

Low-mass scalar production in $\gamma\gamma$ scattering

G. Mennessier ^a

^aL.P.T.A., UMR 5207, Universite Montpellier II, CNRS

We estimate the $I = 0$ scalar meson $\sigma/f_0(600)$ $\gamma\gamma$ widths, from $\pi\pi$ and $\gamma\gamma$ scattering data below 700 MeV using an improved analytic K-matrix model.

Communication on part of a work done with NARISON Stephan and OCHS Wolfgang [1,2]

1. Introduction. Preliminary remarks

- This is an attempt to get information on the nature of the low-mass scalar meson, the controversial σ or ϵ or $f_0(600)$, from $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow \pi + \pi$ at energies below ~ 700 Mev.

- Studies of this process go back to Lyth (1971) [3], Yndurain (1972) [4], ... [5] [6] [7], and recently Boglione-Pennington [8], Pennington [9], Achasov-Shestakov [10], Oller-Roca [11], Pennington et al. [12], Giacosa-Gutsche-Lyubovitskij [13] ...

- Though not proved for composite particules (to my knowledge), I will assume "usual" analyticity properties in s (the energy squared), with **Left** cut from t, u particle exchanges, and **Right** cut above threshold, from physical channel.

- Working at lowest order in E.M. , **unitarity is linear**, and involves **STRONG** amplitudes.

- from unitarity and analyticity, Muskhelishvili [14] have shown how to determine a set of **Fundamental solutions**, from which one can obtain the full family of solutions, which is determined **up to Polynomial Ambiguity** once we are given the Left singularities.

- In the 1-channel purely elastic case, the Fundamental solution reduces to the Omnes formula [15], where the phase shift must be chosen **continuous**, to get an analytic and invertible function.

- Analytic extrapolation is unstable if there are no bounds in all directions of the complex plane, and sensitive to even small but rapid variations. This is, presumably, one of the reason of the controverses on the low-mass scalar meson, which appear to be a very broad object. See a recent discussion by Yndurain et al. [16]

2. STRONG interaction parametrisation

Since we only study the low energy part, we assume **elastic unitarity** from threshold up to infinity, and unitarise only the S-waves.

Here we will neglect, in particular, the opening of the $K - \bar{K}$ threshold, the effect of the $f_2(1270)$...

We will use parametrisations, of generalized **analytic K-matrix** [17] type, which allow explicit expressions for the Fundamental solution, and explicit continuation on the Riemann sheets.

2.1. I=0, S-wave

- We use an \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{D} representation for T^0 :

$$T^0(s) = \frac{Gf_0(s)}{s_R - s - G\tilde{f}_0(s)} \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{D} = s_R - s - G\tilde{f}_0(s); \quad (2)$$

with Fundamental solution

$$F^0(s) = 1/\mathcal{D}; \quad (3)$$

where the *shape function* $f_0(s)$ has only **Left** singularities, while $\tilde{f}_0(s)$ has only **Right** singularities, with

$$\Im m \tilde{f}_0(s) = \theta\rho(s)f_0(s) \quad (4)$$

and $\Re e \tilde{f}_0$ is obtained by dispersion relation, with minimal subtraction at $s = 0$. For G small, there would exist a *bare* pole at $s = s_R$.

2.1.1.

We choose a simple form for $f_0(s)$,

$$f_0(s) = \frac{s - s_{A0}}{s + \sigma_{D0}} \quad (5)$$

which have an **Adler zero** and 1 pole to simulate the near Left singularities.

- The I=0, S=0 phase-shifts δ_0^0 have been determined by several groups, in particular using ROY equations [18,19].

To determine the 4 parameters $(s_{A0}, \sigma_{D0}, s_R, G)$, we fit the phase-shifts δ_0^0 below 800 Mev, obtained by Caprini et al. [18].

For 26 points, total $\chi^2 = 0.55$, one obtains $s_{A0} = 0.0167$ Gev², $\sigma_{D0} = 0.5013$ Gev², $s_R = 0.8232$ Gev², $G = 1.1839$.

The T^0 amplitude has 2 poles in the second sheet, P1 and P2, with energy w and energy squared s values

$$wP1 = 0.422 - i 0.290 \text{ GeV}; sP1 = 0.0936 - i 0.2447 \text{ GeV}^2$$

$$wP2 = 1.043 - i 0.672 \text{ GeV}; sP2 = 0.6360 - i 1.4027 \text{ GeV}^2$$

The first one, P1, is not far from the [18] one : $0.441 - i 0.272 \text{ GeV}$. The second, P2, unexpected for the author, will certainly move a lot when taking into account what happens near $K\bar{K}$ threshold.

However, if one just take the limit $G \rightarrow 0$, the heavy pole P2 goes to the *bare* pole ($wP2- > \sqrt{s_R}$), while P1 goes to unphysical negative s value, on the Left cut ($wP1- > \sqrt{(-\sigma_{D0})}$).

2.1.2.

For a choice of $f_0(s)$ with a cut instead of a pole,

$$f_0(s) = \lambda + G \frac{1}{s - sD} \log\left(1 + \frac{s - sD}{mu2}\right) \quad (6)$$

and corresponding $\tilde{f}_0(s)$, fitting again the phase-shifts [18], one obtains with $\chi^2 = 0.66$, $sD = 0.0778$, $mu2 = 0.3462$, $G = -0.4673$, $\lambda = 1.477$.

When scaling both λ and G to zero, the lowest pole P1 disappear before reaching Left cut (and before couplings vanish), while P2 keep the same behaviour, going to the bare pole ($wP2- > \sqrt{s_R}$).

Though this does not correspond to a true QCD limit, it could indicate that the existence of the P1 pole is related to possibility of physical decay.

2.2. I=2, S-wave

- We take for T^2 :

$$T^2(s) = \frac{\Lambda f_2(s)}{1 - \Lambda \tilde{f}_2(s)} \quad (7)$$

where

$$f_2(s) = \frac{s - s_{A2}}{(s + \sigma_{D1})(s + \sigma_{D2})} \quad (8)$$

is more convergent to avoid an unwanted bound state pole, with

$$\Im m \tilde{f}_2(s) = \theta \rho(s) f_2(s) \quad (9)$$

3. EM interaction

3.1. Pion exchange

The charged $\pi^+\pi^-$ production in $\gamma\gamma$ scattering, is dominated by the Pion exchange, but which does not contribute to the $\pi^0\pi^0$. However once produced, the charged pions can rescatter also into neutral ones.

Let αf^B be the S-wave projection of total Born Pion exchange. Then

$$T_\gamma^0 = \sqrt{2/3} \alpha f^B \text{ and } T_\gamma^2 = \sqrt{1/3} \alpha f^B \quad (10)$$

are the corresponding isospin I=0 and 2 amplitudes.

3.1.1.

Let us define \tilde{f}_0^B , analytic on the Left, with

$$\Im m \tilde{f}_0^B = \theta \rho(s) f_0(s) f^B(s) \quad (11)$$

subtracted at $s = 0$ to satisfy Thompson limit, in a minimal way.

Then

$$T_\gamma^0 = \sqrt{2/3} \alpha (f^B + G \frac{\tilde{f}_0^B}{D}) + \alpha P(s) F^0 \quad (12)$$

is analytic, unitary for any polynomial $P(s)$. The \tilde{f}_0^B term is naturally interpreted as the rescattering contribution, and the $P(s)F^0$ as a direct one. This interpretation is not completely unambiguous, since over-subtracting (or renormalising differently the unitarisation s-bubbles) can lead to a different definition, with same total amplitude. Here also, not to violate Thompson limit, one must restrict to $P(s)$ vanishing at $s = 0$, and limit its degree to avoid too divergent partial-wave.

Thus we will choose $P(s) = \sqrt{2} F_\gamma s$.




Figure 1. Fit of the $\pi^0\pi^0$ cross-section in nanobarn (nb) versus \sqrt{s} using unitarized Born amplitude: $F_\gamma = 0$ (dot-dashed); $F_\gamma = -0.09$: I=0 (large dashed), I=0+2 (continuous); $F_\gamma = -0.07$: I=0+2 (small dashed). The data are from Crystal Ball [20] for $|\cos\theta| \leq 0.8$;

3.1.2.

Analogously, for I=2, one defines \tilde{f}_2^B , analytic on the Left, with

$$\Im m \tilde{f}_2^B = \theta \rho(s) f_2(s) f^B(s) \quad (13)$$

Then

$$T_\gamma^2 = \sqrt{1/3} \alpha (f^B + \Lambda \frac{\tilde{f}_2^B}{1 - \Lambda \tilde{f}_2(s)}) \quad (14)$$

is analytic, unitary. Limiting the degree of possible polynomial to the behaviour of rescattering terms completely suppress polynomial contribution.

There is then only 1 parameter free, F_γ .




Figure 2. The same as in Fig. 1 but for $\pi^+\pi^-$ using unitarized Born amplitude: $F_\gamma = 0$ (dot-dashed); $F_\gamma = -0.07$ and I=0+2 (small dashed). The continuous line corresponds to the non-unitarized Born amplitude with $F_\gamma = 0$. The data are from MARKII [21] for $|\cos\theta| \leq 0.6$.

3.2. Results

One uses the f_0 in Eq(5). Fit to MARK II data [21] for $\pi^+\pi^-$, and to CRYSTAL BALL [20] for $\pi^0\pi^0$ below 0.7Gev gives $F_\gamma \sim -0.08$

This corresponds to residues at the P1 pole $resc = (0.091, 0.116)$ for rescattering, $direct = (0.007, 0.031)$ for the direct contribution, $tot = (0.098, 0.151)$ for the total photon-photon width, which can be translated into (using full hadronic width=580.0 MeV) into partial widths $\Gamma\ resc= 2.805$, $\Gamma\ direct= 0.126$, $\Gamma\ tot= 4.0$ keV .

Stephan Narison will speak on consequences for the nature of the particles associated to the poles.

REFERENCES

1. G. Mennessier, S. Narison, W. Ochs, hep-ph.0804.4452; *Phys. Lett.* **B 665** (2008) 205.
2. G. Mennessier, P.Minkowski, S. Narison, W. Ochs, hep-ph.0707.4511.
3. D.H. Lyth, *Nucl. Phys.* **B30** (1971) 195.
4. F.J. Yndurain, *Nuov. Cim.* **7A** (1972) 687.
5. O. Babelon, J.L. Basdevant, D. Caillerie, M. Gourdin, G. Mennessier, *Nucl. Phys.* **B114** (1976) 252.
6. G. Mennessier, *Z. Phys.* **C 16** (1983) 241.
7. D. Morgan, M.R. Pennington *Z. Phys.* **C 37** (1988) 431.
8. M. Boglione and M.R. Pennington, *Eur.Phys.J.* **C9** (1999) 11.
9. M.R. Pennington, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**(2006) 011601.
10. N.N. Achasov and G.N. Shestakov, *Phys. Rev.* **D 77** (2008) 074020.
11. J.A. Oller, L. Roca, archiv:0804.0309 [hep-ph] (2008).
12. M.R. Pennington et al. , arXiv:0803.3389 [hep-ph] (2008).
13. F. Giacosa, T. Gutsche, V.E. Lyubovitskij, *Phys. Rev.* **D 77** (2008) 034007.
14. N.I. Muskhelishvili, "Singular integral equations", Amsterdam, North Holland 1958.
15. R. Omnes, *Nuov. Cim.* **8** (1958) 316.
16. F.J. Yndurain, R. Garcia-Martin, J.R. Pelaez, *Phys. Rev.* **D 76** (2007) 074034
17. O. Babelon, J.L. Basdevant, D. Caillerie, G. Mennessier, *Nucl. Phys.* **B113** (1976) 445.
18. I. Caprini, G. Colangelo, J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Phys. Rev.* **D68** 2003.074006.
19. R. Kaminski, J.R. Pelaez, F.J. Yndurain, *Phys. Rev.* **D 77** (2008) 054015.
20. H. Marsiske et al., Crystal Ball Collaboration, *Phys. Rev.* **D41** (1990).
21. J. Boyer et al., MARK II Collaboration, *Phys. Rev.* **D42** (1990) 1350.
22. J.A. Oller, L. Roca and C. Schat, *Phys. Lett.* **B 659** (2008) 201.