ρ -A₂ Exchange Degeneracy and the Adler Sum Rule*

Walter W. Wada
Department of Physics
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

ABSTRACT

On the basis of ρ -A₂ exchange degeneracy, the structure functions for virtual Compton scattering with $I=1$ and $C=\pm 1$ in the t -channel are assumed proportional to one another. The constant of proportionality is determined by the threshold relation of Bloom and Gilman. The Adler sum rule ($I=1$, $C=-1$) is found to be consistent with the observed behavior of the structure function ($I=1$, $C=+1$) in the scaling region. A simple proportionality relation between $\nu(\bar{W}_2^{\bar{\nu}p} - W_2^{\nu p})$ and $\nu(W_2^{\gamma p} - W_2^{\gamma n})$ is obtained in the scaling limit.

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Atomic Energy Commission, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

*Work supported in part by the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

MASTER

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency Thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

DISCLAIMER

Portions of this document may be illegible in electronic image products. Images are produced from the best available original document.

Some time ago, Harari¹ conjectured that, in the Adler sum rule² for charged photon scattering, there might be a term that depends on q^2 (negative square of the photon mass) in addition to the constant that arises from the current algebra restriction³ on the scattering amplitude. It was suggested that such a term could be identified with a possible fixed $J=1$ pole in the single helicity-flip amplitude, besides the one in the double helicity-flip amplitude whose residue has been identified with the current algebra constant.⁴ The purpose of this work is to make an attempt at an evaluation of the terms in question in the Bjorken scaling limit⁵ by relating the appropriate structure function for the charged photon scattering to that for the neutral photon scattering on the basis of theoretical models. For the latter, there exist extensive data from the MIT-SLAC experiment on deep-inelastic electron-proton scattering.⁶

As is well-known, the forward amplitude for the scattering of charged photons off a spin-averaged proton, $\gamma^\pm(q) + p(p) \rightarrow \gamma^\pm(q) + p(p)$, is given in terms of invariants as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mu\nu}^{\gamma^\pm} &= i \int d^4x e^{-iqx} \langle p(p) | \theta(x_0) [j_\mu^\pm(x), j_\nu^\pm(0)] | p(p) \rangle \\ &= p_\mu p_\nu A^\pm(\nu, q^2) + (p_\mu q_\nu + p_\nu q_\mu) B^\pm(\nu, q^2) \\ &\quad + q_\mu q_\nu C^\pm(\nu, q^2) + \delta_{\mu\nu} D^\pm(\nu, q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\nu = -(pq)/M$. The conservation of the isovector current and the current algebra³ then give

$$\begin{aligned} \nu M A^\pm(\nu, q^2) - q^2 B^\pm(\nu, q^2) &= \pm (2M)^{-1}, \\ \nu M B^\pm(\nu, q^2) - q^2 C^\pm(\nu, q^2) - D^\pm(\nu, q^2) &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Writing

$$\text{Im}(A^-(\nu, q^2) - A^+(\nu, q^2)) \equiv \text{Im} A^{(-)}(\nu, q^2) = \frac{\pi}{2} W_2^{(-)}(\nu, q^2), \quad (3)$$

the Adler sum rule reads²

$$2 \int_0^{\infty} dv W^{(-)}(v, q^2) = 1. \quad (4)$$

Since $A^{(-)}(v, q^2)$ is an s-u crossing antisymmetric amplitude, the t-channel ($I=1$, $C=-1$) is presumably dominated by the ρ -trajectory exchange. With two units of helicity flip involved in the t-channel, the Regge asymptotic behavior of $A^{(-)}(v, q^2)$ should be $v^{\alpha\rho-2}$, where $\alpha\rho \approx \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, for a purely hadronic scattering $W_2^{(-)}(v, q^2)$ should satisfy a superconvergence relation. The current algebra restriction, the unity on the right-hand side of (4), has been reconciled with a fixed $J=1$ pole in the amplitude $A^{(-)}(v, q^2)$.⁴ Should there be a fixed $J=1$ pole also in $B^{(-)}(v, q^2)$, we can write for the asymptotic forms

$$\begin{aligned} A^{(-)}(v, q^2) &= \beta_A(q^2, \alpha\rho) \left(i + \tan \frac{\pi\alpha\rho}{2} \right) v^{\alpha\rho-2} + K_A(q^2) v^{-1}, \\ B^{(-)}(v, q^2) &= \beta_B(q^2, \alpha\rho) \left(i + \tan \frac{\pi\alpha\rho}{2} \right) v^{\alpha\rho-1} + K_B(q^2) M^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $K_A(q^2)$ and $K_B(q^2)M^{-1}$ are the residues of the fixed poles in $A^{(-)}(v, q^2)$ and $B^{(-)}(v, q^2)$, respectively. These residues are assumed to be real.

From (2) it then follows:

$$M^2 K_A(q^2) - q^2 K_B(q^2) = 1. \quad (6)$$

Assuming unsubtracted dispersion relation for $A^{(-)}(v, q^2)$, we then obtain

$$2 \int_0^{\infty} dv W^{(-)}(v, q^2) = 1 + q^2 K_B(q^2). \quad (7)$$

This is the form of the sum rule, modified in relation to (4), that was considered by Hara.^{1,7}

While there is no a priori reason why there should not be the fixed

pole in $B^{(-)}(\nu, q^2)$, the resulting q^2 -dependent term on the right-hand side of (7) has a serious consequence with regard to the parton model,^{8,9,10} in which high-energy photon-hadron scattering is viewed as arising from the interaction of the virtual photon with point-like constituents of the hadron. Indeed, the independence of the right-hand side of (4) upon q^2 is strongly suggestive of such a model.¹¹

Since the neutral photon does not enter into (4) and (7), only the forthcoming neutrino reactions can test these sum rules in a model-independent way.¹² One way of testing these sum rules is to relate the structure functions $W_2^{(-)}(\nu, q^2)$ to the corresponding structure function $W_2^{\gamma p}(\nu, q^2) - W_2^{\gamma n}(\nu, q^2)$ for the proton-neutron difference in the Compton scattering of the virtual photon.

For large ν , $W_2^{(-)}(\nu, q^2)$ and $W_2^{\gamma p}(\nu, q^2) - W_2^{\gamma n}(\nu, q^2)$ are presumably dominated by ρ and A_2 exchanges in the t -channel, respectively. It is then natural to assume that, under the ρ - A_2 exchange degeneracy, they are related to one another by a factor which depends only on q^2 . This point can be illustrated by the following model:

Let us assume SU(3) symmetry for the $\rho\rho\rho$ and $K^*\bar{K}^*\rho$ couplings (F-type) and U(3) symmetry for the $\rho\omega_8 A_2$, $\rho\phi_1 A_2$, and $K^*\bar{K}^* A_2$ couplings (D-type), with the ideal mixing between the eighth component ω_8 of the SU(3) octet and SU(3) singlet ϕ_1 .¹³ Then, the assumption of ρ - A_2 exchange degeneracy that follows from the absence of exotic states in the $K^{*+}p$ channel leads to the ratio given in Fig.1 for the absorptive parts of the vector-meson nucleon scattering amplitudes.

Fig.1

The absorptive part of the forward Compton amplitude reads

$$W_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^4x e^{-iqx} \langle p(p) | [j_{\mu}^{\text{em}}(x), j_{\nu}^{\text{em}}(0)] | p(p) \rangle. \quad (8)$$

Introducing the electromagnetic current in the vector-dominance model (VDM)

$$j_{\mu}^{\text{em}}(x) = \frac{m_{\rho}^2}{f_{\rho}} \rho_{\mu}^0(x) + \frac{m_{\omega}^2}{f_{\omega}} \omega_{\mu}(x) + \frac{m_{\phi}^2}{f_{\phi}} \phi_{\mu}(x), \quad (9)$$

and the ratio given in Fig.1, it can then be shown that

$$W_{\mu\nu}^{\gamma p} - W_{\mu\nu}^{\gamma n} = \frac{m_{\rho}^2 m_{\omega}^2}{f_{\rho} f_{\omega}} \left[(q^2 + m_{\rho}^2)(q^2 + m_{\omega}^2) \right]^{-1} \int d^4x e^{-iqx} \left[\langle p(p) | [j_{\mu}^{\rho^0}(x), j_{\nu}^{\omega}(0)] | p(p) \rangle \right. \\ \left. + \langle p(p) | [j_{\mu}^{\omega}(x), j_{\nu}^{\rho^0}(0)] | p(p) \rangle \right], \quad (10)$$

where $j_{\mu}^{\rho^0}$ and j_{μ}^{ω} are the source currents of the ρ^0 and ω fields, respectively.

For the charged photon scattering with the proton as the target, we have

$$W_{\mu\nu}^{(-)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{m_{\rho}^2}{f_{\rho}} \right)^2 (q^2 + m_{\rho}^2)^{-2} \int d^4x e^{-iqx} \left[\langle p(p) | [j_{\mu}^{\rho^+}(x), j_{\nu}^{\rho^-}(0)] | p(p) \rangle \right. \\ \left. - \langle p(p) | [j_{\mu}^{\rho^-}(x), j_{\nu}^{\rho^+}(0)] | p(p) \rangle \right], \quad (11)$$

where $j_{\mu}^{\rho^{\pm}}$ are the source currents of the $\rho^{\pm}$ fields. From the ratio given in Fig.1, we then get

$$W_{\mu\nu}^{(-)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{m_{\rho}}{m_{\omega}} \right)^2 \frac{f_{\omega}}{f_{\rho}} \frac{q^2 + m_{\omega}^2}{q^2 + m_{\rho}^2} [W_{\mu\nu}^{\gamma p} - W_{\mu\nu}^{\gamma n}]. \quad (12)$$

The same relation must hold between $W_2^{(-)}$ and $W_2^{\gamma p} - W_2^{\gamma n}$. Unfortunately, VDM is known to fail for large q^2 .⁶ Thus, this relation gives only an illustrative

example in support of our assumption.

The q^2 -dependent proportionality between $W_2^{(-)}(\nu, q^2)$ and $W_2^{yp}(\nu, q^2) - W_2^{yn}(\nu, q^2)$ assumed on the basis of the ρ - A_2 exchange degeneracy lies within the domain of the Regge theory. By virtue of the duality hypothesis,¹⁴ these amplitudes must be made up of N^* resonances in the direct channel. While resonance phenomena are coherent properties of the nucleon, in the parton model it is the incoherent scattering by point-like constituents of the hadrons that receives the special emphasis. Nonetheless, it has been shown by Bloom and Gilman¹⁵ that there exists a remarkable consistency between the scaling⁵ for which the parton model provides a possible mechanism and the resonance phenomena, both observed in the deep-inelastic electron scattering. Although there exists at present no theoretical explanation of this consistency,^{15,16} it does suggest strongly that the aforementioned q^2 -dependent proportionality between $W_2^{(-)}(\nu, q^2)$ and $W_2^{yp}(\nu, q^2) - W_2^{yn}(\nu, q^2)$ transcends beyond the Regge regime and remains valid in the region where scaling sets in.¹⁷ The q^2 -dependent proportionality factor is expected to become a constant in the scaling limit ($q^2 \rightarrow \infty$), as is seen in (12). Assuming this to be the case, in the limit $q^2 \rightarrow \infty$, the assumption predicts that the structure functions $\nu(W_2^{yp} - W_2^{yn})$ and the $\nu W_2^{(-)}$ should scale with the same functional dependence on the scale variable.

The proportionality constant can be computed in the scaling limit in the vicinity of the elastic threshold using the relation obtained by Bloom and Gilman from their finite-energy sum rule:¹⁵

$$\lim_{\substack{q^2 \rightarrow \infty \\ \omega' \rightarrow 1}} \nu W_2(\omega') = \lim_{\substack{q^2 \rightarrow \infty \\ \omega' \rightarrow 1}} \frac{1}{\omega' - 1} \left(-q^2 \frac{d}{dq^2} \left[G(q^2) \right]^2 \right), \quad (13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega' &= (2M\nu + M^2)/q^2, \\
G(q^2) &= [F_1(q^2)]^2 + q^2 [F_2(q^2)/2M]^2 \\
&= \frac{[G_E(q^2)]^2 + q^2 [G_M(q^2)/2M]^2}{1 + q^2/4M^2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Following their steps, it can easily be shown that¹⁸

$$\lim_{\substack{q^2 \rightarrow \infty \\ \omega' \rightarrow 1}} \frac{\nu W_2^{(-)}(\omega')}{\nu(W_2^{\gamma p}(\omega') - W_2^{\gamma n}(\omega'))} = \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{d}{dq} [G_M^V(q^2)]^2}{2 \frac{d}{dq} [G_M^S(q^2) G_M^V(q^2)]}, \tag{15}$$

where $G_M^S(q^2)$ and $G_M^V(q^2)$ are the isoscalar and isovector elastic magnetic form factors of the nucleon, respectively. Introducing the relations

$$\begin{aligned}
G_M^S(q^2) &= \frac{1}{2} [G_{Mp}(q^2) + G_{Mn}(q^2)], \\
G_M^V(q^2) &= \frac{1}{2} [G_{Mp}(q^2) - G_{Mn}(q^2)],
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

and the "scaling" of the elastic form factors

$$G_{Mp}(q^2)/\mu_p = G_{Mn}(q^2)/\mu_n, \tag{17}$$

we obtain¹⁹

$$\lim_{\substack{q^2 \rightarrow \infty \\ \omega' \rightarrow 1}} \frac{\nu W_2^{(-)}(\omega')}{\nu(W_2^{\gamma p}(\omega') - W_2^{\gamma n}(\omega'))} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\mu_p - \mu_n}{\mu_p + \mu_n} = \frac{5.35}{2}. \tag{18}$$

As was stated earlier, according to our assumption, the structure functions $\nu W_2^{(-)}$ and $\nu(W_2^{\gamma p} - W_2^{\gamma n})$ should scale with the same functional dependence on ω' .²⁰ Thus, the above ratio evaluated in the limit of the elastic threshold ($\omega' \rightarrow 1$) is expected to hold for all values of ω' . Changing the variable ω' of (14) to

the Bjorken scale variable $\omega = \frac{2MV}{q}$,⁵ the sum rule (7) becomes

$$\frac{\mu_p - \mu_n}{\mu_p + \mu_n} \int_1^\infty \frac{d\omega}{\omega} \nu(W_2^{yp} - W_2^{yn}) = 1 + \left[q^2 K_B(q^2) \right]_{q^2 \rightarrow \infty}. \quad (19)$$

The value for the integral has been determined from the experimental data,⁶ assuming that the scaling persists for all values of ω above the experimentally observed region and adopting the Regge asymptotic behavior for the scaling:²¹

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{d\omega}{\omega} \nu(W_2^{yp} - W_2^{yn}) = 0.19 \pm 0.08. \quad (20)$$

From (19); we then get

$$\lim_{q^2 \rightarrow \infty} q^2 K_B(q^2) = 0.02 \pm 0.43. \quad (21)$$

We thus find that, within the scheme based on the assumption of proportionality between the structure functions with $I=1$ and $C=\pm 1$ in the t -channel, and the Bloom-Gilman duality in the scaling region, the Adler sum rule (4) for the $C=-1$ structure function is consistent with the experimentally observed behavior of the $C=+1$ structure function in the scaling region within the experimental error. The absence of the fixed $J=1$ pole in the amplitude $B^{(-)}$ is consistent with the parton model for the scaling of the $C=-1$ structure function.

The assumption evidently can be extended to the case where both vector and axial vector currents are present. There is no vector-axial vector interference term in the spin-averaged forward amplitude. Thus, the structure function for the neutrino reactions $W_2^{\bar{\nu}p} - W_2^{\nu p}$ is a linear sum of $W_2^{(-)}$ for charged photons and the corresponding one for "axial-vector charged photons." In analogy to the former, the latter is again assumed to be proportional to $W_2^{yp} - W_2^{yn}$. We then expect that there exists a constant proportionality between $\nu(W_2^{\bar{\nu}p} - W_2^{\nu p})$

and $v_{W_2}^{(-)}$ in the scaling region. The constant of proportionality can be determined this time by referring to the Adler sum rules in the scaling limit

$$2 \int_1^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\omega} v_{W_2}^{(-)} = 1, \quad (22)$$

and

$$2 \int_1^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{\omega} v(\bar{W}_2^{\bar{\nu}p} - W_2^{\nu p}) = 2. \quad (23)$$

We then expect that the relation

$$v(\bar{W}_2^{\bar{\nu}p} - W_2^{\nu p}) = 2 v_{W_2}^{(-)} \quad (24)$$

should hold in the scaling region. From (18) and (24), it is then predicted:

$$v(\bar{W}_2^{\bar{\nu}p} - W_2^{\nu p}) = \frac{\mu_p - \mu_n}{\mu_p + \mu_n} v(\bar{W}_2^{\gamma p} - W_2^{\gamma n}). \quad (25)$$

The validity of the scheme presented in this work depends crucially on experimental verification of this relation.

With regard to the residue $K_B(q^2)$ of the fixed pole in $B^{(-)}$ amplitude, it has previously been shown that $K_B(0) \approx 0$ by saturation of the Cabibbo-Radicati sum rule.⁷ We have obtained the result $K_B(q^2 \rightarrow \infty) \approx 0$ in our scheme. The value for $K_B(q^2)$ in the nonscaling region remains yet unknown.

The author wishes to thank J. D. Bjorken for a discussion that inspired this work. He is indebted to J. W. Moffat, H. 3. Nielsen, P. Olesen, and R. T. Torgerson for helpful discussions. He gratefully acknowledges the Niels Bohr Institute for the hospitality extended to him while this work was in progress.

Footnotes and References

1. H. Harari, Phys. Rev. Letters 22, 1078 (1969).
2. S. L. Adler, Phys. Rev. 143, 1144 (1966).
3. M. Gell-Mann, Physics 1, 63 (1964).
4. J. B. Bronzan, I. S. Gerstein, B. W. Lee, and F. E. Low, Phys. Rev. Letters 18, 32 (1967); V. Singh, *ibid.* 18, 36 (1967).
5. J. D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. 179, 1547 (1969).
6. M. Breidenbach et al., Phys. Rev. Letters 23, 935 (1969); H. W. Kendall, Proceedings of 1971 International Symposium on Electron and Photon Interactions at High Energies, Cornell University (1971); E. D. Bloom et al., Proceedings of the XV International Conference on High Energy Physics, Kiev (1970).
7. Taking out explicitly the elastic contribution to the integral in (7) and differentiating the result with respect to q^2 , after an isospin rotation, one obtains at $q^2 = 0$

$$K_B(0) = -\frac{1}{3}\langle r^2 \rangle_E^V + (F_2^V/2M)^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi^2\alpha} \int_0^\infty \frac{d\nu}{\nu} \left[2\sigma_T^V(\nu, I=\frac{1}{2}) - \sigma_T^V(\nu, I=\frac{3}{2}) \right].$$

The well-known Cabibbo-Radicati sum rule corresponds to $K_B(0) = 0$ [N. Cabibbo and L. A. Radicati, Phys. Letters 19, 697 (1966)]. Various authors have shown that the sum rule is satisfied with $K_B(0) \approx 0$. See F. J. Gilman and H. J. Schnitzer, Phys. Rev. 150, 1362 (1966); S. L. Adler and F. J. Gilman, *ibid.* 152, 1460 (1966) and 156, 1598 (1967); F. J. Gilman, *ibid.* 167, 1365 (1968); G. J. Aubrecht and W. W. Wada, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.), in press.

8. R. P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. Letters 23, 1415 (1969); Proceedings of the Third Topical Conference on High Energy Collisions of Hadrons, Stony Brook, New York (1969); Photon-Hadron Interactions (W. A. Benjamin, Inc., Reading, Mass., 1972).
9. J. D. Bjorken, Proceedings of 1967 International School of Physics at Varenna (Academic Press, New York and London, 1968).
10. J. D. Bjorken and E. A. Paschos, Phys. Rev. 185, 1975 (1969).
11. J. D. Bjorken and S. F. Tuan, Comments on Nuclear and Particle Physics 5, 71 (1972).
12. For the neutrino reactions, the current algebra constant in the Adler sum rule is 2. Similarly for (7).
13. In this scheme, ϕ decouples from the ρA_2 system.
14. P. G. O. Freund, Phys. Rev. Letters 20, 235 (1968); H. Harari, *ibid.* 20, 1395 (1968).
15. E. D. Bloom and F. J. Gilman, Phys. Rev. Letters 25, 1140 (1970); Phys. Rev. D 4, 2901 (1971).
16. S. D. Drell, Proceedings of the Amsterdam International Conference on Elementary Particles, North-Holland Publishing Co. (1972).
17. H. D. I. Abarbanel, M. L. Goldberger, and S. B. Treiman, Phys. Rev. Letters 22, 500 (1969). In this paper, the structure functions in the Bjorken scaling limit are discussed in terms of the Regge asymptotic functions.

18. The elastic Born term for $W_2^{(-)}$ is proportional to $2\left[\left(F_1^V(q^2)\right)^2 + q^2\left(F_2^V/2M\right)^2\right]$, whereas that for $W_2^{\gamma p} - W_2^{\gamma n}$ to $4\left[F_1^S(q^2)F_2^V(q^2) + q^2\left(F_2^S(q^2)/2M\right)\left(F_2^V(q^2)/2M\right)\right]$.
19. It is interesting to compare this ratio (2.67) with that (1.45) from (12) based on SU(6) symmetry $\left(f_\omega/f_\rho = 3\right)$. The discrepancy may be attributed to the failure of the VDM in the scaling region.
20. It has been argued that, for large ω ($\omega' = \omega$ as $q^2 \rightarrow \infty$), the nonscaling photon-dissociation contribution to νW_2 in the electroproduction may be important. However, such contributions are canceled in the differences $\nu W_2^{(-)}$, $\nu(W_2^{\gamma p} - W_2^{\gamma n})$, and $\nu(W_2^{\bar{\nu} p} - W_2^{\nu p})$. See H. T. Nieh, Phys. Rev. D 7, 3401 (1973).
21. C. H. Llewellyn Smith, SLAC-PUB-817 (1970).

Fig.1

The relative magnitudes of the absorptive parts of the vector meson-nucleon scattering amplitudes in pole approximation.