QCD Sum Rules study of meson-baryon sigma term
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The pion (baryon) sigma term and the strange-quark condensates of the octet and the decuplet baryons are calculated by employing the method of quantum chromodynamics (QCD) sum rules. We evaluate the vacuum-to-vacuum transition matrix elements of two baryon interpolating fields in an external isoscalar-scalar field and use a Monte Carlo (MC) approach to systematically analyze the sum rules and the uncertainties in the results. We extract the ratios of the sigma term, which have rather high accuracy and minimal dependence on QCD parameters. We discuss the sources of uncertainties and comment on possible strangeness content of the nucleon and the Delta.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The meson-baryon sigma terms are important for hadron physics as they provide a measure of chiral-symmetry breaking and the scalar quark condensates inside the baryon. In particular, the pion-nucleon and the pion-Delta sigma terms have received much attention and have been extensively analyzed in many problems (see Ref. [1] and references therein). The sigma term is related to the chiral-symmetry breaking part of the QCD Lagrangian

\[ L_m = m \left( \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d + \bar{s}s \right) \]

which is expressed in terms of SU(3)-avov SU(3)_f singlet and octet pieces

\[ u_1 = \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d + \bar{s}s \]
\[ u_2 = \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d + \bar{s}s \]

where \( m = (2m_u + m_d)_3 \) and \( m = (m_u + m_d)_3 \) is the average light-quark mass. The strength of the SU(3)_f breaking is controlled by the matrix elements of the octet and can be related to the resulting baryon mass splittings through Gell-Mann, Okubo mass formulas. The sigma term, which are defined in terms of these matrix elements, can be in turn deduced from the SU(3)_f pattern and the observed baryon-mass differences [2,3,4].

The sigma term is equivalent to the values of the scalar form factors

\[ m_B \left( p^0; t^0 \right) \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d \left( p; t \right) = - \frac{1}{3} \left( k^+ \left( p^0 \right) \right)_B \left( p; t \right) \]
\[ m_B \left( p^0; t^0 \right) \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d \left( p; t \right) = - \frac{1}{3} \left( k^+ \left( p^0 \right) \right)_B \left( p; t \right) \]

\[ m_B \left( p^0; t^0 \right) \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d \left( p; t \right) = - \frac{1}{3} \left( k^+ \left( p^0 \right) \right)_B \left( p; t \right) \]

at zero momentum transfer, with \( B = N, \Delta, \) and \( B = N, \Delta, \) where \( \left( p^0; t^0 \right) \) is the Rarita-Schwinger spinor of the spin-3/2 baryon, with the spin projection \( t^0 \) and \( m \) is the octet sigma term, and \( B \left( k^+ \left( p^0 \right) \right)_B \left( p; t \right) \) are the scalar and tensor form factors, respectively. The matrix elements on the right-hand sides (RHS) of (1a) and (1b) is conventional in the case of the free Delta Lagrangian. The sigma terms are also dened via the Feynman-an-Helmholtz theorem as

\[ m_B \left( p^0; t^0 \right) \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d \left( p; t \right) = \frac{1}{3} \left( k^+ \left( p^0 \right) \right)_B \left( p; t \right) \]

The m B \left( p^0; t^0 \right) \bar{u}u + \bar{d}d \left( p; t \right) represent the strangeness content of the baryons, which can be combined with the pion-nucleon and the pion-Delta sigma terms to obtain, e.g., the eta-baryon sigma term as

\[ \frac{1}{3} \left( k^+ \left( p^0 \right) \right)_B \left( p; t \right) + 2 \left( m_B \right)_B \left( p; t \right) \]
The strange quark condensate of the nucleon is of special interest, which is expressed by the ratio
\[ y = \frac{2N}{\tau s} \eta s \frac{1}{NN_{\tau u} + \frac{1}{NN_{\tau d}}} \]  
and related to the pion-nucleon sigma a term through
\[ N = n = 1 \ y \]  
where \( N = 32 \text{ MeV} \) is the pion-nucleon sigma a term obtained from the matrix elements of the octet place in Eq. \( \text{(1)} \) using baryon-mass splittings \( \text{(2)} \). Hence, a discrepancy between \( N \) and the directly observed \( N \) gives a measure of the strangeness content of the nucleon. The assumption from the Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka (OZI) rule as \( y = 0 \) implies a \( N \) which is significantly smaller than expectations based on \( N \) scattering. The resulting puzzle can be solved by considering the possibility of a non-vanishing \( N \) content in the nucleon. This interesting issue has been tackled using various theoretical approaches, e.g., the chiral perturbation theory gives \( y \approx 0.21 \) \( \text{(8)} \), and lattice QCD gives \( y \approx 0.36 \) \( \text{(8)} \).

To our knowledge, there are only a few calculations in the literature for the meson-hyperon sigma a term. The quark condensates of the baryons have been calculated in Ref. \( \text{(8)} \) by means of a Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (NJL) approach to QCD. A chiral model has been used in Ref. \( \text{(8)} \) to evaluate the long-range part of the hyperon scalar form factors and the pion-octet-baryon sigma a term. When considered in the framework of the octet and the decuplet baryons, a determination of the sigma a term is important for understanding the role played by the chiral symmetry breaking in the octet-decuplet mass splittings. Moreover, since there is no direct coupling of the pion to Lambda baryon, the - sigma a term cannot be directly determined from experiment. Therefore a theoretical determination of the sigma a term together with the - sigma a term is crucial as these terms are related to the - mass splitting. Two of us have recently calculated \( \text{(8)} \) the pion-nucleon and the pion-Delta sigma a terms by utilizing the external- \( \text{(8)} \) QCD sum rules (QCD SR), which are a powerful tool to extract quantitative information about hadron properties \( \text{(8,10,11,12)} \). In this framework, one starts with a correlation function that is constructed in terms of hadron interpolating fields. On the theoretical side, the correlation function is calculated using the Operator Product Expansion (OPE) in the Euclidean region. This correlation function is matched with an Ansatz that is introduced in terms of hadronic degrees of freedom on the phenomenological side. The matching provides a determination of hadronic parameters like baryon masses, magnetic moments, coupling constants of hadrons, and so on. Our aim in this work is to calculate the scalar quark condensates of the octet and the decuplet baryons and the related sigma a term in Eq. \( \text{(9)} \), by using the external- \( \text{(8)} \) QCD sum rules. To determine the value of the sigma a term, we evaluate the vacuum-to-vacuum transition matrix elements of two baryon interpolating fields in an external isoscalar-scalar field. For our numerical procedure, we use the Monte Carlo method (based on analysis introduced in Ref. \( \text{(13)} \)). This method provides a more systematic treatment of uncertainties in QCD SR.

Our paper is organized as follows: In Section \( \text{(11)} \), we present the formulation of QCD SR and construct the relevant sum rules. We give the numerical analysis of the sum rules in Section \( \text{(11)} \). Finally, we discuss the results and arrive at our conclusions in Section \( \text{(11)} \).

II. THE DERIVATION OF THE SUM RULES

In the external- \( \text{(8)} \) QCD SR method, one starts with the correlation function of the baryon interpolating fields in the presence of an external constant isoscalar-scalar field \( S_q \), defined by
\[ \int d^4x e^{i p \cdot x} \bar{\psi} \rho [B \pi \Gamma_B(0)] \psi_{\alpha q} = \]  
\[ Z \rho(p) + S_q \rho [B \pi \Gamma_B(0)] \psi_{\alpha q} = \]  
\[ Z \rho(p) + S_q [\psi_{\alpha q} + 0 (S_q^2)] ; \]  
\[ \int d^4x e^{i p \cdot x} \bar{\psi} \rho [B \pi \Gamma_B(0)] \psi_{\alpha q} = \]  
\[ Z \rho(p) + S_q [\psi_{\alpha q} + 0 (S_q^2)] ; \]  
where \( B \) and \( B \) are the octet- and the decuplet-baryon interpolating fields, which are respectively given as
\[ N = \rho (u \ s) ; \]  
\[ r = \rho (u \ s) ; \]  
\[ = \frac{2}{3} \rho (u \ s) + \frac{1}{3} \rho (u \ s) \]  
\[ \rho (u \ s) + \rho (u \ s) ; \]  
\[ \rho (u \ s) + \rho (u \ s) ; \]  
Here \( abcd \) are the color indices, \( T \) denotes transposition and \( C = 1 \) \( \text{(9)} \). For the interpolating fields of the octet baryons, there are two independent local operators, but the ones in Eq. \( \text{(9a)} \) are the optimum choices for the lowest-lying positive-parity baryons (see, e.g., Ref. \( \text{(14)} \) for a discussion on negative-parity baryons in QCD SR). \( \rho (p) \) and \( \rho (p) \) are the correlation functions when the external field is absent and correspond to the functions that are used to determine the baryon masses. The second term \( s \) in Eqs. \( \text{(9)} \) represent the linear responses of the correlators to a small external scalar field \( S_q \), which are computed with an additional term to the QCD Lagrangian:
\[ L = S g \gamma^a \bar{\psi}(x) u(x) + \bar{\psi}(x) d(x) \bar{\psi}(x) \]  
\[ S g \gamma^a \bar{\psi}(x) s(x) ; \]  
\( \text{(10)} \)
Here, $S_u = S_d$ ($S_s$) represent the external scalar field and $g^s$ ($g^a$) is associated with the coupling of the external scalar field to the $u$- and the $d$- ($s$-) quark. $\hat{u}_B^{(i)} = \hat{d}_B^{(i)} = \hat{u}_{B}^{(i)}$ denote the correlation functions in the existence of the external $S$ ($S_s$) field. The external scalar field contributes to the correlation functions in Eq. (5) in two ways: first, it directly couples to the quark field in the baryon currents and second, it modifies the condensates by polarizing the QCD vacuum. In the presence of an external scalar field, there are no correlations that break the Lorentz invariance, like $\hat{h}_{qi}$ which appears in the case of an external electromagnetic field $F$. However, the condensates already existing in the vacuum are modified by the external field, viz.

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{h}_{qi} & \to \hat{h}_{qi} \hat{S}_{qi}, \quad \hat{h}_{si} \to \hat{h}_{si} \hat{S}_{si}; \\
\hat{h}_{qi} & \to \hat{h}_{qi} - \hat{S}_{qi} \hat{h}_{qi}, \quad \hat{h}_{si} \to \hat{h}_{si} - \hat{S}_{si} \hat{h}_{si}; \\
\end{align*}
\]

(1) 

where $(u \ d), \ (u \ d), \ (s \ s), \ s, \ ~s$ are the susceptibilities corresponding to the quark condensates. Similarly, $g_i (u, \ d), g_i (u, \ d), g_i (s, \ s), g_i (s, \ s)$ denote the susceptibilities corresponding to the quark-gluon mixed condensates. Here we explicitly assume that the $u$- and the $d$- ($s$-) quark fields couple solely to the external field $S$ ($S_s$). The quark condensates get modified in the presence of the external fields $S$ and $S_s$ as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\hat{h}_{qi}}{\hat{m}_j} & = i \hat{h}_{qi} \hat{G}_{ij}; \\
\frac{\hat{h}_{gi}}{\hat{m}_j} & = \hat{h}_{gi} \hat{G}_{ij}; \\
\end{align*}
\]

(12a)

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{\hat{h}_{qi}}{\hat{m}_j} & = - i \hat{h}_{qi} \hat{G}_{ij}; \\
\frac{\hat{h}_{gi}}{\hat{m}_j} & = \hat{h}_{gi} \hat{G}_{ij}; \\
\end{align*}
\]

(12b)

where we retain the non-diagonal responses of $\hat{h}_{qi}$ ($\hat{h}_{si}$) to external $S$ ($S_s$) field via the susceptibilities $\sim$ and $\sim$, and similarly for the quark-gluon mixed condensates via $\sim$ and $\sim$. The coupling of the external scalar field to the quark is simply taken as $g^S g^S = 1$.

At the quark level, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{D} [ (x) (0) ] & = 2 i \abc a b c d e f g h i j \ \mathrm{Tr} S_u^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x) \ C [ S_a^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x)^\dagger \ C \ 5 S_{d}^{c d e f g h i j} (x) \ 5; \\
\end{align*}
\]

(13a)

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{D} [ (x) (0) ] & = 0 \ T [ (x) (0) ] (x) \ S_{d}^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x) \ C [ S_a^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x)^\dagger \ C \ 5 S_{d}^{c d e f g h i j} (x) \ 5; \\
\end{align*}
\]

(13b)

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{D} [ (x) (0) ] & = 0 \ T [ (x) (0) ] (x) \ S_{d}^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x) \ C [ S_a^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x)^\dagger \ C \ 5 S_{d}^{c d e f g h i j} (x) \ 5; \\
\end{align*}
\]

(13c)

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{D} [ (x) (0) ] & = 2 i \abc a b c d e f g h i j \ \mathrm{Tr} S_u^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x) \ C [ S_a^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x)^\dagger \ C \ 5 S_{d}^{c d e f g h i j} (x) \ 5; \\
\end{align*}
\]

(13d)

respectively for $N$, $\sim$, and $\sim$, and

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{D} [ (x) (0) ] & = 2 i \abc a b c d e f g h i j \ \mathrm{Tr} S_u^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x) \ C [ S_a^{a b c d e f g h i j} (x)^\dagger \ C \ 5 S_{d}^{c d e f g h i j} (x) \ 5; \\
\end{align*}
\]

(14a)
The second term appears in the existence of the external field and is given as

\[ i [S_q^0]^{ab} \delta^{\beta\gamma} [\bar{q}(x)q(0)] \delta_{\beta\gamma} \]

\[ = \frac{i}{2} \left[ \frac{m_q x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} + \frac{i m_q}{48} \delta^{ab} \right] + \frac{i m_q \alpha_s G^n}{12} \ln \left( \frac{x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} \right) + \frac{i m_q \alpha_s G^n}{12} \ln \left( \frac{x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} \right) \]

respectively for , , and .

To calculate the Wilson coefficients, we need the quark propagators in the presence of the external scalar field, which are written as

\[ S_q(x) = S_q^0(x) + S_q^0(x) \quad (15) \]

The first term on the RHS is the part of the propagator in the absence of the external field, which is given as

\[ i [S_q^0]^{ab} \delta^{\beta\gamma} [\bar{q}(x)q(0)] \delta_{\beta\gamma} \]

\[ = \frac{i}{2} \left[ \frac{m_q x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} + \frac{i m_q}{48} \delta^{ab} \right] + \frac{i m_q \alpha_s G^n}{12} \ln \left( \frac{x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} \right) + \frac{i m_q \alpha_s G^n}{12} \ln \left( \frac{x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} \right) \]

The ground-state hadron contribution is singled out by utilizing the zero with approximation, where the hadronic contributions from the Breit-Wigner form to the imaginary part of the correlation function is proportional to the function:

\[ \text{Im} [\bar{n} (p)] = 2 \left( \frac{q \cdot m_B}{p^2} \right) \delta^{ab} \delta^{\beta\gamma} [\bar{q}(x)q(0)] \delta_{\beta\gamma} \]

when the quark and external field have the same flavor. Otherwise, we have

\[ i [S_q^0]^{ab} \delta^{\beta\gamma} [\bar{q}(x)q(0)] \delta_{\beta\gamma} \]

\[ = \frac{i}{2} \left[ \frac{m_q x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} + \frac{i m_q}{48} \delta^{ab} \right] + \frac{i m_q \alpha_s G^n}{12} \ln \left( \frac{x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} \right) + \frac{i m_q \alpha_s G^n}{12} \ln \left( \frac{x^2}{\alpha_s G^n} \right) \]

The analyticity of the correlation function allows us to write the phenomenological side of the sum rules in terms of a double-dispersion relation of the form

\[ \text{Re} \left[ \bar{n} (p) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{Z_1}{s_1} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{Z_1}{p^2} \right) \delta s_1 s_2 \quad (19a) \]

\[ \text{Re} \left[ \bar{n} (p) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{Z_1}{s_1} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{Z_1}{p^2} \right) \delta s_1 s_2 \quad (19b) \]

The ground-state hadron contribution is singled out by utilizing the zero with approximation, where the hadronic contributions from the Breit-Wigner form to the imaginary part of the correlation function is proportional to the function:

\[ \text{Im} [\bar{n} (p)] = 2 \left( \frac{q \cdot m_B}{p^2} \right) \delta^{ab} \delta^{\beta\gamma} [\bar{q}(x)q(0)] \delta_{\beta\gamma} \]

where $q$ and $m_B$ represent the quark and external field, respectively, and $\alpha_s$ is the strong coupling constant.
for spin-1/2 baryons. The correlation functions for the spin-3/2 baryons are similarly expressed. In the presence of external eld we have transitions to excited baryon states which are denoted as $E$.

The matrix elements of the currents $b$ and $B$ between the vacuum and the hadron states are defined as

$$
\begin{align}
\hbar j_b^B(p;t) &= b(p;t); \\
\hbar j_B^b(p;t) &= B(p;t);
\end{align}
$$

respectively for the octet and the decuplet baryons, where $b$ and $B$ are the residues. For the spin-3/2 baryons, we make use of the Rarita-Schwinger spin sum, which is

$$
X(p;t) = \frac{2}{3} \frac{p \cdot p}{m_B^2} \left( \sigma + m_B \right) T(p + m_B);
$$

where the slash denotes $\bar{p} = p$. Inserting Eq. (21) into Eq. (20) and using the definitions in Eq. (3), the pole structures of the correlation functions in Eq. (19) are obtained as

$$
\begin{align}
\frac{2}{3} \frac{p \cdot p}{m_B^2} \left( \sigma + m_B \right) T(p + m_B) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{p \cdot p}{m_B^2} \left( \sigma + m_E \right) T(p + m_E);
\end{align}
$$

for spin-1/2 baryons and

$$
\begin{align}
\frac{2}{3} \frac{p \cdot p}{m_B^2} \left( \sigma + m_B \right) T(p + m_B) + \frac{2}{3} \frac{p \cdot p}{m_E^2} \left( \sigma + m_E \right) T(p + m_E);
\end{align}
$$

for spin-3/2 baryons. Here, the second term $s$ is associated with the transitions to higher baryon states and $B$ denote the transition matrix elements.

We can bring the correlation functions $^q B$ and $^q b$ into the form

$$
\begin{align}
^q_B(p) &= \frac{q}{b} \left( p \cdot p \right) \sigma + \frac{q}{b} \left( p \cdot p \right) \gamma^5; \\
\left[ ^q b \right](p) &= \frac{q}{b} \left( p \cdot p \right) \gamma^\mu + \frac{q}{b} \left( p \cdot p \right) \gamma^\mu,
\end{align}
$$

where the ellipsis represents the Lorentz-D irac structures other than $\sigma$ and $\gamma^\mu$. Note that one can obtain the sum rules at different Lorentz structures. Here, we choose to work with the sum rules at the structures $\sigma$ and $\gamma^\mu$ for the octet and the decuplet baryons, respectively, where the latter are completely contributed by the decuplet baryons with $J = \frac{3}{2}$ (see, e.g., Ref. [12] for details).

One then expresses the correlation function for the octet baryons as a sharp resonance plus a continuum after Borel transformation:

$$
\begin{align}
B(M^2) &= 2 \frac{2}{B} \frac{m_B}{m^2} + C_B M^2 \frac{e^{m_B^2 - M^2}}{M^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_B}} \int \frac{m_B}{M^2} e^{s - M^2} ds_0; \quad (26a)
\end{align}
$$

$$
\begin{align}
B(M^2) &= 2 \frac{2}{B} \frac{m_B}{m^2} + C_B M^2 \frac{e^{m_B^2 - M^2}}{M^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_B}} \int \frac{m_B}{M^2} e^{s - M^2} ds_0; \quad (26b)
\end{align}
$$

Similarly for decuplet baryons, we write

$$
\begin{align}
B(M^2) &= 2 \frac{2}{B} \frac{m_B}{m^2} + C_B M^2 \frac{e^{m_B^2 - M^2}}{M^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_B}} \int \frac{m_B}{M^2} e^{s - M^2} ds_0; \quad (27a)
\end{align}
$$

$$
\begin{align}
B(M^2) &= 2 \frac{2}{B} \frac{m_B}{m^2} + C_B M^2 \frac{e^{m_B^2 - M^2}}{M^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{w_B}} \int \frac{m_B}{M^2} e^{s - M^2} ds_0; \quad (27b)
\end{align}
$$

Here $w_B$ and $w_B^s$ denote the continuum thresholds in the existence of the $S_q$ and $S_q$ elds, respectively. Above we have defined $u_B^{(1)} = \frac{q}{b} \left( p \cdot p \right) \gamma^5$. We have included the single-pole contributions with the factors $C_B^{(1)}$ and $C_B^{(2)}$, which correspond to transition strengths to higher baryon states [second term on the RHS of (23) and (24) upon Borel transformation]. These transition terms $s$ are not properly summed after the Borel transformation and should be included on the phenomological side.

The QCD sum rules are obtained by matching the OPE sides with the hadronic sides and applying the Borel transformation. We give the resulting sum rules in Appendix A, where we have defined the quark condensate $\frac{\bar{q}}{q} = \frac{2}{3} \bar{q} \gamma^5 q$, and the quark- gluon (mixed) condensate $\frac{\bar{q} q}{g} = \frac{2}{3} \bar{q} \gamma^5 g$ with the QCD coupling constant squared $g^2 = 4 \pi$. The flavor symmetry breaking is accounted for by the factor $f = 1_{\text{SU}(3)}$, and the four- quark condensate is parametrized as $\frac{\bar{q} q}{g} = \frac{2}{3} \bar{q} \gamma^5 g^2$. The continuum contributions are included via the factors

$$
\begin{align}
E_n^{(1)}(p) &= 1 + x + \cdots + \frac{x^n}{n!} e^x; \quad (28a)
\end{align}
$$

$$
\begin{align}
E_n^{(2)}(p) &= 1 + x + \cdots + \frac{x^n}{n!} e^x; \quad (28b)
\end{align}
$$

with $x = \frac{w_B^{(1)}}{M^2}$ and $x = \frac{w_B^{(2)}}{M^2}$. In the sum rules, the third term $s$ on the RHS gives the contributions that come from the responses of the continuum thresholds to the external eld. Here, $\frac{\bar{q} q}{g}$ and $\frac{\bar{q} q}{g}^2$ represent the variations of the continuum threshold and
the coefficients are calculated by di erentiating the continuum parts of the chiral-even octet and decuplet mass sum rules with respect to the quark mass. These terms are suppressed at low pole mass, nevertheless, should be included on the phenomenological side if they are large (see Ref. [9] for a detailed explanation of these terms). The corrections that come from the anomalous dimensions of various operators are included with the factors $L = \log(M) \approx \log(\frac{2}{\Lambda})$, where $M = 500$ MeV is the renormalization scale and $\Lambda$ is the QCD scale parameter. A variation of the renormalization scale as well as that of the QCD scale parameter has little e ect on the results.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE SUM RULES

We determine the uncertainties in the extracted parameters via Monte Carlo based analysis introduced in Ref. [13]. In this analysis, random samples generated are distributed from the uncertainties in the QCD input parameters. Here we use $a_0 = 0.05 \pm 0.05$ GeV$^2$, $b_0 G^2 = 12 \pm 0.5$ GeV$^4$, $m_s = 0.72 \pm 0.08$ GeV$^2$, and $\Lambda = 0.15 \pm 0.04$ GeV. The factorization violation in the four-quark operator is searched via the parameter $\lambda$, where we take $\lambda = 1$ and $\lambda_i = 0.83 \pm 0.05$ and $\lambda_i = 0.11 \pm 0.02$ GeV, respectively (for a discussion on QCD parameters see, e.g., Ref. [13]).

The value of the susceptibility $\sigma$ can be calculated by using the two-point function $[16, 17, 13]$

$$
Z(p^2) = \int d^4x e^{ipx} \Im \langle\Pi[0(x)u(x) + d(x)d(x); u(0)u(0) + d(0)d(0)]\rangle;
$$

via the relation

$$
\Pi_{\Pi} = \frac{1}{2} Z(0);
$$

The two-point function in Eq. (29) at $p^2 = 0$ has been studied in chiral perturbation theory $[15]$ with the result

$$
\Pi_{\Pi} = \frac{16}{16} f^4 \left( \frac{2}{3} + \frac{\alpha f}{3} \right) \frac{11}{6} ;
$$

where $f = 93 \text{ MeV}$ is the pion decay constant and $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are the low-energy constants appearing in the effective chiral Lagrangian. A recent analysis of $-\sigma$ scattering gives $\alpha = 19 \pm 0.2$ and $\beta = 525 \pm 0.04$ [20]. Using these values of $\alpha$ and $\beta$ taking the quark condensate $a_0 = 0.52 \pm 0.05 \text{ GeV}^3$ we nd $\sigma = 10 \pm 1 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. The susceptibility $\sigma$ is less certain. It is reasonable to asume $\sigma = 10 \pm 3 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ as we shall see below, the nal results are insensitive to a variation in $\sigma$.

The susceptibilities $\sigma$ and $\sigma'$ can be related to and $\sigma''$, respectively, in a straightforward way by using the three-avor NJL model [21, 22]. In NJL model, the constituent-quark mass is composed of the current-quark mass and a dynamical part ($M_d$) that has a purely non-perturbative origin:

$$
M_i = m_i + M_i^d; \quad i = u; d; s;
$$

$$
M_i^d = 2g_i H_i q_i + M_i^0;
$$

where $m_i$ is the constituent-quark mass, $q_i$ is the four-quark coupling and $M_i^0$ represents a potentially small contribution that originates from the six-quark coupling. The scalar charge of the constituent quark can be de ned by using the Feynman-Hellmann theorem as

$$
Q_{ij} = \Pi_{ij} = \frac{\partial M}{\partial m_i} = q_{ij} + R_{ij};
$$

where we have defined $R_{ij} = \partial M^0 = \delta m_i$ with the aid of Eq. (11). In NJL model, $\delta m_i$ vanishes in the diagonal case and we obtain $R_{ii} = 2g_i H_i q_i = \delta m_i$. Using the values of $R_{ij}$ as given in Eq. (4.13) of Ref. [7], we nd

$$
\frac{R_{uu}}{R_{dd}} = 1; \quad \frac{R_{uu}}{R_{ss}} = \frac{14}{10}; \quad \frac{R_{ff}}{R_{ff}} = 0.42; \quad 2\pi
$$

which implies that $\sigma < \sigma'$. Inserting the central values as $\sigma = 10 \pm 1 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ and $\sigma' = 0.43 \pm 0.15 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ yields $\sigma'' = 4.5 \pm 0.5 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. In our numerical analysis we consider the susceptibility values $\sigma'' = 4 \pm 1 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ by allowing a generous uncertainty and adopt $\sigma'' = 4 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$.

The non-vanishing values of the non-diagonal susceptibilities $\gamma, \gamma_0, \gamma_5$ and $\gamma_5$, which are functions for $n, s$ and $\gamma_5$ only, are related to the nucleon and the Delta in the $\gamma$ and $\gamma_5$ content for the nucleon and the Delta, and to the $\gamma_5$ content for the Omega. Such anomalous quark contents are OZI-rule suppressed, therefore we expect that these non-diagonal susceptibilities should be very small, if non-zero. $\gamma$ and $\gamma_5$ can be expressed in terms of a correlation function as in Eq. (29) and estimated in chiral perturbation theory. In our analysis, we shall treat these susceptibilities as free parameters and adopt the ranges $2 \sim 1 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ and $2 \sim 1 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. We also assume $\gamma \sim \gamma_0$ and $\gamma_5 \sim \gamma_5$. We would like to note that these ranges are consistent with those in Ref. [22], which were taken to reproduce the baryon isospin mass splittings. Moreover, since the sum rules for $n, s$ depend solely on the non-diagonal susceptibilities, $\gamma$ and $\gamma_5$ are actually constrained by the strangeness content of the nucleon, which can be determined independently by using other approaches. As we shall see below, these values of the susceptibilities produce a strangeness content for the nucleon in agreement with the expectations based on lattice QCD and chiral perturbation theory.
TABLE I: The parameter values that we use for the numerical analysis of the mass sum rules \([12,23]\), the obtained values of the overlap amplitudes and the continuum contributions for each sum rule at the lower ends of the valid Borel regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Res. Region</th>
<th>cont. m (GeV)</th>
<th>( m_{\pi}^2 ) (GeV)</th>
<th>( m_{\Sigma}^2 ) (GeV)</th>
<th>( m_{\Xi}^2 ) (GeV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N ([0.9-1.2]) 24%</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([0.9-1.4]) 13%</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([0.8-1.3]) 30%</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([0.9-1.4]) 44%</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([1.0-1.2]) 30%</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([0.9-1.3]) 13%</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([0.9-1.4]) 7%</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([1.0-1.5]) 6%</td>
<td>1.672</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We use \(10^3\) such configurations from which the uncertainty estimates in the extracted parameter values are obtained using a fit of the LHS of the sum rules to the RHS. For \( m^2 \), we make use of the Gell-Mann-Oakes-Renner relation, which is

\[
2m^2 \Sigma_{ij} = m^2 f^2, \quad (35)
\]

where \( m = 138 \) MeV is the pion mass. We use the chiral-odd mass sum rules given in Appendix B for normalization of the chiral-odd sum rules, which have been found to be more reliable than the chiral-even sum rules \([12,23]\). The Monte Carlo analyses of the sum rules are performed by fitting the mass sum rules \([A1-B3]\) to obtain the pole residues \( m^2 \) and \( m_{\Sigma}^2 \), and these residue values are used in the chiral-odd sum rules \([A1-A14]\) for each corresponding parameter set.

The valid Borel regions are determined so that the highest-dimensional operator contributes no more than about \(10\%\) to the OPE side, which gives the lower limit on the valid Borel region and ensures OPE convergence. The upper limit is determined using a criterion such that the continuum-plus-continuum-change and plus-excited-state contributions are less than about \(50\%\) of the phenom enological side, which is imposed so as to warrant the pole dominance (this constraint is slightly relaxed for sum rule \( A1 \)). Note that, while the first criterion is rather straightforward, one does not initially have a complete control on the second, since the phenomenological parameters are determined from the C and they are correlated. We use the following strategy: we first make the C in a reasonably selected Borel region, which is then adjusted by trial and error according to the results until the above criteria are satisfied.

The parameter values that we use for the numerical analysis of the mass sum rules \([B1-B3]\), together with the fitted values of the overlap amplitudes, are given in Table I. We also give the continuum contributions for each sum rule at the lower ends of the valid Borel regions (continuum contributions amount to \(50\%\) of the total phenom enological side at the higher ends of the Borel regions). In order to reduce the uncertainties in the parameters as much as possible, we perform the baryon mass analysis at their experimental values and the continuum thresholds at around the \(s\)-resolved resonance mass as suggested by the Particle Data Group \([24]\). It is well known that the chiral-odd sum rules are less prone to higher order corrections in \( m_{\Sigma}^2 \) and they perform better as compared to the chiral-even sum rules due to cancellations in the continuum, however the chiral-odd sum rule somewhat overestimates the mass of the Delta resonance (see Refs. \([12,23]\) for details). Therefore, we take as input the value of the Delta mass as suggested by the chiral-odd sum rule.

FIG. 1: The subtracted form of the sum rules \([A1], [A2]\), and \([A3]\). The solid line is the double-pole contribution and the dashed line is the OPE-m minus-excited states and minus-continuum-change contributions, where we use the average values of the QCD and the obtained parameter values. The error bars at the two ends represent the uncertainties in the QCD parameter values.

FIG. 2: (color online) Same as Fig. 1 but for the sum rules \([A4], [A5]\) and \([A6]\). The error bar at the higher end for \( A5 \) is slightly shifted for clear viewing.

It is relevant to point out that the dominant contributions to the OPE sides of the sum rules \([A1] - [A4]\) come from the terms that involve the susceptibilities, whereas
TABLE II: The values of the sigma term $\sigma_B^{(s)}$, and the transition strengths $C_B^{(s)}$, for each resonance as obtained from a set of 10^7 parameter sets. The second error in $\sigma_B^{(s)}$ is due to the uncertainty in the parameter and the first is the sum of errors due to all remaining sources. The second column shows the valid Borel regions and the third column shows the continuum-plus-continuum-change and plus-excited-state contributions at the lower ends of the valid Borel regions. We give the ratios of the sigma term $s$ in the last column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resonance</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>cont.+ exc.</th>
<th>$C_B$ (GeV^2)</th>
<th>$\sigma_B$ (MeV)</th>
<th>$\frac{\sigma_B}{a}$</th>
<th>$\frac{\sigma_B}{b}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>[0.9-1.8]</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1.32(1.15)</td>
<td>14(03)(02)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.9-1.3]</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7.45(2.92)</td>
<td>53(09)(15)</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.1-1.7]</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7.81(2.96)</td>
<td>43(07)(08)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.8-1.2]</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3.50(1.03)</td>
<td>7(2)(2)</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>[1.2-1.6]</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>24.25(6.49)</td>
<td>56(10)(12)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.2-1.5]</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>39.94(12.65)</td>
<td>54(10)(15)</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.2-1.7]</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11.60(2.89)</td>
<td>28(04)(06)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.3-2.1]</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2.33(1.81)</td>
<td>6(1)(1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>[0.9-1.4]</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1.95(52)</td>
<td>243(72)(31)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.9-1.4]</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0.93(47)</td>
<td>161(41)(25)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.8-1.2]</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2.81(39)</td>
<td>129(36)(34)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.0-1.4]</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2.34(47)</td>
<td>272(99)(44)</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>[1.2-1.6]</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7.24(2.23)</td>
<td>301(080)(056)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.2-1.5]</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>4.25(1.56)</td>
<td>173(053)(034)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.2-1.8]</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10.38(3.19)</td>
<td>323(091)(048)</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.1-1.8]</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11.03(2.91)</td>
<td>380(117)(048)</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second error in $\sigma_B^{(s)}$ is due to the uncertainty in the parameter and the first is the sum of errors due to all remaining sources. The second column shows the valid Borel regions and the third column shows the continuum-plus-continuum-change and plus-excited-state contributions at the lower ends of the valid Borel regions. We give the ratios of the sigma term $s$ in the last column.

![Figure 3: Same as Figure 1 but for the sum rules (A7) and (A10).](image)

\[ \sum_{B} m_B^{(s)} \leq \frac{\sigma_B}{m_B^{(s)}} = \frac{\sigma_B}{m_B^{(s)}} \text{MeV}^2; \]  \hspace{1cm} (36a)

where $\sum_{B} m_B^{(s)}$ represent the OPE-m minus-excited state and m minus-continuum-change contributions, and then we plot the logarithm of both sides. As the RHS appears as a straight line with this form, the linearity of the LHS gives an indication of the OPE convergence and

\[ \sum_{B} m_B^{(s)} \leq \frac{\sigma_B}{m_B^{(s)}} = \frac{\sigma_B}{m_B^{(s)}} \text{MeV}^2; \]  \hspace{1cm} (36b)
the quality of the continuum model. This procedure is equivalent to searching for a plateau region as a function of the Borel mass as in the “traditional” analysis of the QCD SR. Figs. 1-6 show the logarithm s of the subtracted form s in (33) as a function of inverse Borel mass squared. A linear behavior of the subtracted form s in these figures implies that the valid Borel regions selected according to the criterion above match the plateau regions.

In Table I we present the values of the sigma term $s$, $s_{1(1)}$ and $s_{1(1)}$, and the transition strengths $C_{B(1)}$ and $C_{B(0)}$, for each resonance as obtained from the sets of (A11)-(A14) with $10^3$ parameter sets. The second column shows the valid Borel regions that are determined according to the criterion explained above and the third column shows the continuum-plus-continuum-change plus-excited-state contributions at the lower ends of the valid Borel regions. For comparison purposes, we also give the values of the sigma term $s$ as obtained from a charm model in Ref. [8] and from NJL model [7, 21] (the latter are obtained by multiplying the quark condensates of the baryons given in Ref. [9] with the central values of the quark masses, $m = 6 \, \text{MeV}$ and $m = 110 \, \text{MeV}$).

We quote two errors for the extracted sigma term $s$: The first is the error due to uncertainty in the parameter set and the second is the sum of errors due to all remaining sources.

The large errors in the final results and the dependence on QCD parameter sets can be substantially removed by considering the ratios of the sigma term $s$. We extract these ratios, which are listed in the last column of Table I, by dividing the corresponding values of the two sigma term $s$ for each QCD parameter set and by making a statistical analysis of the final distribution. By comparing the values of the sigma term $s$ with those of the ratios, we find that the ratios can be determined rather accurately due to cancellations in the systematic errors. The errors of $50\%$ in the final results are reduced to a level of 10-20\% in most of the cases when the ratios are considered. We can see this fact by studying the correlations between the $s$ and the QCD parameter sets via scatter plots. In Fig. 7, we present the scatter plots showing the correlations between $s$, $s$, and $s$. In these figures, the data are normalized with the mean values of the sigma term $s$ (the normized value is represented by $s_{1(1)}$) so that the results can be compared on the same scale. The shaded regions represent the extracted values of the sigma term $s$ with their errors. The data with the error bars (in blue) are shown for reference and give the value of the sigma term $s$ when either $s$ or $s$ are changed by $3$ standard deviations. In Fig. 8 similar scatter plots are given for the correlations between $s$, $s$, $s$, and $s$. The Monte Carlo analysis has the advantage that it covers wide ranges of parameter values. We observe no correlation with $s$ and $s$, which implies that the results are almost independent of $s$ and $s$. A slight positive correlation is observed with the absolute value of $s$, while the correlations with $s$ are somehow stronger. The scatter plots showing the correlations between the sigma term $s$ and the parameter imply that the sum rules have the strongest dependence on $s$. This
Fig. 7: (color online) Scatter plots showing the correlations between $s$, $s$, and $G$. The data are normalized with the mean values of the sigma terms (the normalized value is represented by $\sim \sigma \left( \chi \right)$). The shaded regions represent the extracted values of the sigma term with their errors. The data with the error bars (in blue) are shown for reference and give the value of the sigma term when $s$, $s$, or $G$ deviate by 3 standard deviations.

Fig. 8: (color online) Same as Fig. 7 but for the correlations between $s$, $s$, and $s$, $s$, $G$.

dependence is also the main source of error in the final results of the sigma terms.

We now turn to the ratios of the sigma terms. In Figs. 9 and 10, similar scatter plots are shown for the correlations between the ratios $s$, $s$, $s$, $s$, and the parameters $s$, $s$, $s$, $s$. It is impressive to observe that the errors are reduced to a great extent when the ratios are considered and only a slight dependence remains on the QCD parameters. Even the strongest dependence on one parameter is removed. This behavior is common to all sigma terms, which suggests that more accurate and reliable results can be obtained by considering the ratios.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

We have derived the QCD SR for the scalar quark condensates of the octet and the decuplet baryons. This, together with the definitions in Eqs. (3) and (5), leads to a determination of the baryon sigma terms. We have applied a Monte Carlo-based analysis of the sum rules, where we have generated randomly selected parameter sets from the uncertainties in the QCD input parameters and have made $10^5$ tests in order to determine how the initial errors propagate to the final parameters. To determine the valid Borel windows, we have applied two criteria which take account of the pole dominance and the OPE convergence.
The large errors in the parameter originate from several sources. The factorization violation parameter, and the susceptibilities are the main sources of uncertainty. We have determined the susceptibility of the light quark sector in a model-independent way by using the chiral perturbation theory results. The susceptibility $s^\tau$ can be related to by using the three-flavor NJL model. It is reasonable to assume $s_G$ and $s^\tau$ (with larger uncertainties). Our analysis shows that the sigma terms have no considerable dependence on $s_G$ and $s^\tau$. The results are consistent with the current ones even for the vanishing values of these susceptibilities. We consider anomalous quark contents of the octet and the decuplet baryons by allowing small but non-zero values for $\tau^\tau$, $\tau_G$ and $s^\tau$. Note that such an OZI-rule-violating case is considered as a trial complementary to our analysis. In the limit of vanishing non-diagonal susceptibilities, the sigma terms $s_N$ and $s^\tau$ vanish as well (in consistency with the OZI rule) and all other sigma terms and their ratios are mostly unaffected.

The overlap amplitudes as determined from the baryon-mass rules, which we have used to normalize the sum rules for the sigma terms, introduce considerable uncertainties and can only be improved by a better accuracy of the mass sum rules as a result of reducing the errors in the input QCD parameters. Lastly, the transitions to higher-order states and the unknown change of the continuum threshold with the external field are another sources of uncertainty. We have observed that although a generous range is allowed for the second, it has relatively small impact on the final results and can be safely neglected. However, the transitions to higher-order states, which are not properly suppressed after the Borel transformation, should be included on the phenomenon.
logical side as they give large contributions for most of the cases.

It is impressive to see that the large systematic errors cancel when we consider the ratios of the sigma term s. We would like to stress the ratio values given in Table[1] as our main results, which can be rather accurately determined and have a minimum dependence on the QCD parameter. We have denoted this fact by studying the correlations between the input parameters and the sigma term s together with their ratios. We have found that the ratios depend very weakly on the parameter e as well as on the susceptibilities (within a wide range of 3 standard deviations), as a result of which the error bars shrink. Our results predict the orderings $N > >$ and $s > s$ for the pion-baryon sigma term s, independently of the values of the susceptibilities and. As for the strange-quark m ass contributions to the octet and decuplet baryons, we nd $s > s > s$ and $s > s > s$.

The sigma term gives a m easure of the contribution of explicit chiral-symmetry breaking in the baryon m asses. The QCD Hamiltonian consists of the chiral-invariant term s containing the gauge couplings of gluons and the chiral non-invariant quark-m ass term. Suppose that the chiral non-invariant term is weak and therefore treated perturbatively. Then the sigma term is nothing but the contribution of the quark-m ass term to the baryon m ass. We nd that, among the octet and decuplet hyperons, the chiral-symmetry breaking gives the largest contributions to and baryons. A non-trivial outcome is that and depend mainly on the non-diagonal responses of the quark condensates (besides some small contributions from direct couplings). These sigma term s are consistent with zero in the limit of vanishing non-diagonal susceptibilities. We also nd that is considerably smaller than, which indicates that the quark mass term contributes to m ass splitting. One caveat in the treatment of the octet baryons is that instead of the optimum choices for the interpolating eib, which are known to perform rather successfully in the mass determination [27], it is possible to adopt a generalized definition in terms of arbitrary m ings between two different local operators. Such an extension of our analysis with more general interpolating eib is desirable, but has the difficulty of treating one extra parameter. Note that in the case of the decuplet baryons we have a unique local operator.

Finally, we would like to comment on the anomalous quark content of the baryons. Our sum rules show that a non-vanishing response of $\pi$ to external $S_s(33)$ eib implies $OZI$-rule violating $S_s$ content for the nucleon and the Delta. Similarly, a non-diagonal response of $\pi$ to external $S_s(\nu + d)$ eib leads to a small but non-negligible $S_s$ content for the Omega. Therefore, the interesting question of baryon anomalous quark content boils down to a determination of the susceptibilities $\gamma, \gamma$, and $\gamma$. In the range of the values considered for $\gamma$ and $\gamma$, the value we obtain for the strangeness content of the nucleon as $\gamma = 161.6$ MeV is larger than that from the NJL model but comparing favorably to expectations based on chiral perturbation theory (130 MeV according to Ref. [28]), and on lattice QCD (183–8 MeV according to Ref. [8]). This corresponds to a nucleon strangeness fraction of $\gamma = 0.04$ 0.06 as deduced in Eq. [5], in agreement with that from lattice QCD as $\gamma : 0.036$ [8]. The ratio of the $OZI$-rule violating contributions to the nucleon and the Delta is of special interest:

$$\frac{N}{S} = 0.99 \pm 0.09; \quad (37)$$

which predicts an equivalent strangeness content for the nucleon and the Delta.
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APPENDIX A : THE QCD SUM RULES FOR THE MESON-BARYON SIGMA TERMS

In this Appendix, we give the sum rules for the meson-baryon sigma term s, which are obtained by matching the OPE sides with the hadronic sides and applying the Borel transformation:

$$\begin{align*}
&\frac{4}{3} a^2 M^2 L^{4+9} + \frac{m_s^2}{3} a^3 M^2 L^{14+27} + \frac{m_s^2}{6} (\bar{a}^2 + a^2) M^2 L^{2+27} \\
&\quad + m_s f a^2 M^4 E_0 L^{4+9} + \frac{m_s^2}{6} a^2 f M^2 L^{26+27}
\end{align*}
$$

(A1)

$$\begin{align*}
&= \frac{2}{z} \left( a^2 \bar{a} \right) M^2 \left( a^2 + a^2 \right) M^2 L^{4+9} e^{im^2} + \frac{m_s^2}{3} a^2 f M^2 L^{2+27} + m_s^2 a^2 M^2 L^{2+27} + m_s^2 a^2 M^2 L^{2+27}.
\end{align*}$$
\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{4}{3} a_q (2f) M^4 E_0 & \quad \frac{4}{9} a_q^2 (2f) M^2 L^{4+9} \quad \frac{8}{9} ~ f a_q^2 M^2 L^{4+9} \\
+ \frac{m_0^2}{3} f a_q M^2 L^{14+27} & \quad + \frac{m_0^2}{18} M^2 L^{14+27} \quad (2f) \quad \frac{M^2 L^{2+27}}{3} \quad \frac{M^2 L^{2+27}}{9} \quad \frac{M^2 L^{2+27}}{9} \quad (f + g) M^2 L^{2+27} \\
+ \frac{4m_s^3}{3} M^6 E_1 L^{8+9} & \quad \frac{4m_s^3}{3} M^6 E_1 L^{8+9} \quad \frac{m_0^2}{6} a_q M^4 E_0 L^{4+9} \quad \frac{m_0^2}{6} a_q M^4 E_0 L^{4+9} \\
= & \quad \frac{\sim m}{m^2} f + C \quad M^2 + \frac{w^4}{2} \quad \frac{3m_s^3}{4} (3f + 4) a_q \quad w^2 M^2 L^{4+9} \\
& \quad e^{(m^2 w^2)^e} \quad e^{-m^2 w^2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
a_q M^4 E_0 & \quad \frac{m_0^2}{6} a_q M^2 L^{14+27} \quad \frac{4}{3} \quad \sim f^2 a_q^2 M^2 L^{4+9} \\
+ \frac{m_0^2}{6} (f + g) f a_q M^2 L^{2+27} & \quad + \frac{m_0^2}{3} a_q M^2 L^{26+27} \\
= & \quad \frac{\sim m}{m^2} f + C \quad M^2 + \frac{w^4}{2} \quad \frac{2m_s^3}{3} (f + 4) a_q \quad w^2 M^2 L^{4+9} \\
& \quad e^{(m^2 w^2)^e} \quad e^{-m^2 w^2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{2}{3} a_q (1 + 2f) M^4 E_0 & \quad \frac{16+27}{9} \quad \frac{8}{9} \quad (1 + f) a_q^2 M^2 L^{28+27} \quad \frac{8}{9} \quad f a_q^2 M^2 L^{28+27} \\
+ \frac{m_0^2}{9} (2 + 7f) a_q M^2 L^{2+27} & \quad + \frac{7}{27} (1 + f) \quad (f + g) m_0^2 a_q^2 L^{14+27} \\
+ \frac{14}{27} f (f + g) m_0^2 a_q^2 L^{14+27} & \quad + \frac{4m_s^3}{3} M^6 E_1 L^{8+27} \quad \frac{4m_s^3}{3} a_q M^4 E_0 L^{4+27} \\
+ \frac{5m_s^3}{18} (f + 1) a_q M^4 E_0 L^{10+27} & \quad \frac{7m_s^3}{9} \quad \frac{4m_s^3}{9} (1 + f) a_q^2 L^{16+27} \\
= & \quad \frac{\sim m}{m^2} f + C \quad M^2 + \frac{w^4}{2} \quad \frac{2m_s^3}{3} (f + 4) a_q \quad w^2 M^2 L^{4+27} \\
& \quad e^{(m^2 w^2)^e} \quad e^{-m^2 w^2} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{a_q}{3} M^4 (4f + 1) E_0 & \quad \frac{L^{16+27}}{9} \quad \frac{8}{9} \quad f a_q^2 M^2 L^{28+27} \quad \frac{8}{9} \quad f (1 + f) a_q^2 M^2 L^{28+27} \\
+ \frac{m_0^2}{18} (5 + 14f) a_q M^2 L^{2+27} & \quad + \frac{7}{27} f \quad (f + g) m_0^2 a_q^2 L^{14+27} \\
+ \frac{14}{7} f (f + g) \quad \frac{m_0^2 a_q^2 L^{14+27}}{27} & \quad + \frac{4m_s^3}{3} M^6 E_1 L^{8+27} \quad \frac{7m_s^3}{9} \quad \frac{4m_s^3}{9} (1 + f) a_q^2 L^{16+27} \\
+ \frac{2m_s^3}{9} (f + 2) a_q & \quad \frac{2m_s^3}{3} \quad \frac{2m_s^3}{3} (f + 4) a_q \quad w^2 M^2 L^{4+27} \\
& \quad e^{(m^2 w^2)^e} \quad e^{-m^2 w^2} \\
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\frac{8}{3} a_q M^2 L + \frac{7}{9} f^2 (\sim + \sim_G) m_0^2 a_q M^{14+27} \\
3 m_s f a_q M^4 E_0 L^{4+27} + 3 m_s \sim_G m_0^2 f a_q M^2 L^{10+27} \\
= \sim_2 m \left( \frac{m_s}{m} \right) + C^s M^2 + \frac{w^4}{5} \left( \frac{m_s}{m} \right) \left( a_q M^2 L \right) 4+27 \\
e^{(m^2 \sim (w^4)^2)} e^{(m^2 \sim M^2)} \; ; \\
(A 6)
\]

\[
\frac{4}{3} a_q M^2 L + \frac{7}{9} f^2 (\sim + \sim_G) m_0^2 a_q M^{2+27} \\
= \sim_2 m \frac{m_s}{m} + C^s M^2 + \left( \frac{w^4}{5} \right) \left( \frac{m_s}{m} \right) \left( a_q M^2 L \right) 26+27 \\
e^{(m^2 \sim (w^4)^2)} e^{(m^2 \sim M^2)} \; ; \\
(A 7)
\]

\[
a_q f M^4 E_0 \frac{m_s^2}{6} f a_q M^2 L^{14+27} + \frac{4}{3} a_q M^2 L + \frac{4}{9} a_q (2f + 1) M^2 L^{4+29} \\
+ \frac{m_0^2}{6} (f + 1) a_q M^2 L^{2+27} + 4 m_s M^4 E_1 L^{8+9} + m_s f a_q M^4 E_0 L^{4+9} \\
+ \frac{m_s}{3} a_q M^2 L^{26+27} + \frac{m_s}{3} \sim_G m_0^2 a_q M^2 L^{26+27} \\
= \sim_2 m \frac{m_s}{m} + C^s M^2 + \left( \frac{w^4}{5} \right) \left( \frac{m_s}{m} \right) \left( a_q M^2 L \right) 2+27 \\
e^{(m^2 \sim (w^4)^2)} e^{(m^2 \sim M^2)} \; ; \\
(A 8)
\]

\[
\frac{4}{3} a_q M^2 L + \frac{7}{9} f^2 (\sim + \sim_G) m_0^2 a_q M^{2+27} \\
= \sim_2 m \frac{m_s}{m} + C^s M^2 + \left( \frac{w^4}{5} \right) \left( \frac{m_s}{m} \right) \left( a_q M^2 L \right) 4+27 \\
e^{(m^2 \sim (w^4)^2)} e^{(m^2 \sim M^2)} \; ; \\
(A 9)
\]

\[
\frac{8}{3} a_q M^2 L + \frac{7}{9} f^2 (\sim + \sim_G) m_0^2 a_q M^{14+27} \\
= \sim_2 m \frac{m_s}{m} + C^s M^2 + \left( \frac{w^4}{5} \right) \left( \frac{m_s}{m} \right) \left( a_q M^2 L \right) 4+27 \\
e^{(m^2 \sim (w^4)^2)} e^{(m^2 \sim M^2)} \; ; \\
(A 10)
\]

\[
\frac{8}{3} a_q M^2 L + \frac{7}{9} f^2 (\sim + \sim_G) m_0^2 a_q M^{14+27} \\
= \sim_2 m \frac{m_s}{m} + C^s M^2 + \left( \frac{w^4}{5} \right) \left( \frac{m_s}{m} \right) \left( a_q M^2 L \right) 26+27 \\
e^{(m^2 \sim (w^4)^2)} e^{(m^2 \sim M^2)} \; ; \\
(A 11)
\]
Here $M$ is the Borel mass and we have defined $\sim_{B}^{2} = 32 \frac{4}{B^{(s)}}$ and $\sigma_{B^{(s)}} = 16 \frac{4}{C_{B^{(s)}}}$.

**APPENDIX B: THE QCD SUM RULES FOR THE BARYON MASSES**

We use the following chiral-odd mass sum rules for normalization of the sigma-term sum rules [22, 23, 33]:

\[
\begin{aligned}
m_{N} & : \\
a_{q}B_{1} & M^{4} \frac{1}{18} a_{q} b = \frac{\sim_{N}^{2}}{2} m_{N} e^{m_{N}^{2}} ;
\end{aligned}
\]
\[ M^4 \frac{1}{3} (4 f) a_q E_1 + \frac{1}{2} (4 f) a_q \]  
\[ \frac{m}{3} M^6 E_2 L^{8-9} + \frac{m}{24} b M^2 E_0 L^{8-9} + \frac{4 m}{9} a_q^2 \]  
\[ = \frac{-2}{2} m + e^{m - \lambda^2}; \]  
\[ m \]  
\[ f a_M^4 E_1 + \frac{f a_b}{18} + m a M^6 E_2 L^{8-9} + \frac{m}{8} b M^2 E_0 L^{8-9} + \frac{4 m}{3} a_q^2 \]  
\[ = \frac{-2}{2} m + e^{m - \lambda^2}; \]  
\[ m \]  
\[ a_M^4 E_1 + a_b + 2m a_q = \frac{-2}{2} m + e^{m - \lambda^2}; \]  
\[ m \]  
\[ \frac{4}{3} a_M E_1 (16-27) + \frac{2}{3} a_M L^{2-27} M^2 + 1 \frac{18}{a_q b L^{16-27}} = \frac{-2}{2} m + e^{m - \lambda^2}; \]  
\[ m \]  
\[ \frac{1}{9} (f + 2) a_M^4 E_1 L^{16-27} + \frac{2}{9} (f + 2) m a_M^2 E_0 L^{2-27} + \frac{a_b}{54} (f + 2) L^{16-27} \]  
\[ + \frac{m a}{2} M^6 E_2 L^{8-27} + \frac{m b}{24} M^2 E_0 L^{8-27} + \frac{2m}{3} a_q^2 L^{16-27} = \frac{-2}{2} m + e^{m - \lambda^2}; \]  
\[ m \]  
\[ \frac{4}{9} (2f + 1) a_M^4 E_1 L^{16-27} + \frac{2}{9} (2f + 1) m a_M^2 E_0 L^{2-27} + \frac{a_b}{54} (2f + 1) L^{16-27} \]  
\[ + \frac{m a}{12} M^2 E_0 L^{8-27} + \frac{4m}{3} a_q^2 L^{16-27} = \frac{-2}{2} m + e^{m - \lambda^2}; \]  
\[ m \]  
\[ \frac{4}{3} a_M^4 E_1 L^{16-27} + \frac{2}{3} f m a_M^2 E_0 L^{2-27} + \frac{a_b}{18} f L^{16-27} + \frac{3m}{2} M^6 E_2 L^{8-27} \]  
\[ \frac{m a}{8} M^2 E_0 L^{8-27} + 2m f a_q^2 L^{16-27} = \frac{-2}{2} m + e^{m - \lambda^2}; \]  

---