

Reply to “Comment about pion electroproduction and the axial form factors”

H. Haberzettl

Center for Nuclear Studies, Department of Physics, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. 20052
(8 March 2001)

It is shown that comments by Guichon [1], and also by Bernard, Kaiser, and Meißner [2], regarding my recent criticism [3] of how the axial form factor is supposed to enter pion electroproduction do not address the main point of my argument and therefore are irrelevant.

PACS numbers: 13.60.Le

[PRL]

In a comment, Guichon [1] criticizes my recent paper [3] which shows that one cannot measure the axial form factor in pion production measurements at threshold. The same criticism, albeit in a less civilized manner, but based on essentially the same argument, was also raised by Bernard, Kaiser, and Meißner [2]. I will show here that none of these criticisms does address the main point of my argument. I still maintain therefore, that the conclusions of [3] stand as stated.

Both arguments [1,2] concern the splitting of the axial current \hat{j}_A^μ into $\hat{j}_A^\mu = \hat{j}_{A,W}^\mu + \hat{j}_{A,H}^\mu$, where [3]

$$\hat{j}_{A,W}^\mu = -\gamma_5 \left[\gamma^\mu + (p' - p)^\mu \frac{2m}{t} \right] G_A \frac{\tau}{2}, \quad (1a)$$

$$\hat{j}_{A,H}^\mu = -f_\pi (p' - p)^\mu \frac{\mu^2}{t} \frac{1}{t - \mu^2} \gamma_5 G_t \tau \quad (1b)$$

separate the dependence on the axial form factor G_A and the πNN form factor G_t . The πNN form factor enters the expression for the axial current upon invoking the PCAC constraint and eliminating the pseudoscalar form factor G_P . The criticisms center now on the occurrence of the $1/t$ singularities in both of the terms of (1).

Clearly, this splitting, referred to as “strange” in Ref. [1], is without question algebraically valid, even if it creates seemingly artificial poles $1/t$ in both terms. Written differently,

$$\hat{j}_A^\mu = -\gamma_5 \gamma^\mu G_A \frac{\tau}{2} - f_\pi \frac{(p' - p)^\mu}{t - \mu^2} \gamma_5 G_t \tau + (p' - p)^\mu \gamma_5 \frac{f_\pi G_t - m G_A}{t} \tau, \quad (2)$$

these singularities for $t = 0$ are recast in the well-defined $\frac{0}{0}$ situation contained in the last term in view of the validity of the Goldberger–Treiman relation.

This splitting clearly shows that in the chiral limit of vanishing pion mass, the hadronic part of the axial current, Eq. (1b), vanishes. The $1/t$ pole of the remaining weak part, Eq. (1a), now cannot be cancelled any longer and thus becomes physically relevant in the chiral limit. Furthermore, this splitting allows for a most detailed description of how the electromagnetic (vector) current couples to the axial current, as given in Eq. (14) and as depicted in Fig. 3, both of Ref. [3]. I presume that

this is what is referred to as the “trap in the reasoning” [1]. There is, however, nothing wrong with this procedure. As mentioned in my paper, it can be shown quite directly by employing Green’s function techniques that since the splitting $\hat{j}_A = \hat{j}_{A,W} + \hat{j}_{A,H}$ is valid, the coupling to the electromagnetic current does indeed produce Eq. (14). For this result to obtain, it is irrelevant whether one uses Eq. (1) here or the nonsingular form (2). The advantage of the former, in my opinion, is simply that it allows for a more straightforward graphical interpretation (see Fig. 3 of [3]). The subsequent steps in [3] leading to Eq. (19) and finally to Eq. (23) are purely algebraic. In particular, they show that the complete cancellation of the G_A dependence obtains *before* the $q = 0$ limit is taken. The fact that \mathcal{W} [of Eq. (20)] vanishes even if the nucleon has structure (which I don’t dispute and which I didn’t discuss in my Letter for lack of space) is irrelevant in this context. What is relevant is the statement after Eq. (23) that “on the right-hand side the dependence on G_A cancels completely even before the limit is taken”. This crucial statement can very easily be verified by direct evaluation of the expression in the square brackets on the right-hand side of Eq. (23) along the lines given in my Letter. If the author of Ref. [1] believes that this evaluation is in error, he should be able to point out precisely which of the steps outlined in detail in my paper is in error. The splitting discussed above clearly is not at issue in this respect.

The arguments of Ref. [2] are based on arbitrarily demanding that the factor μ^2/t in Eq. (1b) above should be replaced by unity. This would essentially drop part of the last term in Eq. (2) containing the $\frac{0}{0}$ situation and would indeed lead to the result desired by these authors. There is, however, nothing which justifies this arbitrary replacement and this argument evidently is in error. The conclusions of my paper, therefore, stand as stated.

[1] P. A. M. Guichon, hep-ph/0012126.

[2] V. Bernard, N. Kaiser, and Ulf-G. Meißner, hep-ph/0101062.

[3] H. Haberzettl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3576 (2000).