effects, especially large in systems of light quarks. We will use the relativistic Hamiltonian dynamics (RHD) [17], which is one of approaches to describe relativistic properties of CQM.

In the present paper we discuss the dependence of electromagnetic pion form factor on the internal quark structure. The interest to this problem is due particularly to a possible interpretation of current experiments in Jefferson Lab on the measurement of pion form factor [18] in the range of momentum transfer  $0.5(GeV/c)^2 < Q^2 < 5(GeV/c)^2$ . Using one of relativistic forms of CQM we obtain that pion form factor in this region of  $Q^2$  depends strongly on the constituent quark mass, while the dependence on model quark interaction in pion is weak. This fact gives hope that it could be possible to estimate the constituent quark mass from Jefferson Lab experiments. With the use of model independent Gerasimov sum rule [19] it is possible to estimate the anomalous magnetic moments of constituent quarks from these experiments and our calculations. So, the important characteristics of CQM can be obtained.

In this paper we use the version [20] of the instant form of RHD. In this approach we are dealing with the following integral form of pion electromagnetic form factor in the relativistic impulse approximation:

$$F_\pi(Q^2) = \int d\sqrt{s} d\sqrt{s'} \varphi(k(s)) g_0(s, Q^2, s') \varphi(k'(s')). \quad (1)$$

Here  $s = 4(k^2 + M^2)$ ,  $g_0(s, Q^2, s')$  is the so called free two–particle form factor to be derived by the methods of relativistic kinematics [20],  $\varphi(k)$  is a phenomenological wave function normalized with the account of relativistic density of states [20]:

$$\int \frac{dk}{2\sqrt{k^2 + M^2}} \varphi^2(k) = 1, \quad (2)$$

$$\varphi(k) = \sqrt[4]{4(k^2 + M^2)} k u(k), \quad \int dk k^2 u^2(k) = 1. \quad (3)$$

\*Electronic address: krutov@info.ssu.samara.ru

†Electronic address: troitsky@theory.npi.msu.u

Here  $u(k)$  is a nonrelativistic wave function. The Eq.(2) gives the normalization of the pion charge form factor  $F_\pi(0) = 1$ . The free two-particle form factor in (1) is of the form [20]:

$$g_0(s, Q^2, s') = a(s, Q^2, s')[\theta(s' - s_1) - \theta(s' - s_2)] \\ \times \left\{ b(s, Q^2, s')[G_E^u(Q^2) + G_E^{\bar{d}}(Q^2)] \cos \omega(s, Q^2, s') \right. \\ \left. + c(s, Q^2, s')[G_M^u(Q^2) + G_M^{\bar{d}}(Q^2)] \sin \omega(s, Q^2, s') \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where  $G_E^{u,\bar{d}}(Q^2)$  and  $G_M^{u,\bar{d}}(Q^2)$  are the electric and magnetic single-quark Sachs form factors,  $\omega(s, Q^2, s')$  is the Wigner rotation parameter. The coefficients  $a(s, Q^2, s')$ ,  $b(s, Q^2, s')$ ,  $c(s, Q^2, s')$  and  $\omega(s, Q^2, s')$  and the value  $s_{1,2}$  entering the step function  $\theta(s' - s_{1,2})$  are given by Eq.(10) of Ref. [13] (with  $M_{\bar{s}} = M_u = M$ ).

By analogy with [10] and with the scaling of nucleon form factors we write:

$$G_E^q(Q^2) = e_q f(Q^2), \quad G_M^q(Q^2) = (e_q + \kappa_q) f(Q^2), \quad (5)$$

where  $e_q$  is the quark charge and  $\kappa_q$  is the quark anomalous magnetic moment. However, we do not use for  $f_q(Q^2)$  the form of Ref. [10] but that of Ref. [11]:

$$f_q(Q^2) = \frac{1}{1 + \ln(1 + \langle r_q^2 \rangle Q^2 / 6)}. \quad (6)$$

Here  $\langle r_q^2 \rangle$  is the quark MSR. Let us discuss in brief the motivation for choosing the explicit form (6). One of the features of our approach is the fact that the form factor asymptotic behavior at  $Q^2 \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $M \rightarrow 0$  does not depend on the choice of the wave function in (1) and is defined by the relativistic kinematics of two-quark system only [12]. In the point-like quark approximation ( $\kappa_q=0$ ,  $\langle r_q^2 \rangle=0$ ) the asymptotics coincides with that described by quark counting laws [21]:  $F_\pi(Q^2) \sim Q^{-2}$ . The form (6) gives logarithmic corrections to the power-law asymptotics, obtained in QCD. So, in our approach the form (6) for the quark form factor gives the same asymptotics as in QCD. The monopole form for  $f_q(Q^2)$  [10] gives the different one. Let us notice, however, that the main results of the present paper do not depend on the actual form of the quark form factor.

As the quark interaction potential is not known from the first principles, CQM is usually dealing with model potentials and wave functions depending on fitting parameters. To calculate pion form factor we use the following wave functions for the ground state of quark-antiquark system:

1. Harmonic oscillator (HO) wave function (see e.g. [3]):

$$u(k) = N_{HO} \exp(-k^2/2b^2), \quad (7)$$

2. Power-law (PL) wave function (see e.g. [9]):

$$u(k) = N_{PL} (k^2/b^2 + 1)^{-3}. \quad (8)$$

3. The wave function with linear confinement and Coulomb-like behavior at small distances [22]:

$$u(r) = N_T \exp(-\alpha r^{3/2} - \beta r), \quad (9)$$

$$\alpha = \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{2 M_r a}, \quad \beta = M_r b.$$

In Eq.(9),  $a$  and  $b$  are the parameters of linear and Coulomb parts of potential respectively. We use the value  $b=0.7867$ .

Let us emphasize that we have obtained the expression (1) for the form factor in the framework of the essentially relativistic approach: instant form of RHD. Our current matrix element is explicitly Lorentz covariant and satisfies conservation laws, so that the current operator of composite system does contain the contribution not only of one-particle currents but of two-particle currents, too. We do not use fixed ("good") current components or fixed coordinate frame (for example, Breit frame), as one usually do in other RHD approaches [17].

One can see from the equations (1)–(9) that we use the standard CQM parameters: the constituent quark mass  $M_u = M_d = M$ , the  $u$ - and  $\bar{d}$ - quark anomalous magnetic moments  $\kappa_u$ ,  $\kappa_{\bar{d}}$  (which enter our equations through the sum  $s_q = \kappa_u + \kappa_{\bar{d}}$ ), the constituent quark MSR  $\langle r_u^2 \rangle = \langle r_{\bar{d}}^2 \rangle = \langle r_q^2 \rangle$  and the wave functions parameters –  $b$  in the models (7), (8) and  $a$  and  $b$  in the model (9).

Let us notice that the electroweak properties of mesons have been discussed by different authors in the framework of CQM in the point-quark approximation ( $\langle r_q^2 \rangle = 0$ ,  $\kappa_q = 0$ ) and a consistent description of some processes has been obtained [3,4,6,13]. However, there are strong arguments against this approximation. The model independent Gerasimov sum rules [19] indicate the existence of anomalous magnetic moments of constituent quarks. The anomalous magnetic moments of quarks appear in the calculations of Refs. [2,23]. In our approach the necessity to make the calculations of electromagnetic and weak processes consistent brings one in natural way to the concept of the constituent-quark structure.

The parameters in our calculations are of two types. The first type parameters enter the electromagnetic or weak current of constituent quark:  $M$ ,  $s_q$ ,  $\langle r_q^2 \rangle$ . The second type parameters characterize quark interaction (wave functions) –  $b$ ,  $a$ . We suppose that in the framework of CQM the parameters of the first type do not depend on the parameters of the second type: the first type parameters are the same for different model interactions and these parameters are to be fixed independently from the choice of model interaction. In other words,

the calculation of composite quark systems is analogous to that of composite nuclear systems, e.g. the deuteron. In calculation of the deuteron electromagnetic properties one fixes the parameters in nucleon form factors independently of the choice of nucleon–nucleon interaction potential.

Let us now fix the parameters. At the present time there are two pion characteristics that can be extracted from the data in a model independent way and with sufficient accuracy: the mean square radius  $\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle_{exp}^{1/2} = 0.657 \pm 0.012$  fm [24], and the lepton decay constant  $f_{\pi exp} = 0.1317 \pm 0.0002$  GeV [25]. We assume that the calculations for any quark interaction model satisfy (in addition to the description of the particle spectrum) the conditions:

$$\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle^{1/2} = \langle r_\pi^2 \rangle_{exp}^{1/2} \quad (10)$$

$$f_\pi = f_{\pi exp}. \quad (11)$$

We have used the following forms for pion MSR and the lepton decay constant [13]:

$$\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle = -6 \left. \frac{dF_\pi(Q^2)}{dQ^2} \right|_{Q^2=0} = \langle r_{r.m.}^2 \rangle + \langle r_q^2 \rangle. \quad (12)$$

$$f_\pi = \frac{M \sqrt{n_c}}{\pi} \int \frac{k^2 dk}{(k^2 + M^2)^{3/4}} u(k). \quad (13)$$

$n_c$  – number of colors. In Eq.(12)  $\langle r_{r.m.}^2 \rangle$  is the contribution of quarks relative motion, it depends on  $M$ ,  $s_q$  and on the wave functions parameters;  $\langle r_q^2 \rangle$  is the part of pion MSR due to MSR of quarks. The lepton decay constant is defined by the wave function parameters and by the mass of constituent quark.

The choice of the values (10), (11) to fix the parameters has the following reasons. First, they are measured in a model independent way, that is with no assumptions about the pion structure. Second, as one can see from the Eq.(12), the mean square radius of pion is determined by the form factor behavior near zero. This means that

TABLE I. The values of model parameters for higher ( $M = 0.22$  GeV), medium ( $M = 0.25$  GeV) and lower ( $M = 0.33$  GeV) groups of curves in Fig 1. The parameter  $b$  in (7), (8) is in GeV, the parameter  $a$  in (9) is in GeV<sup>2</sup>. The wave functions parameters  $b$ ,  $a$  and the sum  $s_q$  of quark anomalous magnetic moments are derived from the fitting of the pion MSR  $\langle r_\pi^2 \rangle^{1/2} = 0.657 \pm 0.012$  fm [24] and the best possible posterior fitting of the value  $f_{\pi exp} = 131.7 \pm 0.2$  MeV [25].

Model	$M = 0.22$		$M = 0.25$		$M = 0.33$	
	$s_q = 0.0268$	$f_\pi$	$s_q = -0.0023$	$f_\pi$	$s_q = -0.1965$	$f_\pi$
(7)	$b, a$	127.4	$b, a$	127.8	$b, a$	125.1
(8)	0.6131	131.7	0.5401	131.7	0.4901	131.7
(9)	0.1331	131.7	0.0670	132.1	0.0187	131.7

the condition (10) gives, in fact, a constraint for the pion form factor at small  $Q^2$  values. Analogously the constant  $f_\pi$  is connected with the pion form factor behavior at large momentum transfer. So, the conditions (10) and (11) constrain, in fact, the pion form factor behavior at small and large momentum transfer. Let us note that in the point–quark approximation the conditions (10), (11) can not be fulfilled for realistic values of parameters simultaneously for all models (see below).

So, the constituent quark parameters  $M$ ,  $s_q$ ,  $\langle r_q^2 \rangle$  are the same for all the wave functions (7), (8), (9). The quark mass is a fitting parameter. In addition, we shall use the relation  $\langle r_q^2 \rangle \simeq 0.3/M^2$  between the MSR and the mass of the constituent quark [10,15].

Let us consider now the parameter  $s_q$  and the parameters of the wave functions. To fix these parameters in the framework of the model under consideration one can use the conditions (10), (11). This means however that the values of  $s_q$  are different for different interaction models. If we use one and the same value of  $s_q$  for all the models (7), (8), (9), we can not satisfy the conditions (10), (11) simultaneously. So, we shall use the parameters of wave functions (7), (8), (9) and the parameter  $s_q$  as to fulfill the condition (10) accurately for all models. The condition (11) will be satisfied only approximately. However, we try to use the best possible value of  $f_\pi$  for each model. These values are given in the Table I. In such a way we fix all but one parameters: the constituent quark mass  $M$  remains to be a fitting parameter.

When one changes  $M$  the other parameters are changed following the indicated prescription,  $\langle r_q^2 \rangle$ ,  $s_q$ ,  $a$  and  $b$  being the functions of  $M$ .

The results of our calculation of the pion form factor using the parameters from the Table 1 indicate that the form factor dependence on the quark interaction model is weak, while the dependence on the constituent quark mass is rather significant. Our results are presented in Fig.1. The curves calculated with different wave functions but one and the same quark mass form groups. The position of the group changes essentially with the quark mass.

The great accuracy of planned JLab experiments will make it possible to fix the position of "the group" rather accurately and, so, to determine the constituent quark mass [26]. This estimate (almost) will not depend on the interaction model for quarks in pion.

It is worth to emphasize that the function  $f_q(Q^2)$  (6) enters  $F_\pi(Q^2)$  as a multiplier and so the choice of  $f_q(Q^2)$  does not influence the relative position of curves for different  $M$  and different model wave functions.

It is possible that the slope of the experimental curve will occur to be greater than in our groups, so that for different  $Q^2$  the points will belong to different groups. This case will indicate the constituent quark mass depends on the momentum transfer, in the spirit of the Ref. [8].




FIG. 1.  $\pi$ -meson form factor in the range of JLab experiments. The results of calculations for different interaction models and  $M=0.22, 0.25, 0.33$  GeV. The curves with the same mass form a group. The position of a group is defined by the constituent quark mass.

So, our approach gives the possibility to estimate the constituent quark mass from experimental pion form factor. Moreover, if the mass is determined we can estimate the anomalous magnetic moments of  $u$ - and  $d$ - quarks using the parameter  $s_q = \kappa_u + \kappa_{\bar{d}}$ . To perform this estimation one can use the model independent Gerasimov sum rule [19]:

$$\frac{e_u + \kappa_u}{e_d + \kappa_d} = -1.77, \quad (14)$$

For example, for  $M \simeq 0.25$  GeV we obtain from (14):  $\kappa_u = -0.0285$ ,  $\kappa_d = -0.0262$ , these values are of the order of the values of Ref. [19]. The variation of  $M$  gives different value of  $s_q$ , and thus, of  $\kappa_u$  and  $\kappa_d$ .

The analogous program can be carried out for the kaon.

To conclude, the calculation of the pion form factor in the framework of our approach based on the instant form RHD gives weak dependence on the interaction model for quarks in pion, while the dependence on constituent quark mass is strong. One can imagine that any approach to the calculation of the form factor with any wave function will give the result close to our result, if the MSR and the lepton decay constant are described well enough. Our results provide a possibility to estimate the parameters of the constituent quarks from JLab experiments.

The authors thank S.B.Gerasimov and N.P.Zotov for helpful discussions and valuable comments. This work was supported in part by The Russian Foundation for Basic Research (grant No 96-02-17288).

- 
- [1] S. Godfrey and N.Isgur, Phys.Rev.D **32**, 185 (1985).
  - [2] I.G. Aznauryan and N.L. Ter-Isaakyan, Yad.Fiz. **31**, 1680 (1980).
  - [3] P.L. Chung, F. Coester, and W.N.Polyzou, Phys. Lett.B **205**, 545 (1988).
  - [4] H. Ito, W.W. Buck, and F. Gross, Phys.Lett.B **248**, 28 (1990).
  - [5] O.C. Jakob and L.S. Kisslinger, Phys.Lett.B **243**, 323 (1990).
  - [6] W. Jaus, Phys.Rev.D **44**, 2851 (1991).
  - [7] A.F. Krutov and V.E. Troitsky, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **19**, L127 (1993).
  - [8] L.S. Kisslinger and S.W. Wang, Report No hep-ph/9403261 (unpublished).
  - [9] F.Schlumpf, Phys.Rev.D **50**, 6895 (1994).
  - [10] F. Cardarelli, I.M. Grach, I.M. Narodetskii, E. Pace, G. Salmeé, and S. Simula, Phys. Lett. B**359**, 1 (1995); Phys. Rev. D**53**, 6682 (1996).
  - [11] A.F.Krutov, Yad. Phys. **60**, 1442 (1997) [Phys. At. Nuclei **60**, 1305 (1997)].
  - [12] A.F. Krutov and V.E. Troitsky, Teor. Math. Phys. **116** (1998).
  - [13] E.V. Balandina, A.F. Krutov, and V.E. Troitsky, J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys. **19**, 1585 (1996).
  - [14] N. Isgur and C. H. Llewellyn Smith, Nucl.Phys.B, **317** 526 (1989).
  - [15] U. Vogl, M. Lutz, S. Klimt, and W. Weise, Nucl.Phys.A **516**, 469 (1990). B. Povh and J.Hüfner, Phys.Lett.B **245**, 653 (1990). S.M. Troshin and N.E. Tyurin, Phys.Rev.D **49**, 4427 (1994).
  - [16] S.Godfrey, Report No hep-ph/9712545.
  - [17] B.D. Keister and W. Polyzou, Adv.Nucl.Phys. **21**, 225 (1991).
  - [18] CEBAF Program Advisory Committee, Report of June 14-18, 1993.
  - [19] S.B. Gerasimov, Phys.Lett. B **357**, 666 (1995).
  - [20] E.V. Balandina, A.F. Krutov, and V.E. Troitsky, Teor. Math. Phys. **103**, 381 (1995). A.F.Krutov and V.E.Troitsky, Reports No hep-ph/9707533, hep-ph/9707534, hep-ph/9704293 (unpublished).
  - [21] V.A.Matveev, R.M.Muradyan, and A.N.Tavkhelidze, Lett. Nuovo Cim. **7** 719 (1973), **15** 907 (1973); S.Brodsky and G.Farrar, Phys.Rev.Lett. **31** 1153 (1973).
  - [22] H. Tezuka, J. Phys.A: Math.Gen. **24**, 5267 (1991).
  - [23] S.Capstick and B.D.Keister, Report No nucl-th/9611055.
  - [24] S.R. Amendolia *et al.*, Phys. Lett.B **146**, 116 (1984).
  - [25] Particle Data Group. Part II, Phys.Rev.D **45** (1992).
  - [26] Let us note that the use of our approach to the existing experimental data (see Fig.1) gives only rough estimate for the mass:  $0.22 < M < 0.33$  GeV.
  - [27] S.B. Gerasimov, Yad.Fiz. **29**, 513 (1979).