

Nucleon form factors and $O(a)$ Improvement*

S. Capitani^a, M. Göckeler^b, R. Horsley^c, B. Klaus^d, H. Oelrich^e, H. Perlt^f, D. Petters^{d,e},
D. Pleiter^{d,e}, P. E. L. Rakow^b, G. Schierholz^{a,e}, A. Schiller^f and P. Stephenson^g

^aDeutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, D-22603 Hamburg, Germany

^bInstitut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg, Germany

^cInstitut für Physik, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, D-10115 Berlin, Germany

^dInstitut für Theoretische Physik, Freie Universität Berlin, D-14195 Berlin, Germany

^eDeutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY and NIC, D-15735 Zeuthen, Germany

^fInstitut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Leipzig, D-04109 Leipzig, Germany

^gDipartimento di Fisica, Università degli Studi di Pisa e INFN, Sezione di Pisa, 56100 Pisa, Italy

Nucleon form factors have been extensively studied both experimentally and theoretically for many years. We report here on new results of a high statistics quenched lattice QCD calculation of vector and axial-vector nucleon form factors at low momentum transfer within the Symanzik improvement programme. The simulations are performed at three κ and three β values allowing first an extrapolation to the chiral limit and then an extrapolation in the lattice spacing to the continuum limit. The computations are all fully non-perturbative. A comparison with experimental results is made.

1. INTRODUCTION

For many years experiments have been performed with electron-nucleon scattering to obtain information about the structure of the nucleon. Form factors are defined from the general decomposition of the proton, p (or neutron, n) matrix element¹ ($q = p - p'$):

$$\langle \vec{p}, \vec{s} | \widehat{\mathcal{V}}_{\mu}^{\frac{2}{3}u - \frac{1}{3}d}(\vec{q}) | \vec{p}', \vec{s}' \rangle = \bar{u}(\vec{p}, \vec{s}) \left[\gamma_{\mu} F_1^p + \sigma_{\mu\nu} \frac{q_{\nu}}{2m} F_2^p \right] u(\vec{p}', \vec{s}').$$

We have $F_1(0) = 1$ as \mathcal{V} is a conserved current, while $F_2(0) = \mu - 1$ measures the anomalous magnetic moment (in magnetons). Usually we define the Sachs form factors:

$$G_e(-q^2) = F_1(-q^2) + \frac{-q^2}{(2m)^2} F_2(-q^2),$$

$$G_m(-q^2) = F_1(-q^2) + F_2(-q^2).$$

*Talk given by R. Horsley at Lat98, Boulder, U.S.A.

¹We have already re-written everything in euclidean space, so that eg $p = (iE_p, \vec{p})$ and $-q^2 \equiv q^{(\mathcal{M})2} > 0$.

Experiments lead to phenomenological dipole fits:

$$G_e^p(-q^2) \sim \frac{G_m^p(-q^2)}{\mu^p} \sim \frac{G_m^n(-q^2)}{\mu^n}$$

$$= 1 / \left(1 + (-q^2/m_V^2) \right)^2,$$

$$G_e^n(-q^2) \sim 0,$$

with $m_V \sim 0.82$ GeV, $\mu^p \sim 2.79$, $\mu^n \sim -1.91$.

Neutrino-neutron scattering, $n\nu_{\mu} \rightarrow p\mu^{-}$, gives from the charged weak current the axial form factor $g_A(-q^2)$. In addition $g_A(0)$ is also accurately obtained from β -decay, $n \rightarrow pe^{-}\bar{\nu}$. Upon using current algebra this form factor can be related to the matrix element:

$$\langle \vec{p}, \vec{s} | \widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{\mu}^{u-d}(\vec{q}) | \vec{p}', \vec{s}' \rangle = \bar{u}(\vec{p}, \vec{s}) \left[\gamma_{\mu} \gamma_5 g_A + i\gamma_5 \frac{q_{\mu}}{2m} h_A \right] u(\vec{p}', \vec{s}').$$

The phenomenological fits are:

$$g_A(q^2) = g_A(0) / \left(1 + (-q^2/m_A^2) \right)^2,$$

with $g_A(0) = 1.26$, $m_A \sim 1.00$ GeV.

2. THE LATTICE METHOD

Quenched configurations have been generated at $\beta = 6.0$ ($O(500)$, $16^3 \times 32$ lattice) $\beta = 6.2$ ($O(300)$, $24^3 \times 48$ lattice) and $\beta = 6.4$ ($O(100)$, $32^3 \times 48$ lattice), [1]. By forming the ratio of three-to-two point functions, [2]:

$$R_{\alpha\beta}(t, \tau; \vec{p}, \vec{q}) = \frac{\langle N_\alpha(t; \vec{p}) \mathcal{O}(\tau; \vec{q}) \bar{N}_\beta(0; \vec{p}') \rangle}{\langle N(t; \vec{p}) \bar{N}(0; \vec{p}') \rangle} \times \left[\frac{\langle N(\tau; \vec{p}) \bar{N}(0; \vec{p}') \rangle \langle N(t; \vec{p}) \bar{N}(0; \vec{p}') \rangle \langle N(t-\tau; \vec{p}') \bar{N}(0; \vec{p}') \rangle}{\langle N(\tau; \vec{p}') \bar{N}(0; \vec{p}') \rangle \langle N(t; \vec{p}') \bar{N}(0; \vec{p}') \rangle \langle N(t-\tau; \vec{p}') \bar{N}(0; \vec{p}') \rangle} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \propto \langle N_\alpha(\vec{p}) | \hat{\mathcal{O}}(\vec{q}) | N_\beta(\vec{p}') \rangle,$$

the appropriate matrix elements can be found. (Only the quark line connected part of the 3-point function is considered.) For each β we chose three κ values and a variety of 3-momenta: $\vec{p} = 2\pi/N_s \{ (0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0) \}$, $\vec{q} = 2\pi/N_s \{ (0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 2, 0), (1, 0, 0), (2, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1), (0, 0, 1) \}$ together with the nucleon either unpolarised or polarised in the y direction. (Some combinations were too noisy to be used though.) After sorting the matrix elements into q^2 classes (defined by q^2 in the chiral limit), 4-parameter fits are made assuming that the form factors are linear in the bare quark mass am_q . $O(a)$ improved Symanzik operators are used:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_\mu^R &= Z_V(1 + b_V am_q) \times \\ &\quad [\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \psi + \frac{1}{2} ic_V a \partial_\lambda (\bar{\psi} \sigma_{\mu\lambda} \psi)], \\ \mathcal{A}_\mu^R &= Z_A(1 + b_A am_q) \times \\ &\quad [\bar{\psi} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi + \frac{1}{2} c_A a \partial_\mu (\bar{\psi} \gamma_5 \psi)], \end{aligned}$$

where Z_V , Z_A , b_V , c_V , c_A (and c_{sw}) have been non-perturbatively calculated by the Alpha collaboration, [3]. All matrix elements thus are correct to $O(a^2)$. We can check Z_V as \mathcal{V}_μ is a conserved current (ie $F_1(0) = 1$). In Fig. 1 we show a comparison of the two determinations of Z_V . Very good agreement is seen. This is not the case when Wilson fermions are used (see ref. [5]). Finally we note that although we have included the improvement terms in our operators, numerically they seem to have little influence on the value of the matrix element.




Figure 1. Z_V for improved fermions. Shown is the lowest order perturbation result together with a tadpole-improved version (as given in [4]). The non-perturbative determinations are shown as open circles, [3], and filled squares, this work.




Figure 2. The proton form-factors $G_e^p(-q^2)$ and $G_m^p(-q^2)$ against $-q^2$ showing experimental results (open circles, taken from ref. [6]) and lattice results (filled circles, $\beta = 6.2$ only). The string tension is used to fix the scale as in [4]. All fits are dipole fits.

3. RESULTS

In Fig. 2 we show $G_e^p(-q^2)$ and $G_m^p(-q^2)$ for $\beta = 6.2$ together with experimental results (also plotting the other β values tends to clutter the picture). Making dipole fits gives Fig. 3 for the continuum extrapolation. There seems to be little inclination for m_V to approach the experimental result. (A roughly similar result is obtained from G_m^p , although due to larger error bars the results are more compatible.)

For the axial current we find the results in Figs. 4, 5. The form factor fall-off is again too




Figure 3. m_V from $\beta = 6.0, 6.2, 6.4$ against a^2 . The phenomenological value is also given at $a^2 = 0$.




Figure 4. $g_A(-q^2)$ against $-q^2$, notation as in Fig. 2.

soft as m_A is too large. However the important $g_A(0)$ is faring better, see Fig. 6.

4. CONCLUSIONS

We have performed simulations at three β values so that an attempt can be made to take the continuum extrapolation, $a \rightarrow 0$. While the lattice dipole masses seem to be too large, $g_A(0)$ is in reasonable agreement with the experimental result. The mass discrepancies may be due to a quenching effect, although only similar simulations using dynamical fermions will be able to answer this.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The numerical calculations were performed on the Ape *QH2* at DESY-Zeuthen and the Cray *T3E* at ZIB, Berlin. Financial support from the DFG is also gratefully acknowledged.




Figure 5. The continuum extrapolation of m_A .




Figure 6. The continuum extrapolation of $g_A(0)$.

REFERENCES

1. D. Pleiter, this conference.
2. G. Martinelli et al., Nucl. Phys. B316 (1989) 355; W. Wilcox et al., Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 1109, hep-lat/9205015; K. F. Liu et al., Phys. Rev. D49 (1994) 4755, hep-lat/9305025.
3. M. Lüscher et al., Nucl. Phys. B491 (1997) 323, hep-lat/9609035; Nucl. Phys. B491 (1997) 344, hep-lat/9611015; M. Guagnelli et al., Nucl. Phys. (Proc Suppl) 63 (1998) 886, hep-lat/9709088.
4. M. Göckeler et al., Phys. Rev. D57 (1998) 5562, hep-lat/9707021.
5. S. Capitani et al., 31st Ahrenschoop Symposium, Buckow, Germany (Wiley-VCH 1998), hep-lat/9801034.
6. C. V. Christov et al., Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. 37 (1996), hep-ph/9604441.