

Comment on the Burkhardt – Cottingham and Generalized Gerasimov–Drell–Hearn Sum Rules for the neutron

J. Soffer

*Centre de Physique Théorique - CNRS - Luminy,
Case 907 F-13288 Marseille Cedex 9 - France*¹

and

O.V. Teryaev

*Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna
Head Post Office, P.O. Box 79, 101000 Moscow, Russia*²

Abstract

A description of the generalized Gerasimov–Drell–Hearn sum rule for neutron is suggested, using its relation to the Burkhardt–Cottingham sum rule.

PACS numbers: 11.50.Li, 13.60.Fz, 13.88.+e

¹E-mail: soffer@frcpn11.in2p3.fr

²E-mail: teryaev@thsun1.jinr.dubna.su

The generalized Gerasimov-Drell-Hearn (GDH) sum rule [1, 2] is just being tested experimentally [3] and the proton data are in the good agreement with our prediction [4, 5], making use of its relation to the Burkhardt-Cottingham sum rule. They also agree with a new estimate of the contributions from low-lying resonances [6]. We should stress, that such a similarity is by no means surprising, since the dominant magnetic form factor of $\Delta(1232)$ is contributing entirely through the structure function g_2 [5], which is the key ingredient of our approach. Given the fact that the experimental data [3] are also available for a neutron target (although with a poor accuracy), we present here the quantitative prediction for the neutron case.

Let us consider the Q^2 -dependent integral

$$I_1(Q^2) = \frac{2M^2}{Q^2} \int_0^1 g_1(x, Q^2) dx. \quad (1)$$

It is defined for *all* Q^2 , and g_1 is the obvious generalization for all Q^2 of the standard scale-invariant $g_1(x)$. Note that the elastic contribution at $x = 1$ is not included in the above sum rule. One recovers then at $Q^2 = 0$ the GDH sum rule

$$I_1(0) = -\frac{\mu_A^2}{4}, \quad (2)$$

where μ_A is the nucleon anomalous magnetic moment in nuclear magnetons. While the $I_1(0)$ is always negative, its value at large Q^2 is determined by the Q^2 -independent integral $\int_0^1 g_1(x) dx$, which is positive for proton and negative for neutron.

It is possible to decompose I_1 as the difference of the contributions from two form factors I_{1+2} and I_2

$$I_1 = I_{1+2} - I_2, \quad (3)$$

where

$$I_{1+2}(Q^2) = \frac{2M^2}{Q^2} \int_0^1 g_{1+2}(x) dx, \quad I_2(Q^2) = \frac{2M^2}{Q^2} \int_0^1 g_2(x) dx, \quad (4)$$

$$g_{1+2} = g_1 + g_2. \quad (5)$$

There are solid theoretical arguments to expect a strong Q^2 -dependence of I_2 . It is the well-known Burkhardt-Cottingham(BC) rule [7], derived independently by Schwinger [8], using a rather different method. It states that

$$I_2(Q^2) = \frac{1}{4} \mu G_M(Q^2) [\mu G_M(Q^2) - G_E(Q^2)], \quad (6)$$

where μ is the nucleon magnetic moment, G 's denoting the familiar Sachs form factors which are dimensionless and normalised to unity at $Q^2 = 0$. For large Q^2 one can neglect the r.h.s. and get

$$\int_0^1 g_2(x) dx = 0. \quad (7)$$

In particular,

$$I_2(0) = \frac{\mu_A^2 + \mu_A e}{4}, \quad (8)$$

e being the nucleon charge in elementary units. To reproduce the GDH value one should have

$$I_{1+2}(0) = \frac{\mu_A e}{4}. \quad (9)$$

Note that I_{1+2} does not differ from I_1 for large Q^2 due to the BC sum rule, but it is *positive* in the proton case. It is possible to obtain a smooth interpolation for $I_{1+2}^p(Q^2)$ between large Q^2 and $Q^2 = 0$ [4], namely

$$I_{1+2}^p(Q^2) = \theta(Q_0^2 - Q^2) \left(\frac{\mu_A}{4} - \frac{2M^2 Q^2}{(Q_0^2)^2} \Gamma_1^p \right) + \theta(Q^2 - Q_0^2) \frac{2M^2}{Q^2} \Gamma_1^p, \quad (10)$$

where $\Gamma_1^p = \int_0^1 g_1^p(x) dx$. The continuity of the function and of its derivative is guaranteed with the choice $Q_0^2 = (16M^2/\mu_A) \Gamma_1^p \sim 1 GeV^2$, where the integral is given by the world average proton data. It is quite reasonable to distinguish the perturbative and the non-perturbative regions. As a result one obtains a crossing point at $Q^2 \sim 0.2 GeV^2$, below the resonance region [4], while the positive value at $Q^2 = 0.5 GeV^2$ is in a good agreement with the E143 data [3].

To generalize this approach to the neutron case, one needs a similar parametrization for the neutron. Since the value at $Q^2 = 0$ is equal to zero, it is not sufficient to limit oneself to the simplest linear parametrization and one needs to add two terms, one quadratic and one cubic in Q^2 . A simple parametrization providing the continuity of the function and its first and second derivative is

$$I_{1+2}^n(Q^2) = \frac{2M^2}{Q_0^2} \Gamma_1^n \left[\frac{Q^2}{Q_0^2} \theta(Q_0^2 - Q^2) [6 - 8 \frac{Q^2}{Q_0^2} + 3(\frac{Q^2}{Q_0^2})^2] + \theta(Q^2 - Q_0^2) \frac{Q_0^2}{Q^2} \right] \quad (11)$$

Note that because of the extra terms in the parametrization, Q_0^2 is not determined by the continuity conditions, and we are taking the same value as in the proton case. The parametrization seems to be rather natural in terms of the Q^2 -dependent integral $\Gamma_{1+2}^n(Q^2)$, which is equal to its asymptotic value $\Gamma_{1+2}^n(\infty) = \Gamma_1^n$ down to Q_0^2 . Below Q_0^2 it is just

$$\Gamma_{1+2}^n(Q^2) = \left(\frac{Q^2}{Q_0^2} \right)^2 \Gamma_1^n [6 - 8 \frac{Q^2}{Q_0^2} + 3(\frac{Q^2}{Q_0^2})^2]. \quad (12)$$

To parametrize the elastic contribution to the BC sum rule we need the neutron elastic form factors. While the electric one might be neglected, the magnetic form factor is well described by the dipole formula [9]

$$G_M(Q^2) = \frac{1}{(1 + Q^2/0.71)^2}. \quad (13)$$

The plot representing $\Gamma_1^n(Q^2)$ is displayed on Fig.1, where we used $\Gamma_1^n = -0.04$. One can see a behaviour distinct to the case of the resonance model [6], since the minimum occurs at -0.06 for $Q^2 = 0.7 GeV^2$. In addition it is worth noting that our prediction is typically below the QCD extrapolation, since we subtract I_2 (which is a sharp positive contribution both for proton and neutron) from smooth I_{1+2} . In the resonance model it is above the QCD extrapolation for the neutron and below for the proton. We hope it

will be possible to distinguish between these two predictions, as soon as more accurate data will be available from CEBAF.

The success of our model may be considered as an indirect check of the BC sum rule, but it could be also due to a possible cancellation [5] of non-scaling Regge cuts [10] in I_1 , in such a way to preserve our predictions.

We are indebted to Keith Griffioen and Sebastian Kühn for an interesting discussion which led us to write this short paper.

References

- [1] S.B.Gerasimov, *Yad. Fiz.* **2**, 598(1965) [*Sov. J. Nucl Phys.* **2**, 430(1966)].
- [2] S.D.Drell and A.C.Hearn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **16**, 908(1966).
- [3] E143 Collaboration, K.Abe et al.,*Phys.Rev.Lett.* **78**, 815 (1997).
- [4] J.Soffer and O.Teryaev, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 3373(1993).
- [5] J.Soffer and O.Teryaev, *Phys. Rev.* **51**, 25(1995).
- [6] V.D.Burkert and B.L.Ioffe, *Phys.Lett.* **B296**, 223(1992). *JETP* **105**, 1153(1994).
- [7] H.Burkhardt and W.N.Cottingham, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **16**, 543(1970).
- [8] J.Schwinger, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **72**, 1559(1975).
- [9] A.Lung et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 718(1993).
- [10] B.L.Ioffe, V.A.Khoze, L.N.Lipatov, *Hard Processes*, (North-Holland,Amsterdam, 1984).




Fig 1