



Phenomenological Schwinger-Dyson approach to η - η' mass matrix ^{*}

D. Kekez^a and D. Klabučar^b

^aRudjer Bošković Institute, P.O.B. 180, 10002 Zagreb, Croatia

^bPhysics Department, Faculty of Science, Zagreb University

Abstract. It is reviewed pedagogically how a very successful description of the η - η' mass matrix can be achieved in the consistently coupled Schwinger-Dyson and Bethe-Salpeter approach in spite of the limitations of the ladder approximation. This description is in agreement with both phenomenology and lattice results.

The Schwinger-Dyson and Bethe-Salpeter (SD-BS) approach is the bound-state approach that is chirally well-behaved. (For example, see Ref. [1, 2, 3] for recent reviews, and references therein for various phenomenological and other applications of SD-BS approach.) Therefore, among the bound-state approaches it is probably the most suitable one to treat the light pseudoscalar mesons. One solves the Schwinger-Dyson (SD) equation for dressed propagators of the light u , d and s quarks using a phenomenologically successful interaction. These light-quark propagators are then employed in consistent solving of Bethe-Salpeter (BS) equations for various quark-antiquark ($q\bar{q}$) relativistic bound states. Namely, in both SD and BS equations we employ the same, ladder approximation, and the same interaction due to an effective, *dressed* gluon exchange. In the chiral limit (and close to it), light pseudoscalar (P) meson $q\bar{q}$ bound states ($P = \pi^{0,\pm}, K^{0,\pm}, \eta$) then **simultaneously** manifest themselves also as (*quasi*-)Goldstone bosons of dynamically broken chiral symmetry. This resolves the dichotomy “ $q\bar{q}$ bound state *vs.* Goldstone boson”, enabling one to work with the mesons as explicit $q\bar{q}$ bound states (for example, in Refs. [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]) while reproducing (even analytically, in the chiral limit) the famous results of the axial anomaly for the light pseudoscalar mesons, namely the amplitudes for $P \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $\gamma^* \rightarrow P^0 P^+ P^-$ [12]. This is unique among the bound state approaches – for example, see Refs. [1, 6, 12] and references therein. Nevertheless, one keeps the advantage of bound state approaches that from the $q\bar{q}$ substructure one can calculate many important quantities (such as the pion decay constant f_π) which are just parameters in most of other chiral approaches to the light-quark sector. The description [5, 8, 9, 10] of η - η' complex is especially noteworthy, as it is very successful in spite of the limitations of the SD-BS approach in the ladder approximation.

For the description of η and η' , the crucial issues are the meson mixing and construction of physical meson states. They are formulated in Refs. [5, 8, 9] for

^{*} Talk delivered by D. Klabučar.

the SD-BS approach, where solving of appropriate BS equations yields the eigenvalues of the squared masses, $M_{u\bar{u}}^2, M_{d\bar{d}}^2, M_{s\bar{s}}^2$ and $M_{u\bar{s}}^2$, of the respective quark-antiquark bound states $|u\bar{u}\rangle, |d\bar{d}\rangle, |s\bar{s}\rangle$ and $|u\bar{s}\rangle$. The last one is simply the kaon, and $M_{u\bar{s}}$ is its mass M_K . Nevertheless, the first three do not correspond to any physical pseudoscalar mesons. Thus, $M_{u\bar{u}}^2, M_{d\bar{d}}^2, M_{s\bar{s}}^2$ do not automatically represent any physical masses, although the mass matrix (actually, to be precise, the non-anomalous part of the mass matrix) is simply $\hat{M}_{NA}^2 = \text{diag}(M_{u\bar{u}}^2, M_{d\bar{d}}^2, M_{s\bar{s}}^2)$ in the basis $|q\bar{q}\rangle, (q = u, d, s)$. However, the flavor SU(3) quark model leads one to recouple these states into the familiar octet-singlet basis of the zero-charge subspace of the light unflavored pseudoscalar mesons:

$$|\pi^0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|u\bar{u}\rangle - |d\bar{d}\rangle), \quad (1)$$

$$|\eta_8\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|u\bar{u}\rangle + |d\bar{d}\rangle - 2|s\bar{s}\rangle), \quad (2)$$

$$|\eta_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|u\bar{u}\rangle + |d\bar{d}\rangle + |s\bar{s}\rangle). \quad (3)$$

With $|u\bar{u}\rangle$ and $|d\bar{d}\rangle$ being practically chiral states as opposed to a significantly heavier $|s\bar{s}\rangle$, Eqs. (1–3) do not define the octet and singlet states of the exact SU(3) flavor symmetry, but the *effective* octet and singlet states. However, as pointed out by Gilman and Kauffman [13] (following Chanowitz, their Ref. [8]), in spite of this flavor symmetry breaking by the s quark, these equations still implicitly assume nonet symmetry in the sense that the same states $|q\bar{q}\rangle$ ($q = u, d, s$) appear in both the octet member η_8 (2) and the singlet η_0 (3). Nevertheless, in order to avoid the $U_A(1)$ problem, this symmetry must ultimately be broken by gluon anomaly at least at the level of the masses of pseudoscalar mesons.

In the basis (1–3), the non-anomalous part of the (squared-)mass matrix of π^0 and etas is

$$\hat{M}_{NA}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_\pi^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & M_{88}^2 & M_{80}^2 \\ 0 & M_{08}^2 & M_{00}^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

The η_8 “mass” $M_{88} \equiv M_{\eta_8}$ can be related to the kaon mass through the Gell-Mann–Okubo (GMO) relation, although the kaon does not appear in this scheme as it obviously cannot mix with π^0 and etas, since it is strangely flavored. Equation (4) shows that also the isospin $I = 1$ state π^0 decouples from any mixing with the $I = 0$ states η_8 and η_0 , thanks to our working in the isospin limit throughout. Therefore, we are concerned only with the diagonalization of the 2×2 submatrix in the subspace of etas in order to find their physical masses and corresponding $q\bar{q}$ content. In the isospin limit, obviously $M_{u\bar{u}} = M_{d\bar{d}}$, which we then can strictly identify with our model π^0 mass M_π . Since in this model we can also calculate $M_{s\bar{s}}^2 = \langle s\bar{s} | \hat{M}_{NA}^2 | s\bar{s} \rangle$, this gives us our calculated entries in the mass matrix:

$$M_{88}^2 \equiv \langle \eta_8 | \hat{M}_{NA}^2 | \eta_8 \rangle \equiv M_{\eta_8}^2 = \frac{2}{3}(M_{s\bar{s}}^2 + \frac{1}{2}M_\pi^2), \quad (5)$$

$$M_{80}^2 \equiv \langle \eta_8 | \hat{M}_{NA}^2 | \eta_0 \rangle = M_{08}^2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3}(M_\pi^2 - M_{s\bar{s}}^2), \quad (6)$$

$$M_{00}^2 \equiv \langle \eta_0 | \hat{M}_{NA}^2 | \eta_0 \rangle = \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{1}{2} M_{s\bar{s}}^2 + M_\pi^2 \right). \quad (7)$$

The last one, M_{00} , is the *non-anomalous part* of the η_0 “mass” M_{η_0} . Namely, all the model masses $M_{q\bar{q}'}$ ($q, q' = u, d, s$) and corresponding $q\bar{q}'$ bound state amplitudes are obtained in the ladder approximation, and thus (irrespective of what the concrete model could be) with an interaction kernel which cannot possibly capture the effects of gluon anomaly. Fortunately, the large N_c expansion indicates that the leading approximation in that expansion describes the bulk of main features of QCD. The gluon anomaly is suppressed as $1/N_c$ and is viewed as a perturbation in the large N_c expansion. It is coupled *only* to the singlet combination η_0 (3); only the η_0 mass receives, from the gluon anomaly, a contribution which, unlike quasi-Goldstone masses $M_{q\bar{q}'}$ ’s comprising \hat{M}_{NA}^2 , does *not* vanish in the chiral limit. As discussed in detail in Sec. V of Ref. [5], in the present bound-state context it is thus best to adopt the standard way (see, e.g., Refs. [14, 15]) to *parameterize* the anomaly effect. We thus break the $U_A(1)$ symmetry, and avoid the $U_A(1)$ problem, by shifting the η_0 (squared) mass by an amount denoted by 3β (in the notation of Refs. [8, 9]). The complete mass matrix is then $\hat{M}^2 = \hat{M}_{NA}^2 + \hat{M}_A^2$, where

$$\hat{M}_A^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 3\beta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

and where the value of the anomalous η_0 mass shift 3β is related to the topological susceptibility of the vacuum, but in the present approach must be treated as a parameter to be determined outside of our bound-state model, i.e., fixed by phenomenology or taken from the lattice calculations [16].

We could now go straight to the nonstrange-strange (NS-S) basis, but before doing this, it may be instructive to rewrite for a moment the matrix (8) in the flavor, $|q\bar{q}\rangle$ basis, where

$$\hat{M}_A^2 = \beta \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

since for some readers it may be the best place to introduce the effect of flavor symmetry breaking. Namely, Eq. (9) tells us that due to the gluon anomaly, there are transitions $|q\bar{q}\rangle \rightarrow |q'\bar{q}'\rangle$; $q, q' = u, d, s$. However, the amplitudes for the transition from, and into, light $u\bar{u}$ and $d\bar{d}$ pairs need not be the same as those for the significantly more massive $s\bar{s}$. The modification of the anomalous mass matrix (9) which allows for possible effects of the breaking of the SU(3) flavor symmetry is then

$$\hat{M}_A^2 = \beta \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & X \\ 1 & 1 & X \\ X & X & X^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

There are arguments [8, 9], supported by phenomenology, that the transition suppression is estimated well by the nonstrange-to-strange ratio of respective constituent masses, $X \approx \mathcal{M}_u/\mathcal{M}_s$, or, as commented below, of respective decay constants, $X \approx f_\pi/f_{s\bar{s}}$.

After adding the anomalous contribution (8) to Eq. (4), pion still remains decoupled and we obviously still can restrict ourselves to 2×2 submatrix in the subspace of etas. However, when dealing with quark degrees of freedom when the symmetry between the nonstrange (NS) and strange (S) sectors is broken as described above, the most suitable basis for that subspace is the so-called NS - S basis:

$$|\eta_{NS}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|u\bar{u}\rangle + |d\bar{d}\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\eta_8\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|\eta_0\rangle, \quad (11)$$

$$|\eta_S\rangle = |s\bar{s}\rangle = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|\eta_8\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\eta_0\rangle. \quad (12)$$

The η - η' mass matrix in this basis is

$$\hat{M}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_{\eta_{NS}}^2 & M_{\eta_S \eta_{NS}}^2 \\ M_{\eta_{NS} \eta_S}^2 & M_{\eta_S}^2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{u\bar{u}}^2 + 2\beta & \sqrt{2}\beta X \\ \sqrt{2}\beta X & M_{s\bar{s}}^2 + \beta X^2 \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\Phi} \begin{pmatrix} M_{\eta}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & M_{\eta'}^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where the indicated diagonalization is given by the NS - S mixing relations¹

$$|\eta\rangle = \cos \phi |\eta_{NS}\rangle - \sin \phi |\eta_S\rangle, \quad |\eta'\rangle = \sin \phi |\eta_{NS}\rangle + \cos \phi |\eta_S\rangle, \quad (14)$$

rotating η_{NS}, η_S to the mass eigenstates η, η' . Now the NS - S mass matrix (13) tells us that due to the gluon anomaly, there are transitions $|\eta_{NS}\rangle \leftrightarrow |\eta_S\rangle$. However, the amplitude for the transition from, and into, η_{NS} , need not be the same as those for the more massive η_S . The role of the flavor-symmetry-breaking factor X is to allow for that possibility. As remarked little earlier, there are arguments [8, 9], supported by phenomenology, that the transition suppression is estimated well by the nonstrange-to-strange ratio of respective quark constituent masses, \mathcal{M}_u and \mathcal{M}_s . Due to the Goldberger-Treiman relation, this ratio is essentially equal [5, 8, 9] to the ratio of η_{NS} and η_S pseudoscalar decay constants $f_{\eta_{NS}} = f_{\pi}$ and $f_{\eta_S} = f_{s\bar{s}}$ which are calculable in the SD-BS approach. Same as \mathcal{M}_u and \mathcal{M}_s , they were found in our earlier papers, especially [5, 8, 9]. In other words, we can estimate the flavor-symmetry-breaking suppression factor as $X \approx \mathcal{M}_u/\mathcal{M}_s$, or equivalently, as $X \approx f_{\pi}/f_{s\bar{s}}$. Our model results $\mathcal{M}_u/\mathcal{M}_s = 0.622$ and $f_{\pi}/f_{s\bar{s}} = 0.689$ are in both cases reasonably close to $X_{\text{exp}} \approx 0.78$ extracted phenomenologically [8, 9] from the *empirical* mass matrix \hat{m}_{exp}^2 featuring experimental pion and kaon masses, or, after diagonalization, η and η' masses – see Eq. (7) in Ref. [9]. (In our model calculations below, we use $X = f_{\pi}/f_{s\bar{s}} = 0.689$ to show the robustness of our approach to slight variations. Namely, our earlier works [8, 9, 17] mostly presented results based on slightly different values of X obtained with the help of ratios of $\gamma\gamma$ amplitudes, which is yet another, but again related way of obtaining X .)

In our present notation, capital M_a 's denote the calculated, model pseudoscalar masses, whereas lowercase m_a 's denote the corresponding empirical

¹ The effective-singlet-octet mixing angle θ , defined by analogous relations where $\eta_{NS} \rightarrow \eta_8, \eta_S \rightarrow \eta_0, \phi \rightarrow \theta$, is related to the NS - S mixing angle ϕ as $\theta = \phi - \arctan \sqrt{2} = \phi - 54.74^\circ$. The relation between our approach and the two-mixing-angle scheme is clarified in the Appendix of Ref. [8].

masses. The empirical mass matrix \hat{m}_{exp}^2 can be obtained from the calculated, model one in Eq. (13) by *i*) obvious substitutions $M_{u\bar{u}} \equiv M_\pi \rightarrow m_\pi$ and $M_{s\bar{s}} \rightarrow m_{s\bar{s}}$, and *ii*) by noting that $m_{s\bar{s}}$, the ‘‘empirical’’ mass of the unphysical $s\bar{s}$ pseudoscalar bound state, is given in terms of masses of physical particles as $m_{s\bar{s}}^2 = 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$ due to the Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner (GMOR) relation. Since $M_{u\bar{u}}$, obtained by solving the BS equation, is identical to our model pion mass M_π , it was fitted to the empirical pion mass m_π , *e.g.*, in Ref. [8]. Similarly, $M_{u\bar{s}} \equiv M_K$ is fitted to the empirical kaon mass m_K . Therefore we also have $M_{s\bar{s}}^2 \approx 2m_K^2 - m_\pi^2$, since our model has good chiral behavior and also satisfies the GMOR relation, thanks to which we have $M_{s\bar{s}}^2 = 2M_K^2 - M_\pi^2$ in a very good approximation. We thus see that in our model mass matrix, the parts stemming from its *non-anomalous* part \hat{M}_{NA}^2 (4) are already close to the corresponding parts in \hat{m}_{exp}^2 . We can thus expect a good overall description of the masses in η and η' complex. We now proceed to verify this expectation.

The *anomalous* entry β is fixed phenomenologically to be $\beta_{\text{exp}} \approx 0.28 \text{ GeV}^2$, along with $\chi_{\text{exp}} \approx 0.78$, by requiring that trace and determinant of \hat{m}_{exp}^2 have their experimental values. But, this can be done also with our calculated, model mass matrix \hat{M}^2 . Requiring that the empirical value of the trace $m_\eta^2 + m_{\eta'}^2 \approx 1.22 \text{ GeV}^2$ be fixed by Eq. (13), yields

$$\beta = \frac{1}{2 + \chi^2} [(m_\eta^2 + m_{\eta'}^2)_{\text{exp}} - (M_{u\bar{u}}^2 + M_{s\bar{s}}^2)] \quad (15)$$

where $\chi = f_\pi/f_{s\bar{s}} = 0.689$ and $M_{u\bar{u}} = 0.1373 \text{ GeV}$ and $M_{s\bar{s}} = 0.7007 \text{ GeV}$ are now our model-calculated [8] quantities, giving us $\beta = 0.286 \text{ GeV}^2$. Since $(M_{u\bar{u}}^2 + M_{s\bar{s}}^2) = 2m_K^2$ holds to a very good approximation, our approach satisfies well the first equality (from the matrix trace) in

$$2\beta + \beta\chi^2 = m_\eta^2 + m_{\eta'}^2 - 2m_K^2 = \frac{2N_f}{f_\pi^2} \chi, \quad (16)$$

where the second equality is the Witten-Veneziano (WV) formula [18], with χ being the topological susceptibility of the pure Yang-Mills gauge theory. Our model values of χ and β (f_π is fitted to its experimental value) thus imply $\chi = (178 \text{ MeV})^4$, in excellent agreement with the lattice result $\chi = (175 \pm 5 \text{ MeV})^4$ of Alles *et al.* [16].

The mixing angle is then determined to be $\phi = 43.2^\circ$ (or equivalently, $\theta = -11.5^\circ$), for example through the relation

$$\tan 2\phi = \frac{2\sqrt{2}\beta\chi}{M_{\eta_s}^2 - M_{\eta_{NS}}^2}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$M_{\eta_{NS}}^2 = M_{u\bar{u}}^2 + 2\beta = M_\pi^2 + 2\beta = 0.592 \text{ GeV}^2 = (769 \text{ MeV})^2 \quad (18)$$

and

$$M_{\eta_s}^2 = M_{s\bar{s}}^2 + \beta\chi^2 = 0.627 \text{ GeV}^2 = (792 \text{ MeV})^2 \quad (19)$$

are our *calculated* η_{NS} and η_S masses. They have reasonable values, in a good agreement with, *e.g.*, η_{NS} and η_S masses calculated in the dynamical SU(3) linear σ model [17].

The diagonalization of the NS-S mass matrix gives us the η and η' masses:

$$M_{\eta}^2 = \cos^2 \phi M_{\eta_{NS}}^2 - \sqrt{2}\beta X \sin 2\phi + \sin^2 \phi M_{\eta_S}^2 \quad (20)$$

$$M_{\eta'}^2 = \sin^2 \phi M_{\eta_{NS}}^2 + \sqrt{2}\beta X \sin 2\phi + \cos^2 \phi M_{\eta_S}^2 . \quad (21)$$

Plugging in the above predictions for β , X , $M_{\eta_{NS}}$ and M_{η_S} , our model η and η' masses then turn out to be $M_{\eta} = 575$ MeV and $M_{\eta'} = 943$ MeV. This is in good agreement with the respective empirical values of 547 MeV and 958 MeV.

However, the above is not all that can be said about agreement with experiment and other approaches. The second thing we may point out is the reasonable agreement we find if we insert our values of β , X and $M_{q\bar{q}}$'s into our model mass matrix and compare it with the η - η' mass matrix obtained on lattice by UKQCD collaboration [19].

Third, Ref. [8] clearly shows that our approach and results are not in conflict, but in fact agree very well with results in the two-mixing-angle scheme (reviewed and discussed in, *e.g.*, Ref. [20]). Actually, our results can also be given [8,21] in the two-mixing-angle scheme.

Fourth, what we found from the mass matrix is consistent with what we found in the same SD-BS approach through another route, *i.e.* from $\eta, \eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ processes [5,8,9,10].

The above shows that the consistently coupled SD-BS approach provides a surprisingly satisfactory description of the η - η' complex, especially if one recalls that β , parameterizing the anomalous η_0 mass shift, was the only new parameter. Namely, all other model parameters were fixed already by Ref. [22] providing the model we used in Refs. [4,5,6,7,8,9,10]. Nevertheless, we would like to point out that even this one parameter, β , can be fixed beforehand. Instead of being a parameter, β can be obtained through WV formula (16) from the lattice results on the topological susceptibility χ . The central value of widely accepted $\chi = (175 \pm 5 \text{ MeV})^4$ [16] would lead to β less than 7% below our model value, which is within upper error bar anyway. Thus, we can eliminate β as a free parameter and still achieve almost as satisfactory description as the one given above.

Acknowledgment: D. Klabučar thanks the organizers, M. Rosina, B. Golli and S. Širca, for their hospitality and for the partial support which made possible his participation at Mini-Workshop Bled 2002.

References

1. C. D. Roberts, arXiv:nucl-th/0007054.
2. R. Alkofer and L. von Smekal, Phys. Rept. **353** (2001) 281 [arXiv:hep-ph/0007355].
3. C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45** (2000) S1 [arXiv:nucl-th/0005064].
4. D. Kekez and D. Klabučar, Phys. Lett. B **387** (1996) 14 [arXiv:hep-ph/9605219].
5. D. Klabučar and D. Kekez, Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998) 096003 [arXiv:hep-ph/9710206].

6. D. Kekez, B. Bistrovic and D. Klabučar, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **14** (1999) 161 [arXiv:hep-ph/9809245].
7. D. Kekez and D. Klabučar, *Phys. Lett. B* **457** (1999) 359 [arXiv:hep-ph/9812495]. See also D. Klabučar and D. Kekez, arXiv:hep-ph/9905251, hep-ph/9907537, hep-ph/9909273.
8. D. Kekez, D. Klabučar and M. D. Scadron, *J. Phys. G* **26** (2000) 1335 [arXiv:hep-ph/0003234].
9. D. Klabučar, D. Kekez and M. D. Scadron, arXiv:hep-ph/0012267; published in "Rostock 2000/Trento 2001, Exploring quark matter," p. 145.
10. D. Kekez and D. Klabučar, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2002) 057901 [arXiv:hep-ph/0110019].
11. B. Bistrovic and D. Klabučar, *Phys. Lett. B* **478**, 127 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9912452]. (For completeness, see also B. Bistrovic and D. Klabučar, *Phys. Rev. D* **61** (2000) 033006 [arXiv:hep-ph/9907515].)
12. R. Alkofer and C. D. Roberts, *Phys. Lett. B* **369** (1996) 101 [arXiv:hep-ph/9510284], and references therein.
13. F. J. Gilman and R. Kauffman, *Phys. Rev. D* **36** (1987) 2761 [Erratum-ibid. *D* **37** (1988) 3348].
14. V. A. Miransky, "Dynamical Symmetry Breaking In Quantum Field Theories," *World Scientific Publishing Co., Singapore* (1993).
15. J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich and B. R. Holstein, "Dynamics Of The Standard Model," Cambridge Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol. **2** (1992) 1.
16. B. Alles, M. D'Elia and A. Di Giacomo, *Nucl. Phys. B* **494** (1997) 281 [arXiv:hep-lat/9605013].
17. D. Kekez, D. Klabučar, and M. D. Scadron, *J. Phys. G* **27** (2001) 1775 [arXiv:hep-ph/0101324].
18. E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys. B* **156** (1979) 269;
G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys. B* **159** (1979) 213.
19. C. McNeile and C. Michael [UKQCD Collaboration], *Phys. Lett. B* **491** (2000) 123 [arXiv:hep-lat/0006020].
20. Th. Feldmann, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **15** (2000) 159.
21. D. Klabučar and D. Kekez, "Schwinger-Dyson approach to light pseudoscalars," arXiv:hep-ph/0212290, to appear in *Few Body Systems Suppl.*, editors R. Krivec, B. Golli, M. Rosina, S. Širca, *Proceedings of the XVIII European Conference on Few-Body Problems in Physics*, 7–14 September 2002, Bled, Slovenia.
22. P. Jain and H. J. Munczek, *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) 5403.