

Hadronic light-by-light scattering in the muon $g - 2$: impact of proposed measurements of the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width and the $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0$ transition form factor with the KLOE-2 experiment

Andreas Nyffeler^(a)

^(a) Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhusi, Allahabad - 211019, India

We present a recent study [1] of the impact of proposed measurements at KLOE-2 of the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width to 1% precision and the $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0$ transition form factor $\mathcal{F}_{\pi^0\gamma^*\gamma}(Q^2)$ for small space-like momenta to 6%, on estimates of the numerically dominant pion-exchange contribution to hadronic light-by-light (had. LbyL) scattering in the muon $g - 2$.

Hadronic effects dominate the uncertainty in the prediction of a_μ in the Standard Model and make it difficult to interpret the current discrepancy between theory and experiment as a sign of new physics. In particular, the estimate $a_\mu^{\text{had. LbyL}} = [(105 - 116) \pm (26 - 40)] \times 10^{-11}$ relies entirely on calculations using hadronic models which employ some form factors for the interaction of mesons with photons. To fully profit from future planned $g - 2$ experiments with a precision of $\pm 15 \times 10^{-11}$, these large model uncertainties have to be reduced.

Theoretical constraints and experimental measurements of the relevant form factors can help to constrain the models and to reduce the uncertainties in $a_\mu^{\text{had. LbyL}}$. In the calculation of the pion-exchange contribution, the fully off-shell form factor $\mathcal{F}_{\pi^0\gamma^*\gamma^*}((q_1 + q_2)^2, q_1^2, q_2^2)$ enters, where also the pion is off-shell with momentum $(q_1 + q_2)$. On the other hand, measurements of the transition form factor $\mathcal{F}_{\pi^0\gamma^*\gamma}(Q^2) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\pi^0\gamma^*\gamma^*}(m_\pi^2, -Q^2, 0)$ are in general only sensitive to a subset of the model parameters. Thus, having a good description for the pion transition form factor is only necessary, not sufficient, in order to determine $a_\mu^{\text{LbyL};\pi^0}$.

With the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ lifetime from the PDG and current data on the transition form factor, the error on $a_\mu^{\text{LbyL};\pi^0}$ is roughly $\pm 4 \times 10^{-11}$, not taking into account other sources of uncertainty, e.g. related to the off-shellness of the pion. The lifetime fixes the normalization of the transition form factor at $Q^2 = 0$, a source of uncertainty in had. LbyL scattering, which has not been considered in most evaluations. Including the recent PrimEx result on the lifetime leads to a reduction of the error to $\pm 2 \times 10^{-11}$. Including in addition the simulated KLOE-2 data yields a further reduction of the error to $\pm(0.7 - 1.1) \times 10^{-11}$. For some models, like vector-meson dominance (VMD), which have only a few parameters that are completely determined by measurements of the transition form factor, this represents the total error in $a_\mu^{\text{LbyL};\pi^0}$. In other models, e.g. those based on large- N_C QCD matched to the OPE, there are parameters related to the off-shellness of the pion which dominate the total error in $a_{\mu;\text{large-}N_C}^{\text{LbyL};\pi^0} = (72 \pm 12) \times 10^{-11}$. Note that a smaller error does not necessarily imply that a model is better, i.e. closer to reality. Maybe the model is too simplistic. The VMD model is known to have a wrong high-energy behavior with too strong damping, which underestimates the contribution, compared to the large- N_C QCD model, by 15×10^{-11} .

[1] D. Babusci et al., Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1917 (2012); arXiv:1109.2461 [hep-ph].

E-mail:

nyffeler@hri.res.in