

## Feynman-Hellmann approach to transition matrix elements and quasidegenerate energy states

M. Batelaan,<sup>1</sup> K. U. Can,<sup>1</sup> R. Horsley,<sup>2</sup> Y. Nakamura,<sup>3</sup> P. E. L. Rakow,<sup>4</sup> G. Schierholz,<sup>5</sup> H. Stüben,<sup>6</sup> R. D. Young,<sup>1,7</sup> and J. M. Zanotti<sup>1</sup>

(QCDSF-UKQCD-CSSM Collaboration)

<sup>1</sup>CSSM, Department of Physics, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia 5005, Australia

<sup>2</sup>School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3FD, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>RIKEN Center for Computational Science, Kobe, Hyogo 650-0047, Japan

<sup>4</sup>Theoretical Physics Division, Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool L69 3BX, United Kingdom

<sup>5</sup>Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Notkestr. 85, 22607 Hamburg, Germany

<sup>6</sup>Universität Hamburg, Regionales Rechenzentrum, 20146 Hamburg, Germany

<sup>7</sup>Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA



(Received 16 May 2023; accepted 5 July 2023; published 18 August 2023)

The Feynman-Hellmann approach to computing matrix elements in lattice QCD by first adding a perturbing operator to the action is described using the transition matrix and the Dyson expansion formalism. This perturbs the energies in the two-point baryon correlation function, from which the matrix element can be obtained. In particular at leading order in the perturbation we need to diagonalize a matrix of near-degenerate energies. While the method is general for all hadrons, we apply it here to a study of a sigma to nucleon baryon transition vector matrix element.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.034507](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.034507)

### I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum chromodynamics—the theory of quarks and gluons has been spectacularly successful in describing inelastic scattering of particles at very high energies, as witnessed in particle accelerators. In this region the coupling constant decreases and allows the application of perturbation theory for quarks and gluons. However at lower energies these bind into hadrons. This is a nonperturbative effect and presently the most successful method to try to describe this is via numerical Monte Carlo simulations of a discretized version of QCD—lattice QCD. While this approach has been pursued from the early days of QCD, it is only recently that computer speeds have improved to such an extent that reasonably accurate numerical results are possible. The general situation of the field is given in [1]. While many

early computations were for the mass spectrum, more recently the focus is on matrix elements, particularly for the nucleon or more generally for the baryon octet.<sup>1</sup>

Most of these baryon matrix elements are needed at nonzero momentum transfer. Typical examples are those relevant to lepton-hadron scattering processes leading to form factors, e.g. see [2–4] for recent reviews, or to inelastic processes such as deep inelastic scattering (DIS) with the associated parton distribution functions (PDFs) e.g. [5,6] or alternatively via the related hadron tensor or Compton amplitude to give the structure function [7–9]. [Often the operator product expansion (OPE) is used as it is simpler to determine moments of structure functions, which are also related to matrix elements.] Alternatively matrix elements at low energies for baryon (or meson) semileptonic decays are of interest. Indeed, these matrix elements are becoming increasingly important, as they provide crucial input into the precision determination

Published by the American Physical Society under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. Further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the published article's title, journal citation, and DOI. Funded by SCOAP<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>While we shall concentrate on the baryon octet in this article, the results presented here are more general and applicable to all hadrons.

of elements of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) [10,11], nuclear physics [12] and the search for beyond-the-standard-model effects in neutron  $\beta$ -decay, [13–16], and as such are to be regarded as complementary to searches at the large hadron collider (LHC).

Traditionally matrix elements have been computed from three-point correlation functions. On the lattice these require a (baryon) source and sink together with an operator between them. To avoid excited state contamination and to achieve ground state dominance the distances between the source, operator and sink must be large enough for this to be numerically achieved. However, given the lattice sizes at present available and coupled with the fact that higher-point correlation functions are numerically noisier, this can be difficult to achieve. More recently an alternative approach based on the Feynman-Hellmann theorem has emerged [17–20]. This perturbs the QCD action with a given operator leading to the required matrix element residing in the resulting energy shift. This can be determined from a two-point correlation function with just a source and sink, rather than a three-point correlation function.

While this approach has been successfully applied to elastic form factors [21], as described in more detail later this needed an application of (degenerate) perturbation theory for matrix elements with baryons having the same energy. While possible, in practice this restricts the approach. In this article we shall generalize previous results from needing degenerate energies to “near-degenerate” or “quasidegenerate” energies. As discussed here this then allows us to consider processes such as the decays of baryons, where it is otherwise difficult to achieve degeneracy of their respective energies.

Derivations of the Feynman-Hellmann approach can be given based on the two-point Green’s function defined from the partition function, or from the transfer matrix viewpoint. In this article we shall adopt the latter approach. In principle this can allow for a better discussion of the source and sink wave functions to be used. In Sec. II we briefly describe the transfer matrix technique, mainly to introduce our notation and modification of the QCD Hamiltonian to include a perturbing operator. We shall take the spectrum of the QCD Hamiltonian to have a set of isolated quasidegenerate energy states. In Sec. III we consider a two-point baryon correlation function which upon using the Dyson expansion for the transfer matrix leads, for large source-sink separation times  $t$ , to the result given in Eq. (28), namely a sum of exponential decays in  $t$  with coefficients given by various perturbed energies. The energies are related to eigenvalues from the diagonalization of a matrix in the space of quasidegenerate states and leads to the phenomenon of “avoided” energy levels. The simplest case is of two quasidegenerate states, leading to the solution of a quadratic equation for the eigenvalues. To resolve these energy states we regard the associated two-point correlation function matrix as a generalized

eigenvalue problem (GEVP) which is equivalent to a variational approach [22–24]. (This is further discussed in Sec. V when we consider the numerical implementation.) Furthermore, incorporating the spin index, as also discussed in this section, leads to a doubling of the eigenvalue matrix. However, due to the spin structure of the baryon matrix elements under consideration this does not complicate the determination of the eigenvalues significantly.

The results are rather general, and in this article in Sec. IV and the Appendices we consider several examples. They are all variations where the kinematic geometry is chosen so that initial baryon,  $B$ , moves with 3-momentum  $\vec{p}$  and the final baryon,  $B'$  with momentum  $\vec{p}' = \vec{p} + \vec{q}$  (or alternatively  $\vec{p} - \vec{q}$ ) where  $\vec{q}$  is the momentum transfer chosen such that  $E_B(\vec{p}) \approx E_{B'}(\vec{p}')$ . Taking  $B' = B$  for flavor diagonal baryons describes the lepton scattering case, while  $B' \neq B$  gives the flavor changing decay case appropriate to investigating weak decays. In Sec. V we discuss specific lattice arrangements. We first discuss our proposal for including the (quark) operator in the action and the subsequent matrix inversion. This effectively inserts the operator in quark lines between the source and sink baryons and so we consider here valence insertions only. (To include sea quarks for flavor diagonal matrix elements would require special-purpose generation of configurations or reweighting with trace estimates.) The explicit example of the vector current decay  $\Sigma \rightarrow N$ , [25–28], is then considered, whose transition matrix elements are flavor off-diagonal. Some numerical results follow, which we also compare with the conventional three-point correlation function determination of the matrix element. Section VII gives our conclusions.

The Appendixes give some further details of the methods employed in this article. Appendix A briefly discusses the Euclideanized matrix elements, for completeness, of all local bilinear currents. To evaluate these we need in turn the spinor bilinear terms, which are given in Appendix B. In Appendix C we give an alternative derivation of the energy results including spin for the examples considered here. In Appendix D we describe all the correlation functions needed for this article, while Appendix E gives some more details of the fermion matrix inversion employed here. Preliminary results have appeared in [29].

## II. THE TRANSFER MATRIX

### A. Background

In this article we shall consider the Euclidean two-point correlation function with a Hamiltonian which includes a perturbing operator with a possible 3-momentum transfer  $\vec{q}$

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\lambda B' B}(t) &= \langle \hat{B}'(t; \vec{p}') \hat{B}(0, \vec{0}) \rangle_{\lambda} \\ &= \text{tr}[\hat{B}'(t; \vec{p}') \hat{B}(0, \vec{0}) \hat{S}_{\lambda}(\vec{q})^T] / \text{tr} \hat{S}_{\lambda}(\vec{q})^T, \quad (1) \end{aligned}$$

where  $T$  is the temporal box size and with  $\hat{B}(0, \vec{0})$  the initial baryon state at time 0 and spatial origin  $\vec{x}_0 = \vec{0}$  together with  $\hat{B}'(t; \vec{p}')$  the final baryon state at time  $t$  and momentum  $\vec{p}'$ . Presently we shall ignore any complications arising from the baryon spin structure, and include this later by generalizing appropriately the formulas obtained. (Other hadrons, for example mesons, could thus be considered.) The final baryon state<sup>2</sup>

$$\hat{B}'(t; \vec{p}') = \int_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}'\cdot\vec{x}} \hat{B}'(t, \vec{x}), \quad (2)$$

is a function of momentum  $\vec{p}'$ . We shall not consider any possible lattice discretization effects in this article, so we shall use a continuum notation in all dimensions. As the initial baryon state is taken at the source position  $\vec{x}_0 = \vec{0}$  it contains all momenta and thus

$$\hat{B}(0, \vec{0}) = \int_{\vec{p}} \hat{B}(0; \vec{p}). \quad (3)$$

This arrangement is adopted because when numerically finding the correlation function we invert the Dirac operator for the Green's function on a spatial source point.

The transfer matrix  $\hat{S}_\lambda$  is defined by

$$\hat{S}_\lambda(\vec{q}) = e^{-\hat{H}_\lambda(\vec{q})}, \quad (4)$$

where we assume the Hamiltonian,  $\hat{H}_\lambda$ , exists together with the associated complete set of energy eigenstates,<sup>3</sup> in particular a unique vacuum state.

We shall consider a perturbed Hamiltonian, here given by

$$\hat{H}_\lambda(\vec{q}) = \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{\alpha} \lambda_{\alpha} \hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{q}), \quad (5)$$

with momentum  $\vec{q}$ , as an expansion in  $\lambda_{\alpha}$  where  $\alpha$  is to be regarded as just a label (so for example can be a single Lorentz index or a collection of indices). The perturbing operator  $\hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{q})$  is defined by

$$\hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{q}) = \int_{\vec{x}} \left( \hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{x}) e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} + \hat{O}_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(\vec{x}) e^{-i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} \right), \quad (6)$$

<sup>2</sup>For simplicity we use a mixture of continuum notation and discrete notation. We shall not consider any possible lattice artifacts effects here. So, for example, we shall use

$$\frac{(2\pi)^3}{V} \delta^3(\vec{p} - \vec{q}) \equiv \delta_{\vec{p}, \vec{q}} = \begin{cases} 1 & \vec{p} = \vec{q} \\ 0 & \vec{p} \neq \vec{q} \end{cases}.$$

<sup>3</sup>Strictly speaking, even for the unperturbed action considered later here, see Sec. V B 3, positivity is lost, but a transfer matrix can still be defined [30]. Practically, this is not a problem and we ignore this point here.

where  $\hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{x})$  may be taken to be a bilinear in the quark fields, i.e. a generalized current, see Appendix A for some more details.  $\hat{H}_0$  conserves momentum, but  $\hat{H}_\lambda$  only conserves momentum modulo  $\vec{q}$ . In this form  $\hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{q})$  is Hermitian. Note that in [31] we considered just the case where  $\hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{x})$  is also Hermitian. (It is possible to generalize to non-Hermitian operators (see [19]), however we shall not consider this further here.) As the previous equations indicate, we are considering operators defined in Euclidean space. The Hermiticity relation for bilinear operators between the Euclidean and Minkowski spaces is also briefly discussed in Appendix A. It is also easy to include covariant derivatives, for example in Eq. (23) in [32] where the general relation between the Minkowski and Euclidean operators for the vector and axial currents was given. We do not discuss this case further here.

We can also incorporate the generalization to complex  $\lambda$  by writing  $\lambda$  in polar form,  $\lambda_{\alpha} = |\lambda_{\alpha}| e^{i\phi_{\alpha}}$  and absorb the phase into the definition of the operator. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\alpha} \hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{q}) &\rightarrow \lambda_{\alpha} \int_{\vec{x}} \hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{x}) e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} + \lambda_{\alpha}^* \int_{\vec{x}} \hat{O}_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(\vec{x}) e^{-i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} \\ &= |\lambda_{\alpha}| \int_{\vec{x}} (e^{i\phi_{\alpha}} \hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{x})) e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} \\ &\quad + |\lambda_{\alpha}| \int_{\vec{x}} (e^{i\phi_{\alpha}} \hat{O}_{\alpha}(\vec{x}))^{\dagger} e^{-i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

This can be useful if we are considering the  $O(\lambda^2)$  terms which gives the Compton amplitude [8,31,33], as indicated here in Sec. III A (real  $\lambda$  gives the symmetric part of the amplitude while complex  $\lambda$  enables the antisymmetric part of the Compton amplitude to be determined). However, as we are only interested in the  $O(\lambda)$  result here, for simplicity of notation in future we just take  $\lambda_{\alpha}$  as real. In addition for this case then the index  $\alpha$  is redundant, as we are practically just considering one operator. So we shall usually suppress it, but it can easily be reinstated if necessary. (Again, if we are interested in the  $O(\lambda^2)$  or higher-order terms then the index is relevant, as cross terms of operators appear.)

First using  $\hat{B}'(t; \vec{p}) = \hat{S}_{\lambda}^{\dagger}(\vec{q})' \hat{B}'(0; \vec{p}) \hat{S}_{\lambda}(\vec{q})'$  and then inserting a complete set of states (in the presence of the perturbation) and taking the temporal box size large picks out the vacuum state and gives the usual result

$$C_{\lambda B'B}(t) = {}_{\lambda} \langle 0 | \hat{B}'(0; \vec{p}') \hat{S}_{\lambda}(\vec{q})' \hat{B}(0, \vec{0}) | 0 \rangle_{\lambda}, \quad (8)$$

where  $|0\rangle_{\lambda}$  is the vacuum in the presence of the perturbation and the spectrum of  $\hat{H}$  is now normalized with respect to this vacuum. As all the operators are at time  $t = 0$ , in future we drop this argument. Equation (8) is the basic equation we shall consider in this article.




FIG. 1. A sketch of the energy levels. The set of quasidegenerate energy states are denoted by  $S$ , labeled from 1 to  $d_S$ . These states are well-separated from other states.

### B. Quasidegenerate energy states

We shall first derive a general expression, and then consider particular cases. In particular we shall consider discrete degenerate energy states, i.e.  $E_{B_r}(\vec{p}_r) = E_{B_s}(\vec{p}_s)$  or near-degenerate energy states  $E_{B_r}(\vec{p}_r) \approx E_{B_s}(\vec{p}_s)$ , both possibilities labeled by  $r = 1, 2, \dots$  (similarly for  $s$ ) each with a given fixed momentum. Collectively we call this set  $S$  of “quasidegenerate energy” states, the total number being  $d_S$ .

In this scenario, as we shall see, simple perturbation theory as it stands breaks down and we have to consider degenerate perturbation theory. This also ensures smooth behavior in  $\lambda$ . In the following we shall assume that these energy states are the only possible quasidegenerate states and well-separated from other states, as sketched in Fig. 1. We shall later argue that other states are either more damped (those with higher energies in the figure), or for any lower state(s) a GEVP must be applied. However in this article we will only consider the quasidegenerate energy states as the ground states.

The spectrum of the unperturbed Hamiltonian,  $\hat{H}_0$ , is given by

$$\hat{H}_0|X(\vec{p}_X)\rangle = E_X(\vec{p}_X)|X(\vec{p}_X)\rangle. \quad (9)$$

Let  $S$  be the discrete set of quasidegenerate energy states and have  $d_S$  elements labeled by  $r$ . More concretely we write for these states

$$E_{B_r}(\vec{p}_r) = \bar{E} + \epsilon_r, \quad r = 1, \dots, d_S, \quad (10)$$

where  $\bar{E}$  is some suitable energy close to all the quasidegenerate energies. It could be taken as the average over the quasidegenerate energy states  $\bar{E} = (E_{B_1} + \dots + E_{B_{d_S}})/d_S$  where we would have  $\epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_{d_S} = 0$  but this is not necessary in the following. (Alternatively we could choose one of the quasidegenerate energy states, such as the one with lowest energy.) Writing  $\epsilon_r = \epsilon c_r$  where  $c_r \sim O(1)$  then  $\epsilon \sim |E_{B_r}(\vec{p}_r) - E_{B_s}(\vec{p}_s)|$  effectively represents the difference in energies between the quasidegenerate states where  $\epsilon$  is small and is taken in the following to be another expansion parameter in addition to  $\lambda$ . The corresponding states are denoted by  $|B_r(\vec{p}_r)\rangle$ . For these quasidegenerate states we have the energies  $E_{B_r}(\vec{p}_r)$  defined by

$$\hat{H}_0|B_r(\vec{p}_r)\rangle = E_{B_r}(\vec{p}_r)|B_r(\vec{p}_r)\rangle. \quad (11)$$

The set of unperturbed states obeys the completeness condition where we sum over all states and momenta. We often explicitly isolate the quasidegenerate states so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X(\vec{p}_X)} |X(\vec{p}_X)\rangle \langle X(\vec{p}_X)| \\ \equiv \sum_r |B_r(\vec{p}_r)\rangle \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r)| + \int_{X(\vec{p}_X) \notin S} |X(\vec{p}_X)\rangle \langle X(\vec{p}_X)| = \hat{1}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

We use the lattice normalization, namely

$$\langle X(\vec{p}_X)|Y(\vec{p}_Y)\rangle = \delta_{X,Y} \delta_{\vec{p}_X, \vec{p}_Y}. \quad (13)$$

However all the formulas and results are such that they can be easily converted to another normalization by the substitution for all states

$$|X(\vec{p}_X)\rangle \rightarrow \frac{|X(\vec{p}_X)\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle X(\vec{p}_X)|X(\vec{p}_X)\rangle}}, \quad |0\rangle \rightarrow |0\rangle. \quad (14)$$

The usual case, of course, is the relativistic normalization

$$\langle X(\vec{p}_X)|Y(\vec{p}_Y)\rangle_{\text{rel}} = 2E_X(\vec{p}_X) \delta_{X,Y} \delta_{\vec{p}_X, \vec{p}_Y}, \quad (15)$$

which we shall later use when discussing the numerical results.

Now inserting two complete sets of unperturbed states before and after  $\hat{S}'_\lambda$  in Eq. (8) gives

$$C_{\lambda B'B}(t) = \int_{X(\vec{p}_X)} \int_{Y(\vec{p}_Y)} \lambda \langle 0|\hat{B}'(\vec{p}')|X(\vec{p}_X)\rangle \langle X(\vec{p}_X)|\hat{S}'_\lambda(\vec{q}')|Y(\vec{p}_Y)\rangle \langle Y(\vec{p}_Y)|\hat{B}(\vec{0})|0\rangle_\lambda. \quad (16)$$

From Eq. (2), as  $\hat{B}'$  has a definite momentum,  $\vec{p}'$ , we can take the geometry to be such that we have a good overlap with just one of the  $d_S$  quasidegenerate states  $|B_r(\vec{p}_r)\rangle$  as depicted in Fig. 1. For  $\hat{B}(\vec{0})$  we also choose an operator with a good overlap

with one of the quasidegenerate states noting that it contains all momenta. We shall further discuss this in the next section, but initially we shall keep the operators general.

### III. DYSON SERIES AND THE CORRELATION FUNCTION

#### A. Perturbed energies

We wish to determine  $C_{\lambda B'B}(t)$  to  $O(\lambda)$ . To this end, first for any two operators  $\hat{A}$ ,  $\hat{B}$  consider the function defined by

$$e^{-(H_0 + \lambda_\alpha O_\alpha)t} = e^{-\hat{H}_0 t} - \lambda_\alpha \int_0^t dt' e^{-\hat{H}_0(t-t')} \hat{O}_\alpha e^{-\hat{H}_0 t'} + \lambda_\alpha \lambda_\beta \int_0^t dt' \int_0^{t'} dt'' e^{-\hat{H}_0(t-t')} \hat{O}_\alpha e^{-\hat{H}_0(t'-t'')} \hat{O}_\beta e^{-\hat{H}_0 t''} + O(\lambda^3), \quad (18)$$

which is equivalent to the Dyson expansion. We note that the term quadratic in  $\lambda$  can be manipulated into a form appropriate for the Compton amplitude. An alternative derivation using the path integral is discussed in [8,31]. A recent review is given in [34]. For the specific approach using the transfer matrix given here see also [33].

To evaluate  $C_{\lambda B'B}(t)$  we apply the Dyson expansion of Eq. (18) to Eq. (16) after splitting the completeness relation as given in Eq. (12). As mentioned before we shall consider the case where  $E_X$  (and  $E_Y$ ) are much greater than all the isolated quasidegenerate states as depicted in Fig. 1, i.e.  $E_X, E_Y \gg \bar{E}$  in Eq. (12). There are four terms and dropping temporarily the momentum arguments gives

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B_r | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{O})t} | B_s \rangle &= e^{-\bar{E}t} (\delta_{rs} - t D_{rs} + O(2)), \\ \langle B_r | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{O})t} | Y \rangle &= -e^{-\bar{E}t} \left( \lambda \frac{\langle B_r | \hat{O} | Y \rangle}{E_Y - E_{B_r}} + O(2) \right) + \text{more damped}, \\ \langle X | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{O})t} | B_s \rangle &= -e^{-\bar{E}t} \left( \lambda \frac{\langle X | \hat{O} | B_s \rangle}{E_X - E_{B_s}} + O(2) \right) + \text{more damped}, \\ \langle X | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{O})t} | Y \rangle &= \text{more damped}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where we have defined the  $d_S \times d_S$  matrix<sup>4</sup>

$$D_{rs} = \epsilon_r \delta_{rs} + \lambda a_{rs}, \quad \text{with} \quad a_{rs} = \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r) | \hat{O}(\vec{q}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s) \rangle. \quad (20)$$

Note that from Eq. (10) we have  $\epsilon_r = E_{B_r} - \bar{E}$ . In Eq. (19) “more damped” means that these terms drop off as  $\propto e^{-E_X t}$ , i.e. faster than  $e^{-\bar{E}t}$ . The kept terms (i.e.  $D$ ) means terms of the form  $O(1)$  or  $O(\epsilon t)$ ,  $O(\lambda t)$  while  $O(2)$  means terms of

$f(t) = e^{-t\hat{A}} e^{t(\hat{A}+\hat{B})}$ . By the usual technique of differentiating and then integrating  $f(t)$  with respect to  $t$  we soon find the operator identity

$$e^{t(\hat{A}+\hat{B})} = e^{t\hat{A}} + \int_0^t dt' e^{(t-t')\hat{A}} \hat{B} e^{t'(\hat{A}+\hat{B})}. \quad (17)$$

Regarding  $\hat{B}$  as “small”, this can be iterated. From Eq. (5) we thus set  $\hat{A} \rightarrow -\hat{H}_0$  and  $\hat{B} \rightarrow -\lambda_\alpha \hat{O}_\alpha$ . This gives to  $O(\lambda^2)$ ,

the form  $O(\epsilon^2 t^2)$ ,  $O(\lambda^2 t^2)$ ,  $O(\epsilon t \lambda t)$ . Thus, for this expansion to be valid we need  $\lambda t \ll 1$ ,  $|\epsilon_r| t \ll 1$  and  $t \gg 0$  (for the damped terms to be negligible) thus

$$0 \ll t \ll \frac{1}{\lambda}, \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \ll t \ll \frac{1}{\max |E_{B_r}(\vec{p}_r) - E_{B_s}(\vec{p}_s)|}. \quad (21)$$

Furthermore defining  $|B_s(\vec{p}_s)\rangle_\lambda$  as

$$|B_s(\vec{p}_s)\rangle_\lambda = |B_s(\vec{p}_s)\rangle - \lambda \sum_{E_Y \gg \bar{E}} |Y(\vec{p}_Y)\rangle \frac{\langle Y(\vec{p}_Y) | \hat{O}(\vec{q}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s) \rangle}{E_Y - E_{B_s}}, \quad (22)$$

then we can rewrite Eq. (16) as

$$C_{\lambda B'B}(t) = \sum_{rs} \lambda \langle 0 | \hat{B}'(\vec{p}') | B_r(\vec{p}_r) \rangle_\lambda \langle B_r | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{O})t} | B_s \rangle_\lambda \langle B_s(\vec{p}_s) | \hat{B}(\vec{0}) | 0 \rangle_\lambda, \quad (23)$$

<sup>4</sup> $D$  is a function of the momenta, but as with  $C_{\lambda B'B}(t)$  we shall suppress this dependence.

where

$$\langle B_r(\vec{p}_r) | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{\mathcal{O}})t} | B_s(\vec{p}_s) \rangle = (\delta_{rs} - t D_{rs}) \times e^{-\bar{E}t}. \quad (24)$$

Note that we have achieved a factorization where any unwanted  $|Y\rangle$  states, with  $E_Y \gg E_{B_s}$ , have been absorbed into the time-independent renormalization of the wave function and do not need to be further considered.

The matrix  $D$  given in Eq. (20) can be diagonalized, as it is Hermitian by construction. Let  $\mu^{(i)}$  be the real eigenvalues and  $e_r^{(i)}$  the associated orthonormal  $d_S$  dimensional eigenvectors

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d_S} e_r^{(i)} e_s^{(i)*} = \delta_{rs}, \quad \sum_{r=1}^{d_S} e_r^{(i)*} e_r^{(j)} = \delta^{ij}. \quad (25)$$

Thus, we have

$$D_{rs} = \sum_{i=1}^{d_S} \mu^{(i)} e_r^{(i)} e_s^{(i)*}. \quad (26)$$

(Note that to find the eigenvalues we have to first solve a  $d_S$ -dimensional polynomial.) So all together using this in Eq. (24) we find the intermediate result

$$\langle B_r | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{\mathcal{O}})t} | B_s \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d_S} e_r^{(i)} [1 - t \mu^{(i)}] e_s^{(i)*} \times e^{-\bar{E}t}, \quad (27)$$

which we now use to find the final form of the correlation function.

## B. The correlation function

### 1. General result

Finally, we reexponentiate the first term in Eq. (27) and then substitute back into Eq. (23) to give the leading term at large  $t$  of

$$C_{\lambda B' B}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_S} A_{\lambda B' B}^{(i)} e^{-E_\lambda^{(i)} t}, \quad (28)$$

where the perturbed energies are given by

$$E_\lambda^{(i)} = \bar{E} + \mu^{(i)}, \quad (29)$$

and the amplitude

$$A_{\lambda B' B}^{(i)} = w_{B'}^{(i)} \bar{w}_B^{(i)}, \quad (30)$$

with

$$w_{B'}^{(i)} = \sum_{r=1}^{d_S} Z_r^{B'} e_r^{(i)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w}_B^{(i)} = \sum_{s=1}^{d_S} \bar{Z}_s^B e_s^{(i)*}, \quad (31)$$

where the wave functions, or overlaps, are

$$Z_r^{B'} = {}_\lambda \langle 0 | \hat{B}'(\vec{p}') | B_r(\vec{p}_r) \rangle_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{Z}_s^B = {}_\lambda \langle B_s(\vec{p}_s) | \hat{B}(\vec{0}) | 0 \rangle_\lambda. \quad (32)$$

Equations (28)–(32) are the results that we shall be using in the following.

In the final/initial baryon space,  $\{B', B\}$ , the determination of  $E_\lambda^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, d_S$  is now equivalent to a GEVP, where we diagonalize a matrix of correlation functions. To determine all the energies we thus require this to be at least a  $d_S \times d_S$  matrix, so both the sets  $\{B'\}$  and  $\{B\}$  must be at least  $d_S$  dimensional.

If there were states  $|Z\rangle$  with lower energy than the quasidegenerate energy states and hence less damped than these states then the  $\{B', B\}$  space must be increased and a larger GEVP applied. We do not consider this lower-energy case further here, and take the quasidegenerate energy states to be the lowest states. Additionally, if the higher-energy states have not died away sufficiently then a larger  $\{B', B\}$  space could also be used.

### 2. A simplification

The above result is true for general source and sink operators. If as mentioned before, we set  $\hat{B}'$  and  $\hat{B}$  “close” to  $\hat{B}_r$  and  $\hat{B}_s$  respectively then the above expressions greatly simplify and we expect that Eq. (31) reduces to

$$w_r^{(i)} = Z_r^{B'} e_r^{(i)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w}_s^{(i)} = \bar{Z}_s^B e_s^{(i)*}. \quad (33)$$

In turn this means that the overlaps  $Z_r^{B'}$  and  $\bar{Z}_s^B$  although defined using the perturbed states of Eq. (22), the  $O(\lambda)$  terms have then little effect. For example for  $Z_r^{B'}$  using Eq. (22)<sup>5</sup> to expand  ${}_\lambda \langle 0 | \hat{B}'(\vec{p}') | B_r(\vec{p}_r) \rangle_\lambda$  the  $O(\lambda)$  terms which involve overlaps such as  $\langle 0 | \hat{B}_r | Y \rangle$  or  $\langle X | \hat{B}_r | B_r \rangle$  vanish or are small due to the orthogonality of the spectrum, so the effect of the perturbation on the overlaps is higher order in  $\lambda$ . We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_r^{B'} &= \langle 0 | \hat{B}_r(\vec{0}) | B_r(\vec{p}_r) \rangle + \dots \quad \text{and} \\ \bar{Z}_s^B &= \langle B_s(\vec{p}_s) | \hat{B}_s(\vec{0}) | 0 \rangle + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where in addition for  $Z_r^{B'}$  we have also used  $\hat{B}(\vec{x}) = e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \hat{B}(\vec{0}) e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}}$  to rewrite it in the above form.

### C. The relation between the initial and final momenta

While the equations in Sec. III B are the basic results, this discussion is general and can be applied to many

<sup>5</sup>We shall assume that this also holds for the perturbed vacuum,  $|0\rangle_\lambda$ .

quantum systems. We shall now be more specific to the situation here. However before considering some examples we shall first discuss some properties of the matrix element appearing in Eq. (20). Using  $\hat{O}(\vec{x}) = e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}}\hat{O}(\vec{0})e^{i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}}$  we soon find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r) | \hat{O}(\vec{q}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s) \rangle &= \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r) | \hat{O}(\vec{0}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s) \rangle \delta_{\vec{p}_r, \vec{p}_s + \vec{q}} \\ &+ \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r) | \hat{O}^\dagger(\vec{0}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s) \rangle \delta_{\vec{p}_r, \vec{p}_s - \vec{q}}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Thus the initial momentum,  $\vec{p}_s$  either steps up or down by  $\vec{q}$ , i.e.

$$\vec{p}_r = \vec{p}_s + \vec{q}, \quad \text{or} \quad \vec{p}_r = \vec{p}_s - \vec{q}, \quad (36)$$

and the quasidegenerate states, as sketched in Fig. 1, are mixed together.

As a simple example, to be discussed in some detail in Sec. IV, let us take the two-dimensional quasidegenerate state subspace as having momentum  $\vec{p}$  and  $\vec{p} + \vec{q}$ . Thus, the final momentum  $\vec{p}_r$  can be chosen to be either  $\vec{p}_r = \vec{p} + \vec{q}$  with the + sign and  $\vec{p}_s = \vec{p}$  (or  $\vec{p}_r = \vec{p} - \vec{q}$  with the - sign and  $\vec{p}_s = \vec{p}$ ) to remain within this subspace. We shall use these results frequently in the coming presentation.

A corollary from Eq. (35) is that for a nonzero momentum transfer,  $\vec{q} \neq 0$ , the diagonal matrix elements  $a_{rr}$  in Eq. (20) are zero, so the  $O(\lambda)$  terms vanish and hence  $D$  becomes trivial. This was alluded to before; if we are investigating momentum transfer and form factors, then we are forced to consider the degenerate energy case to determine the matrix element [21]. Nonzero off-diagonal matrix elements leads to the phenomenon of avoided energy levels, as discussed later in Sec. IV.

As well as degeneracies between levels differing in momentum by  $\pm\vec{q}$  there will also be cases where states differing by  $\pm 2\vec{q}$ ,  $\pm 3\vec{q}$ , etc. are nearly degenerate. Such degeneracies will be converted into avoided level crossings by the operator acting multiple times. [These are determined by higher orders in  $\lambda$  of the Dyson expansion in Eq. (18).] We have not investigated these higher-order cases here.

#### D. Incorporating the spin index

We now consider the complications caused by the spinor index and the consequent spin-1/2 carried by the octet baryons. Until now we have postponed this discussion, so strictly the previous results correspond to spinless scalar particles. To incorporate the spin index,  $\sigma$  and the corresponding Dirac index  $\alpha$  we shall see that this involves an alternative approach to that usually used when computing 3-point correlation functions. We first generalize Eqs. (23) and (24) appropriately and together with  $\hat{B}' \sim \hat{B}_r$  and  $\hat{B} \sim \hat{B}_s$  this gives

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\lambda B_r \alpha B_s \beta}(t) &= \sum_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s} \lambda \langle 0 | \hat{B}_{r\alpha}(\vec{p}_r) | B_r(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) \rangle_\lambda \\ &\times \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{O})t} | B_s(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) \rangle \\ &\times \lambda \langle B_s(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) | \hat{B}_{s\beta}(\vec{0}) | 0 \rangle_\lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) | e^{-(\hat{H}_0 + \lambda \hat{O})t} | B_s(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) \rangle \\ = (\delta_{\sigma_r \sigma_s} \delta_{r s} - t D_{\sigma_r r, \sigma_s s}) \times e^{-\hat{E}t}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

and

$$D_{\sigma_r r, \sigma_s s} = \epsilon_r \delta_{\sigma_r \sigma_s} \delta_{r s} + \lambda a_{\sigma_r r, \sigma_s s}, \quad (39)$$

where we have now defined  $a_{\sigma_r r, \sigma_s s}$  as the matrix element

$$a_{\sigma_r r, \sigma_s s} = \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) | \hat{O}(\vec{q}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) \rangle. \quad (40)$$

As the spin  $\sigma_r = \pm$  the  $D$  matrix is doubled in size, now being a  $2d_s \times 2d_s$  matrix, i.e. the  $r$  index is interlaced in  $\pm$  pairs. The matrix element is defined with respect to  $\hat{H}_0$  and we expect that the energies corresponding to the spin states  $|B(\vec{p}, \sigma)\rangle$ , with  $\sigma = \pm$  are degenerate. (This is a reflection of Kramers degeneracy.)

We could continue as before with this enlarged matrix. However when we have only spin non-flip (the case considered here) or spin-flip matrix elements, it is simplest to try to keep as close as possible to the previous results. We can achieve this by writing the overlaps as

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \langle 0 | \hat{B}_{r\alpha}(\vec{0}) | B_r(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) \rangle_{\lambda \text{rel}} &= Z_r u_\alpha^{(r)}(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) + \dots \\ \lambda \langle B_s(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) | \hat{B}_{s\beta}(\vec{0}) | 0 \rangle_{\lambda \text{rel}} &= \bar{Z}_s \bar{u}_\beta^{(s)}(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

where  $Z_r$  and  $\bar{Z}_s$  are taken as scalars with  $\bar{Z} = Z^*$ . Although the states here are the perturbed states, rather than the unperturbed states, again we expect the effect of the perturbation to be small, as discussed in Sec. III B 2.

Furthermore, although we could consider the Dirac indices as a GEVP it is more convenient to sum over them with some matrix,  $\Gamma$ . In this article we shall primarily consider the unpolarized case with

$$\Gamma^{\text{unpol}} = (1 + \gamma_4)/2, \quad (42)$$

so

$$C_{\lambda r s}(t) = \text{tr} \Gamma^{\text{unpol}} C_{\lambda B_r B_s}(t). \quad (43)$$

Using

$$\bar{u}^{(r)}(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) \Gamma^{\text{unpol}} u^{(s)}(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) = \sqrt{(E_r + M_r)(E_s + M_s)} \delta_{\sigma_r \sigma_s}, \quad (44)$$

[see Appendix B and Eq. (B20)] means that due to the  $\delta_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s}$  term appearing there, the  $\sigma_r, \sigma_s$  sums in Eq. (37) become diagonal, and hence we just sum over them in Eqs. (38), (39). This reduces  $D$  to the previous  $d_s \times d_s$  matrix as in Sec. III B, where

$$D_{rs} = \epsilon_r \delta_{rs} + \lambda a_{rs}, \quad \text{with} \quad a_{rs} = \frac{1}{2} (a_{+,r,+s} + a_{-,r,-s}). \quad (45)$$

This effectively is the same result as before, but we are now just averaging over the diagonal spin terms. Finally, this gives

$$C_{\lambda rs}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{d_s} w_r^{(i)} \bar{w}_s^{(i)} e^{-E_\lambda^{(i)} t}, \quad (46)$$

with<sup>6</sup>

$$w_r^{(i)} = Z_r e_r^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{w}_s^{(i)} = \bar{Z}_s e_s^{(i)*}, \quad (47)$$

where the eigenvectors,  $e_r^{(i)}$  are from the  $D$  matrix in Eq. (45) and the eigenvalues  $\mu^{(i)}$  give the energies  $E_\lambda^{(i)} = \bar{E} + \mu^{(i)}$  as in Eq. (29).

Another possibility is  $\Gamma_{\pm 3}^{\text{pol}} = (1 + \gamma_4)/2 \times (1 \pm i\gamma_5\gamma_3)$  [see Appendix B. 2. 2 and Eq. (B21)] which again gives a reduced  $D_{rs}$  together with  $a_{rs} = a_{\pm r, \pm s}$ . [Note that both these  $\Gamma$ -matrix forms are chosen so that the diagonal  $\delta_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s} \delta_{rs}$  term in Eq. (38) remains as  $\delta_{rs}$ .] The choice of projection matrix,  $\Gamma$ , depends on the symmetry of the operator and picks out the relevant matrix element. So, as discussed here for an unpolarized or spin-nonflip matrix element we would use  $\Gamma^{\text{unpol}}$  or  $\Gamma_{\pm 3}^{\text{pol}}$ .

In Appendix A (together with Appendix B) we have investigated the phase factor relationship between  $a_{-,r,-s}$  with  $a_{+,r,+s}$  (or  $a_{-,r,+s}$  with  $a_{+,r,-s}$ ) for all possible local bilinear currents culminating in Eq. (A8) and Table III.

Furthermore in Appendix C, the general result for the  $d_s = 2$  case is given. Some comments are also made for the spin-flip case using for example  $\Gamma_{\pm}^{\text{pol}} = (1 + \gamma_4)/2 \times i\gamma_5(\gamma_1 \pm i\gamma_2)$  which cannot be put in the form discussed in this section (i.e. as an effective  $D_{rs}$ ).

<sup>6</sup>For notational simplicity we have absorbed some factors into a redefinition of the overlap definitions

$$\sqrt{\frac{E_r + M_r}{E_r}} Z_r \rightarrow Z_r, \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{\frac{E_s + M_s}{E_s}} \bar{Z}_s \rightarrow \bar{Z}_s.$$

This is due to the relativistic normalization, Eq. (15), used for the results in Appendix B, together with Eq. (44) and a factor 2 from the averaging over polarizations.

## IV. QUASIDEGENERATE BARYON ENERGY STATES

### A. Flavor-diagonal matrix elements

The simplest example, as alluded to in Sec. III C, is to consider two close energy states for the same baryon but with different momentum. Thus, the possible operators in Eq. (6) must be flavor diagonal. (We shall consider flavor changing, that is flavor off-diagonal matrix elements in the next section.) To be concrete we shall consider the nucleon,  $B = N(uud)$  here, although the results hold for other octet (or decuplet) particles. As an example, we may take the quark content of the operator to be

$$O(\vec{x}) \sim (\bar{u}\gamma u)(\vec{x}) - (\bar{d}\gamma d)(\vec{x}), \quad (48)$$

where  $\gamma$  is an arbitrary Dirac gamma matrix. As discussed previously we shall first consider the general structure and then finally incorporate the spin index as in Sec. III D.

Clearly we have a degeneracy or near degeneracy when  $\vec{q}$  is chosen such that we have the energy states with  $E_N(\vec{p}) \approx E_N(\vec{p} + \vec{q})$  [or alternatively  $E_N(\vec{p}) \approx E_N(\vec{p} - \vec{q})$ ]. Let us now consider some possible solutions focusing on  $E_N(\vec{p}) \approx E_N(\vec{p} + \vec{q})$ . For clarity we first describe this for the noninteracting case, later we generalize to the interacting case, leading to an avoided level crossing.

Let us first consider the simpler one-dimensional case [for example, suppose that  $\vec{q}$  is in the  $z$ -direction then  $\vec{q} = (0, 0, q)$  and similarly for  $\vec{p}$ ]. There will now be a crossing at  $p = -q/2$  where  $p^2 = (p + q)^2$  and we would have a near-degenerate state close to these states. These are illustrated in the left hand (LH) panel in Fig. 2 where a sketch of the crossing is shown. This is the region we wish to consider perturbation theory by applying the Feynman-Hellmann theorem—well-separated from other potential degeneracies. In three-dimensions we have the corresponding simple solution  $\vec{p} = -\vec{q}/2$ . This possibility was considered in [21].

In the following, we derive results close to (or at) the degeneracies. We shall only consider twofold degeneracies as this means that  $d_s = 2$  and we have a quadratic eigenvalue equation to solve. (The doubling to include the spin index, as previously discussed in Sec. III D is a simple generalization and will be stated at the end of this section.) While we can solve higher-dimensional polynomials, they are likely to be less useful as the result will contain several different nucleon matrix elements, which are difficult to disentangle. Note that this requirement becomes more difficult to achieve if  $\vec{q}$  is too small as the  $\lambda$  range where  $D$  in Eq. (20) takes the form of a  $2 \times 2$  matrix might become rather narrow, forcing the use of higher-dimensional  $D$  matrices.

After this general discussion let us take the two momenta to be  $\vec{p}$  and  $\vec{p} + \vec{q}$  and we consider the case where the two




FIG. 2. LH panel: A sketch of the (unperturbed) energy states  $E_N(p)$ ,  $E_N(p+q)$  versus  $p$  in one dimension for fixed  $q$  using units where  $q = 1$ . Using these units there is a degeneracy at  $p = -1/2$ . RH panel: An equivalent sketch of the perturbed energy states,  $E^{(\pm)}$  based on Eq. (53). The dashed lines are the free case. The sketch shows the avoided energy levels.

degenerate states form the subspace where  $E_N(\vec{p} + \vec{q}) \approx E_N(\vec{p})$ . So we set

$$|B_1(\vec{p}_1)\rangle = |N(\vec{p})\rangle, \quad |B_2(\vec{p}_2)\rangle = |N(\vec{p} + \vec{q})\rangle, \quad (49)$$

with  $E_{B_1}(\vec{p}_1) \equiv E_N(\vec{p}) = \bar{E} + \epsilon_1$  and  $E_{B_2}(\vec{p}_2) \equiv E_N(\vec{p} + \vec{q}) = \bar{E} + \epsilon_2$ . The geometry of  $\vec{p}$  and  $\vec{q}$  is chosen so that  $E_N(\vec{p} + \vec{q}) \approx E_N(\vec{p})$  are the lowest-energy states in this sector, i.e. there is no state with a lower energy, as indicated in the LH panel of Fig. 2. Momentum conservation, i.e. the step-up or step-down in  $\vec{q}$  from Eq. (35) gives the matrix of baryon matrix elements as

$$a_{rs} = \langle B_r(\vec{p}_r) | \hat{O}(\vec{q}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s) \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a^* \\ a & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{rs}, \quad (50)$$

where

$$a = \langle B_2(\vec{p}_2) | \hat{O}(\vec{0}) | B_1(\vec{p}_1) \rangle. \quad (51)$$

To first find the eigenvalues of  $D$  in Eq. (20) we have to solve a quadratic equation. This gives

$$\mu^{(\pm)} = \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2) \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{(\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2)^2 + 4\lambda^2|a|^2}, \quad (52)$$

leading to the energies

$$E_\lambda^{(\pm)} = \bar{E} + \mu^{(\pm)} = \frac{1}{2}(E_1 + E_2) \pm \frac{1}{2}\Delta E_\lambda, \quad (53)$$

with

$$\Delta E_\lambda = E_\lambda^{(+)} - E_\lambda^{(-)} = \sqrt{(E_1 - E_2)^2 + 4\lambda^2|a|^2}. \quad (54)$$

We sketch these energy levels  $E^{(\pm)}$  in the RH panel of Fig. 2 and compare with the free case ( $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ ), dashed lines. We see that for  $\lambda \neq 0$  then we have the phenomenon of avoided energy levels for  $E_\lambda^{(\pm)}$ .

The eigenvectors  $e_r^{(\pm)}$  are given by

$$e_r^{(\pm)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta E_\lambda}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\kappa_\pm} \\ \pm \text{sgn}(\lambda) \sqrt{\kappa_\mp} \frac{a}{|a|} \end{pmatrix}_r, \quad \text{with} \\ \kappa_\pm = \frac{1}{2}\Delta E_\lambda \pm \frac{1}{2}(E_1 - E_2), \quad (55)$$

where the normalization factor has been chosen so that  $|e_1^{(\pm)}|^2 + |e_2^{(\pm)}|^2 = 1$ . A useful relation is  $\kappa_+\kappa_- = \lambda^2|a|^2$ . Note that the components of the eigenvectors are related:  $e_2^{(-)} = -\text{sgn}(\lambda)a/|a|e_1^{(+)}$  and  $e_2^{(+)} = \text{sgn}(\lambda)a/|a|e_1^{(-)}$ . We also see that while the Feynman-Hellmann approach cannot yield any information on the phase of the matrix element from the energy as it is the modulus, the phase is however contained in the eigenvectors as  $a = |a|\zeta_a$  (with  $\zeta_a$  being the phase of the matrix element).

This result of course includes the degenerate case when the nucleon  $\vec{p}$ ,  $\vec{q}$  momenta are arranged so that their energies are the same,  $E_2 = E_1$  (the crossing point in the LH panel of Fig. 2). As discussed earlier, this requires the geometry of the  $\vec{p}$  and  $\vec{q}$  momenta to be chosen such that  $\vec{q}^2 = -2\vec{p} \cdot \vec{q}$  with a possible solution  $\vec{p} = -\vec{q}/2$ . In this case  $\Delta E_\lambda = 2|\lambda||a|$  and eigenvectors  $\vec{e}^{(\pm)} = (1, \pm \text{sgn}(\lambda)a/|a|)/\sqrt{2}$ .

Including the spin index, for the numerical case under consideration in Sec. V where we set  $\Gamma = \Gamma^{\text{unpol}}$  is to simply average over the spins of the matrix element,  $a \rightarrow (a_{++} + a_{--})/2$  as given in Eq. (45). Relations between  $a_{--}$  and  $a_{++}$  are given in Appendix A (together with Appendix B). The general result is given in Appendix C.




FIG. 3. LH panel: A sketch of the (unperturbed) energy states  $E_\Sigma(p)$ ,  $E_N(p+q)$  versus  $p$  in one dimension for fixed  $q$  using units where  $q = 1$ . RH panel: An equivalent sketch of the perturbed energy states,  $E^\pm$ . The dashed lines are the free case. The sketch shows the avoided energy levels.

### B. Flavor off-diagonal (transition) matrix elements

We shall now consider flavor off-diagonal (transition) matrix elements taking for definiteness the  $\Sigma^- \rightarrow n$  decay, or in the isospin limit considered here  $\Sigma(sdd) \rightarrow N(udd)$  as our example, i.e. an  $s \rightarrow u$  decay. We take the quark content of the operator as

$$O(\vec{x}) \sim (\bar{u}\gamma s)(\vec{x}), \quad (56)$$

thus the action is no longer diagonal in quark flavor space. Let us consider the  $|\Sigma\rangle$  and  $|N\rangle$  as having nearly-degenerate energies (or quasidegenerate energies) and apply the previous formalism, in particular Eqs. (28) and (29).

Following the discussion in Sec. IV A, let us consider again  $E_\Sigma(\vec{p}) \approx E_N(\vec{p} + \vec{q})$  the parallel case to that of the LH panel of Fig. 2 but now extended to the  $\Sigma$  particle. In the LH panel of Fig. 3 we sketch this situation for the one-dimensional example. As before we need to

be in a region well-separated from other degeneracies. We now set

$$|B_1(\vec{p}_1)\rangle = |\Sigma(\vec{p})\rangle, \quad |B_2(\vec{p}_2)\rangle = |N(\vec{p} + \vec{q})\rangle. \quad (57)$$

Again from Eq. (10) let us write  $E_{B_1}(\vec{p}_1) = E_\Sigma(\vec{p}) = \bar{E} + \epsilon_1$  and  $E_{B_2}(\vec{p}_2) = E_N(\vec{p} + \vec{q}) = \bar{E} + \epsilon_2$ . We then find that  $\langle B_r(\vec{p}_r) | \hat{O}(\vec{q}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s) \rangle$  has the same structure as in Eq. (50). So the results from Sec. IV A from Eqs. (50)–(55) remain unchanged. In the RH panel of Fig. 3, we show the interacting (i.e.  $\lambda \neq 0$ ) case from Eq. (53). Again we now have an avoided level crossing. In comparison to the previous case (Fig. 2) while very similar, the degeneracy is now shifted to a slightly smaller momentum value.

In Fig. 4 we sketch the corresponding eigenvectors to the eigenvalues of Fig. 3. Shown are  $e_1^{(-)2}$  and  $e_2^{(-)2}$  against  $p$  both for the free and interacting case. While in the free case




FIG. 4. Left panel: The free case where we have plotted  $e_1^{(-)2}$  and  $e_2^{(-)2}$  against  $p$ , again taking units where  $q = 1$ . Right panel: The interacting case showing the change of state.

the components of  $\vec{e}^{(\pm)}$  remain constant (left panel) for the interacting case (right panel) they flip as the momentum  $p$  changes.

## V. LATTICE APPLICATION FOR TRANSITION MATRIX ELEMENTS

As an example of this formalism, we shall now consider in more detail how the previous results can be applied to the  $\Sigma \rightarrow N$  transition matrix element, i.e. decay  $s \rightarrow u$  in the isospin limit as described in Sec. IV B. We first discuss in general the modifications to the action and the fermion inversion procedure before considering the specific numerical results.

### A. The fermion inversion and correlation functions

To apply the results of section IV B we need to consider the action

$$S = S_g + \int_x (\bar{u}, \bar{s}) \begin{pmatrix} D_u & -\lambda T \\ -\lambda T' & D_s \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u \\ s \end{pmatrix} + \int_x \bar{d} D_d d, \quad (58)$$

where  $S_g$  is the gluon action and we shall now consider the fermionic piece in more detail. For simplicity we absorb any clover terms into the  $D_s$ . We take the  $u$  and  $d$  quarks as mass degenerate  $m_u = m_d \equiv m_l$ , with a common mass  $m_l$ . (A more general situation would require a  $3 \times 3$  matrix, when the vector for  $u$  and  $s$  would be extended to  $(u, d, s)$  with nondegenerate quark masses.) For  $T$  we take the general local expression

$$T(x, y; \vec{q}) = \gamma e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}} \delta_{x,y}. \quad (59)$$

For  $\gamma_5$  Hermiticity for the matrix in Eq. (58) we need  $T' = \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5$ . From the action in Eq. (58) we now define the larger-flavor inverse propagator,  $\mathcal{M}$ , as

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} D_u & -\lambda T \\ -\lambda \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 & D_s \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_{uu} & \mathcal{M}_{us} \\ \mathcal{M}_{su} & \mathcal{M}_{ss} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (60)$$

together with  $\mathcal{M}_{dd} \equiv D_d$ .

We can generate correlation functions,  $C_{\lambda rs}(t)$ <sup>7</sup> for a fixed  $\vec{p}$ ,  $\vec{q}$  by choosing  $B'$  and  $B$  to be either  $B_r$  or  $B_s$ , as given in Eq. (57). The correlation function matrix for a particular  $\vec{p}$ ,  $\vec{q}$  pair and suitable for a GEVP-type procedure is thus given by

$$C_{\lambda rs}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} C_{\lambda \Sigma \Sigma}(t) & C_{\lambda \Sigma N}(t) \\ C_{\lambda N \Sigma}(t) & C_{\lambda N N}(t) \end{pmatrix}_{rs}, \quad (61)$$

<sup>7</sup>While we could consider this as a  $(2 \times 4) \times (2 \times 4)$  matrix, as in Eq. (43), we have projected each correlation function with  $\Gamma$ .

(see Appendix D for more details). The individual correlation functions in this equation are built from Green's functions given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_{uu} & G_{us} \\ G_{su} & G_{ss} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} (\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{uu} & (\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{us} \\ (\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{su} & (\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{ss} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (62)$$

The relations are standard between the correlation functions and Green's functions, for completeness we give them in Appendix D.

We now need to invert the matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  in Eq. (60). One possibility is to consider a fermion matrix twice the size to the standard single-flavor fermion matrix for the two flavors. Instead we shall consider here  $\mathcal{M}$  as a  $2 \times 2$  block matrix and invert that. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(uu)} &= (1 - \lambda^2 D_u^{-1} T D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5)^{-1} D_u^{-1}, \\ G^{(ss)} &= (1 - \lambda^2 D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 D_u^{-1} T)^{-1} D_s^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(us)} &= \lambda D_u^{-1} T G^{(ss)}, \\ G^{(su)} &= \lambda D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 G^{(uu)}. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

The problem with Eq. (63) is that it involves an inversion within an inversion, which computationally would be very expensive. However, for small  $\lambda$  (the case considered here) it is sufficient to expand to a low order in  $\lambda$ , especially as the expansion parameter is  $\lambda^2$ . Thus, given  $G_{2n}^{(uu)}$ ,  $G_{2n}^{(ss)}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{2n+2}^{(uu)} &= D_u^{-1} + \lambda^2 D_u^{-1} T D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 G_{2n}^{(uu)}, \\ G_{2n+2}^{(ss)} &= D_s^{-1} + \lambda^2 D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 D_u^{-1} T G_{2n}^{(ss)}, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

for  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ , the exact result being obtained for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $G_{2n+1}^{(us)}$  and  $G_{2n+1}^{(su)}$  for  $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$  are then given from Eq. (64) again using  $G_{2n}^{(uu)}$ ,  $G_{2n}^{(ss)}$  as input. Effectively each matrix inversion (either  $D_u^{-1}$  or  $D_s^{-1}$ ) is associated with an additional power of  $\lambda$ . Even powers of  $\lambda$  vanish for transition terms (and correspondingly odd powers of  $\lambda$  vanish for the flavor-diagonal terms). Some more details are given in Appendix E. For example the leading order result ( $n = 0$ ) for both the diagonal and off-diagonal Green's functions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(uu)} &= D_u^{-1} + O(\lambda^2), \\ G^{(ss)} &= D_s^{-1} + O(\lambda^2), \\ G^{(us)} &= \lambda D_u^{-1} T D_s^{-1} + O(\lambda^3), \\ G^{(su)} &= \lambda D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 D_u^{-1} + O(\lambda^3), \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

which is possibly sufficient as there are no  $O(\lambda^2)$  terms so the validity of the linear term in  $\lambda$  could extend further. The off-diagonal correlation functions are now just like the

usual three-point function integrated over the insertion time.

To better justify the Feynman-Hellmann procedure, we shall consider higher-order iterations to approximate the Green's functions to within numerical accuracy. To build the Green's functions we use  $\delta_{\vec{x},\vec{0}}\delta_{t,0}$  as the initial source, and build the chain using the previously calculated object as the new source as given in Eq. (65). This has the advantage of producing the Green's function and hence correlation function as a continuous function of  $\lambda$  rather than needing a separate evaluation for each value of  $\lambda$  chosen. Each subsequent insertion of the operator on the correlation function is constructed using a sequential source with the insertion time being summed over.

Note that for each different operator and momentum  $\vec{q}$  we have to recalculate everything. This is opposite to the usual common procedure for three-point functions, where we calculate the second Green's function from the sink to the operator (which allows many operators to be inserted for one second inversion).

## B. The simulation

### 1. The decay matrix element and chosen kinematics

We shall consider in this article the vector matrix element  $V_4$  for  $\Sigma \rightarrow N$  where the  $\Sigma$  is stationary, i.e.  $\vec{p} = \vec{0}$  (and  $\vec{q} = \vec{p}' - \vec{0}$ ). Then the (Euclidean) momentum transfer is given in this case by<sup>8</sup>

$$q = (i(M_\Sigma - E_N(\vec{q})), \vec{q}), \quad \text{or} \quad Q^2 = -(M_\Sigma - E_N(\vec{q}))^2 + \vec{q}^2. \quad (67)$$

From Eq. (45) we must average the matrix element over the spin index. These can be computed using the results given in Appendix A together with those in Appendix B. This gives<sup>9</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle N(\vec{q}, +) | \bar{u} \gamma_4 s | \Sigma(\vec{0}, +) \rangle_{\text{rel}} \\ &= \sqrt{2M_\Sigma(E_N(\vec{q}) + M_N)} \\ & \times \left( f_1^{\Sigma N}(Q^2) + \frac{E_N(\vec{q}) - M_N}{M_N + M_\Sigma} f_2^{\Sigma N}(Q^2) \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{E_N(\vec{q}) - M_\Sigma}{M_N + M_\Sigma} f_3^{\Sigma N}(Q^2) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

<sup>8</sup>Note that we have adopted the convention that  $q$  is positive for a scattering process where for the scattered baryon the momentum  $q$  is added to the initial baryon momentum. This is opposite to the semileptonic case, where the lepton and neutrino carry momentum  $q$ . This was reflected in the choice in Sec. IV B. While here this convention does not matter, when unified SU(3) flavor breaking expansions are considered, [35], one specific  $q$  convention has to be chosen for all cases.

<sup>9</sup>For simplicity we simply write  $\hat{O}(\vec{0}) \rightarrow \bar{u} \gamma_4 s$ .

This uses the relativistic normalization, see Eq. (15). (We emphasize this here with the subscript.) Note that the matrix element in Eq. (68) can be considered as a function of  $Q^2$  as Eq. (67) gives  $E_N(\vec{q}) = (Q^2 + M_\Sigma^2 + M_N^2)/(2M_\Sigma)$  which can be used to eliminate  $E_N(\vec{q})$  on the rhs of Eq. (68). Denoting the various spin components by  $a_{\pm\pm}$  then we also find as expected  $a_{--} = a_{++}$ ,  $a_{+-} = 0 = a_{-+}$ . (For this case, the matrix element is real.) In the following for simplicity we will suppress the spin index.

$\Delta E_\lambda$  from Eq. (54) is given as the (positive) difference in the perturbed energies

$$\Delta E_\lambda = \sqrt{(M_\Sigma - E_N(\vec{q}))^2 + 4\lambda^2 \left( \frac{\langle N(\vec{q}) | \bar{u} \gamma_4 s | \Sigma(\vec{0}) \rangle_{\text{rel}}^2}{(2E_N(\vec{q}))(2M_\Sigma)} \right)}. \quad (69)$$

It is thus sufficient to construct just a matrix of correlation functions, as given in Eq. (61) and then apply the GEVP procedure to this.

### 2. GEVP

We apply the GEVP to the  $2 \times 2$  correlator matrix  $C_\lambda(t)$ , Eq. (61). The variation of the method we use here [24] is to first determine the left  $v^{(i)}$  and right  $u^{(i)}$  eigenvectors and then project out the eigenvalues

$$c^{(i)}(t) = e^{-E_\lambda^{(i)} t}, \quad (70)$$

for  $E_\lambda^{(i)}$ ,  $i = \pm$  [see Eq. (53)]. To achieve this, we consider  $t_0$  and a further time  $t_0 + \Delta t_0$  to construct the following eigenvalue equations

$$\begin{aligned} C_\lambda^{-1}(t_0) C_\lambda(t_0 + \Delta t_0) u^{(i)}(t_0, \Delta t_0) &= c^{(i)}(\Delta t_0) u^{(i)}(t_0, \Delta t_0), \\ v^{(i)\dagger}(t_0, \Delta t_0) C_\lambda(t_0 + \Delta t_0) C_\lambda^{-1}(t_0) &= c^{(i)}(\Delta t_0) v^{(i)\dagger}(t_0, \Delta t_0), \\ & i = \pm. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Solving these equations will give the fixed eigenvectors  $u$  and  $v$  (i.e. independent of  $t$ ) which can be combined with the correlator matrix to construct a new correlation function

$$C_\lambda^{(i)}(t) = v^{(i)\dagger} C_\lambda(t) u^{(i)}, \quad i = \pm, \quad (72)$$

which projects out the eigenvalue  $c^{(i)}(t)$ , Eq. (70). Using Eqs. (46) and (47) this means that

$$v_r^{(i)} = \frac{N^{(i)}}{Z_r} e_r^{(i)}, \quad \text{and} \quad u_s^{(i)} = \frac{\bar{N}^{(i)}}{\bar{Z}_s} e_s^{(i)}, \quad (73)$$

where  $N^{(i)}$  and  $\bar{N}^{(i)}$  are normalization constants. Essentially  $v_r^{(i)*}$  measures the component of  $B_r$  in the  $i$ th eigenvector

and similarly for  $u_s^{(i)}$  and  $\bar{B}_s$ . (The above statements and equations are not restricted to just the  $d_s = 2$  case.)

These two correlators  $C_\lambda^{(i)}(t)$ ,  $i = \pm$  represent the two low-lying eigenstates of the system which of course includes the perturbation to the action. To relate this to the transition form factors in Eq. (69) we thus require the energy splitting between these two states. To extract this energy splitting we construct the ratio of the correlators

$$R_\lambda(t) = \frac{C_\lambda^{(+)}(t)}{C_\lambda^{(-)}(t)} \stackrel{t \gg 0}{\propto} e^{-\Delta E_\lambda t}, \quad (74)$$

which in the large Euclidean time limit will behave like a single exponential function and will show up in the effective energy as a plateau region. We thus use this effective energy to pick out a suitable plateau region and then fit a one-exponential function to the ratio. The two important parameters of the GEVP calculation are  $t_0$  and  $\Delta t_0$ . Optimally the time range from  $t_0$  and  $t_0 + \Delta t_0$  needs to be in a region where the ground state is saturated but the signal-to-noise ratio is still sufficiently high to exclude any effects from higher states.

### 3. Lattice details

Numerical simulations have been performed using  $N_f = 2 + 1$   $O(a)$  improved clover Wilson fermions [36] at  $\beta = 5.50$  and  $(\kappa_l, \kappa_s) = (0.121040, 0.120620)$  on a  $N_s^3 \times N_t = 32^3 \times 64$  lattice size. More definitions and details are given in [37]. We briefly mention here that our strategy is to keep the average bare quark mass constant from a value on the  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetry line. The above  $(\kappa_l, \kappa_s)$  have been chosen to correspond to  $\kappa_l = \kappa_s \equiv \kappa_0 = 0.120900$  at the  $SU(3)$  flavor symmetric point. The “distance” in lattice units from the flavor symmetric line is given by  $\delta m_l$  which is defined by

$$\delta m_l = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\kappa_l} - \frac{1}{\kappa_0} \right), \quad (75)$$

and here is  $\sim -0.005$ .  $SU(3)$  flavor breaking terms have been determined, which allows an extrapolation to the physical point for both hadron masses, [37] and matrix elements [28,35]. This situation corresponds to a lattice spacing of  $a \sim 0.074$  fm  $\sim 1/(2.67$  GeV) leading to a pion mass of  $\sim 330$  MeV. Errors given in the following are primarily statistical [using  $\sim O(500)$  configurations] using a bootstrap method.

### 4. Twisted boundary conditions

While the formalism developed here is designed to allow nondegenerate energy states (quasidegenerate energy states), it is clearly necessary to keep the energy of the

states close to each other. Spatial momentum on the lattice is discretized and given in each direction in steps of  $2\pi/N_s$ , which is coarse on this lattice size and makes this requirement difficult to achieve. To obtain a finer energy-level separation we use twisted boundary conditions, [38]; it is sufficient to apply this just to the valence quarks [39–42]. In general we take for a quark,  $q$ ,

$$q(\vec{x} + N_s \vec{e}_i, t) = e^{i\theta_i} q(\vec{x}, t), \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (76)$$

This is rather similar to the Feynman-Hellmann procedure described earlier, and leads to a shift in the momentum in the Green’s function by  $\vec{\theta}/N_s$ . Specifically, we choose to compose  $\vec{q}$  as a twist for the  $u$  quark in the 2-direction. In other words we set the lattice momenta to

$$\vec{p} = \vec{0}, \quad \vec{q} = \left( 0, \frac{\theta_2}{N_s}, 0 \right), \quad (77)$$

and use the results of Sec. IV B. For the runs and number of configurations used in this article, we have determined the masses (in lattice units) as  $M_N = 0.424(11)$  and  $M_\Sigma = 0.461(10)$  close to those given in [37] (the number of configurations used in this study is somewhat smaller). In Table I we give the  $\theta_2$ -parameter values that we have used in our investigation. Run #1 in Table 1 corresponds to  $\vec{q} = \vec{0}$  or “ $q_{\max}$ ”, run #2 corresponds approximately to  $Q^2 = 0$ , while runs #5 and #6 are the closest we have achieved to  $E_N(\vec{0} + \vec{q}) = E_\Sigma(\vec{0}) = M_\Sigma$ . In Table 1 we also give  $\vec{q}^2$ ,  $E_N(\vec{q})$  and the difference  $M_\Sigma - E_N(\vec{q})$  (all in lattice units). These are the measured values from the relevant two-point correlation functions.

## C. Tests

### 1. Correlators and GEVP

We first wish to determine the value of  $n$  required for the expansions in Eq. (65) to provide a good approximation for the full Green’s function of Eq. (63). In Fig. 5 values of the four correlators for  $t_0 = 6$  and  $\Delta t_0 = 4$  where the Green’s functions and hence correlation functions are computed

TABLE I.  $\theta_2$ -twist values, together with  $\vec{q}^2$ ,  $E_N(\vec{q})$ ,  $M_\Sigma - E_N(\vec{q})$  in lattice units. In addition  $M_N = 0.424(11)$  and  $M_\Sigma = 0.461(11)$ . # denotes the run number.

Run #	$\theta_2/\pi$	$\vec{q}^2$	$E_N$	$M_\Sigma - E_N$
1	0.0	0.0	0.424(11)	0.0366(33)
2	0.448	0.0019	0.429(10)	0.0351(35)
3	1	0.0096	0.437(10)	0.0301(42)
4	1.6	0.0247	0.450(12)	0.0182(57)
5	2.06	0.0408	0.462(12)	0.0030(69)
6	2.25	0.0488	0.469(13)	-0.0037(78)




FIG. 5. LH panel: The  $C_{\lambda\Sigma\Sigma}$  correlation functions at  $O(1)$ ,  $O(\lambda^2)$  and  $O(\lambda^4)$ , (squares, circles and stars, respectively) and  $C_{\lambda\Sigma N}$  correlation functions at  $O(\lambda)$  and  $O(\lambda^3)$  (upper triangles and lower triangles, respectively) at  $\lambda = 0.025$  against  $t$  for  $t_0 = 6$  and  $\Delta t_0 = 4$ . The lower subplot shows the ratio of correlation functions  $C_{\lambda\Sigma B}$  ( $B = \Sigma$ , squares and  $B = N$ , triangles) between the two highest orders of  $\lambda$  available. RH panel: Similarly for  $C_{\lambda NN}$  and  $C_{\lambda N\Sigma}$ . The points are slightly offset for visibility. Both results are for run #5 where # denotes the run number.

to various orders of  $\lambda$  by iterating Eq. (65).<sup>10</sup> The LH panel shows the  $C_{\lambda\Sigma\Sigma}$  and  $C_{\lambda\Sigma N}$  correlation functions with  $\lambda = 0.025$ . The lower subplot shows the ratio of the correlation functions between the two highest orders of  $\lambda$  available, to give an impression of the convergence of the series. For the diagonal correlators we see that the change is negligible, while for the off-diagonal correlation functions the change is at most a few % and in the region where the fits are made (see Fig. 6) at most  $\sim 1\%$ . The RH panel shows the  $C_{\lambda NN}$  and  $C_{\lambda N\Sigma}$  correlators also at  $\lambda = 0.025$ . A similar discussion and conclusion holds as for the LH panel.

Applying the GEVP to the  $2 \times 2$  matrix of correlation functions  $\Delta E_\lambda$  is calculated from Eq. (74). The results for  $\Delta E_\lambda$  are dependent on  $\lambda$ , Eq. (69), so as  $\lambda$  increases, the resulting correlation functions will have increasing linear-in-time contributions that become dominant. In Fig. 6 we investigate this by showing the energy difference  $(\Delta E_\lambda)_{\text{eff}}$  versus  $t$  where using Eq. (74) we have  $(\Delta E_\lambda)_{\text{eff}} = -\ln(R_\lambda(t+1)/R_\lambda(t))$ . Again in the upper two plots the various orders in  $\lambda$  are shown;  $O(\lambda)$ ,  $O(\lambda^2)$ ,  $O(\lambda^3)$ , and  $O(\lambda^4)$ . The upper LH panel is with  $\lambda = 0.025$ , while the upper RH panel is for  $\lambda = 0.05$ . It can be seen that the correlator at  $O(\lambda)$  starts to drift up at the higher value of  $\lambda$ , however  $\Delta E_\lambda$  for  $O(\lambda^4)$  still shows a plateau for this value of  $\lambda$ . Again, as discussed previously for the correlation functions in Fig. 5 this gives an impression of the convergence of the Green's functions in Eq. (65) and it's effect

<sup>10</sup>By this we mean that at any order we include the appropriate lower orders, so for example  $O(\lambda^4)$  means we generate the  $O(\lambda^0) + O(\lambda^2) + O(\lambda^4)$  terms iterating Eq. (65) for the diagonal Green's functions.

on the determined energies. In the lower two plots we use an expanded scale for the  $O(\lambda^4)$  results.

We need to check that the parameters used in the GEVP are appropriate and give reliable results. This becomes more of an issue as the energies of the two states come closer together. We will use some criteria to determine an optimal set of parameters [43]:

- (i) The correlation functions should have a good statistical signal over the range spanned by  $t_0$  and  $\Delta t_0$ ;
- (ii) The estimate of the energy difference from  $c^{(i)}$  should be close to the final estimate of the energy difference.

The energies can also be estimated directly from the eigenvalues  $c^{(i)}$  by using  $E_\lambda(c^{(i)}) = -\ln(c^{(i)})/\Delta t_0$ . Since we are interested in the energy difference between the two states, we will consider  $\Delta E_\lambda(c^+, c^-) = -\ln(c^+/c^-)/\Delta t_0$ . This alternative estimation will then be compared to the energy shift from fitting to the (diagonal) ratio of correlators as described in Eq. (74).

Figure 7 shows the difference between these two estimates of the energies as a function of both  $t_0$  and  $\Delta t_0$  for run #5. For  $\Delta t_0 \geq 4$  the uncertainty in the difference is reduced and for  $t_0 \geq 6$  the difference starts to agree with zero. Therefore, we will choose  $t_0 = 6$ ,  $\Delta t_0 = 4$  as the parameters for the GEVP in runs #4, #5 and #6. For the first three runs the difference between the energies of the nucleon and  $\Sigma$  is large enough that the GEVP gives consistent results for smaller parameters and so we choose  $t_0 = 4$ ,  $\Delta t_0 = 2$  for those runs.

With this preliminary background we now discuss the energy shifts and state mixing.




FIG. 6. Upper LH panel:  $(\Delta E_\lambda)_{\text{eff}}$  versus  $t$  for  $\lambda = 0.025$  at  $O(\lambda)$  (circles),  $O(\lambda^2)$  (triangles),  $O(\lambda^3)$  (stars),  $O(\lambda^4)$  (squares) for run #5. Upper RH panel: Similarly for  $\lambda = 0.05$ . The points are slightly offset for visibility. Also shown is the fit interval used and fit using Eq. (74). Lower LH plot: An expanded plot of the upper LH plot at  $O(\lambda^4)$  (squares). Lower RH plot: Similarly for the upper RH plot.




FIG. 7. The difference between two estimates of  $\Delta E_\lambda$ , one calculated from the eigenvalues of the GEVP and the other from a fit to the ratio of correlators in Eq. (74). The difference is shown as a function of both  $t_0$  and  $\Delta t_0$ . For each value of  $\Delta t_0$  it is shown for the values  $t_0 = 1 - 8$ , where the dashed lines separate the values of  $\Delta t_0$ . These results are from run #5. The uncertainties are reduced for  $\Delta t_0 \geq 4$  and they start agreeing with zero for  $t_0 \geq 6$ .

## 2. Energy shifts

We now consider the dependence of  $\Delta E_\lambda$  with  $\lambda$ . In Fig. 8 we show the  $\lambda$  dependence for run #1 (left panel) and #5 (right panel). As the numerical results for the correlation functions are coefficients of a polynomial in  $\lambda$  to  $\lambda^4$  we are able to give the results for  $\Delta E_\lambda$  as a continuous function of  $\lambda$ . This allows a comparison of the numerical results for the various orders in  $\lambda$ . Following this we take the range of  $\lambda$  to be determined when the last iteration in  $\lambda$  produces little perceptible numerical effect and we have confidence in the order of approximation of the Green's function in Eq. (65). From the plots in Fig. 8 between the  $O(\lambda^3)$  and  $O(\lambda^4)$  terms this is the case for the range for  $\lambda$  of  $0 \leq \lambda \lesssim 0.04$ .

## 3. State mixing

The eigenvectors which resulted from the GEVP calculation give insight into how much mixing is occurring




FIG. 8. LH panel: The  $\lambda$ -dependence for run #1 for  $\Delta E_\lambda$ . The numerical results for each order in  $\lambda$  ( $O(\lambda)$ ,  $O(\lambda^2)$ ,  $O(\lambda^3)$  and  $O(\lambda^4)$ ) are given as bands. RH panel: Similarly for run #5.

between the two states at the given  $\lambda$  value. We expect there to be minimal mixing for the data at momentum values which are far removed from the crossover point of the nucleon energy and the sigma mass, and more mixing for momentum values near the crossover point. To show how the mixing changes, we now consider the eigenvectors.

For each eigenvector the square of each component separately will then give an indication of how the mixing changes with respect to the momentum (the normalization of each eigenvector being 1). This can be seen in Fig. 9 where in the LH panel we plot the normalized  $(Z_r v_r^{(-)})^2$  for  $r = 1$  (squares) and 2 (triangles) versus  $\vec{q}^2$ , where  $v_r^{(-)}$  is determined by the GEVP procedure. From Eq. (73) we see that these are equal to  $e_r^{(-)2}$ . As a check we also show in the RH panel of the figure  $e_r^{(-)2}$ ,  $r = 1, 2$  directly computed from Eq. (55) using the previously determined fit values from the energies. [As also discussed there the  $e_r^{(+2)}$  are related to the  $e_r^{(-)2}$  by an interchange.] Values near zero or

one indicate minimal state mixing and values near 1/2 indicate a high amount of mixing between the states. Mixing occurs after run #4 where  $E_N \approx M_\Sigma$ .

We shall consider avoided energy level mixing in more detail in Sec. VI B.

## VI. RESULTS

### A. Energy-level comparison

In the RH panel of Fig. 8 it can be seen that it is possible for the energy shift to be negative for small values of  $\lambda$ . This is due to the ordering of the states being difficult to determine at these values of  $\lambda$ . Since the fitting function in Eq. (69) is strictly positive, it will not produce a good fit for the runs where  $\Delta E_\lambda$  gets close to zero. To solve this, we square the data and fit to the square of the function in Eq. (69). We will also predetermine the value of the energy shift for the unperturbed two-point function  $\Delta E_0 = |E_N(\vec{q}) - M_\Sigma|$  (i.e.  $\lambda = 0$ ) and fix this in the




FIG. 9. LH panel: Normalized  $Z_r v_r^{(-)2}$  ( $r = 1$  squares,  $r = 2$  triangles) against  $\vec{q}^2$ . From Eq. (73) we see that these are equal to  $e_r^{(-)2}$ . RH panel:  $e_r^{(-)2}$ , ( $r = 1$  squares,  $r = 2$  triangles) from Eq. (55) against momentum  $\vec{q}^2$ . Both plots are for  $\lambda = 0.025$ .




FIG. 10. The  $\lambda$ -dependence for runs #1 (top left), #2 (top right), #3 (center left), #4 (center right) #5 (bottom left) and #6 (bottom right) for  $\Delta E_\lambda$ . The numerical results at  $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4)$  are given as bands. The fits are given from using the square of Eq. (69) as further discussed in the text.

fitting function. The matrix element is now the only free parameter.

In Fig. 10 we show the  $\lambda$  dependence of the energy shifts,  $\Delta E_\lambda$ , for runs #1–#6 at  $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4)$ . These, together with their associated errors, are shown as bands in the figures. A fit is made by using the square of Eq. (69). We clearly see in the series of plots that when the

quasidegenerate states become simply degenerate states i.e. if  $E_N(\vec{q}) \approx M_\Sigma$  (runs #5 and #6) then we have approximate linear behavior in  $\lambda$  through the origin.

### B. Avoided energy-level crossing

We now investigate avoided energy-level crossing. In the LH plot of Fig. 3 we sketched the noninteracting case.




FIG. 11. LH panel: The noninteracting  $\Sigma$  mass (filled triangles) and  $N$  energy states (filled squares) as a function of  $\vec{q}^2$  using the results of Table I. RH panel: The mixed states  $E_\lambda^{(-)}$  shown as crosses and  $E_\lambda^{(+)}$  shown as stars.

In the interacting case (RH plot of Fig. 3) the quasienergy levels will avoid each other. While previously we only considered  $\Delta E_\lambda$ , we now consider each energy level,  $E_\lambda^{(\pm)}$ , separately. We compute these from Eq. (53) by using the previously determined  $\Delta E_\lambda$  together with  $E_N(\vec{q})$  and  $M_\Sigma$ . In the LH panel of Fig. 11 we plot noninteracting stationary  $\Sigma$  and the measured  $E_N(\vec{q})$  against  $\vec{q}^2$  using the  $\lambda = 0.025$  results. We see that the energies cross for runs #5 and #6. In the RH panel of Fig. 11 we show the interacting case, where we now see avoided level crossing of the two energy states. This is similar to the case discussed in Sec. IV B.

### C. Result comparison

The results shown in Sec. VIA are for the “bare” matrix element. We take the renormalization constant  $Z_V = 0.863(4)$ , [35]. This is determined from quark-counting for the flavor diagonal matrix elements at zero 3-momentum. Practically this means for this transition matrix element that  $f_1^{\Sigma N}$  is renormalized. From Eq. (68) at  $\vec{q} = \vec{0}$ , the coefficient of the  $f_2^{\Sigma N}$  term vanishes, the coefficient of the  $f_3^{\Sigma N}$  term is  $O(M_\Sigma - M_N) \sim O(\delta m_l)$ , while  $f_3^{\Sigma N}$  is also  $O(\delta m_l)$  and hence this term is  $O(\delta m_l)^2$  and so is negligible. [ $\delta m_l$  the “distance” from the flavor-symmetric line is given in Eq. (75).] For the matrix element expansions in  $\delta m_l$  see, for example, [28,35].

We first wish to compare our results with other derivations using the standard approach, e.g. [44], by computing three-point correlation functions. Briefly, for completeness, defining an (unpolarized) three-point correlation function

$$C_{NV_4\Sigma}(t, \tau; \vec{q}, \vec{0}) = \text{tr} \Gamma^{\text{unpol}} \langle \hat{N}(t; \vec{q}) \hat{V}_4(\tau) \hat{\Sigma}(0, \vec{0}) \rangle, \quad (78)$$

analogously to the two-point correlation function of Eqs. (1) and (43) and applying the same techniques as described earlier and results from Sec. B.2.1 we look for a plateau in the ratio  $R(t, \tau; \vec{0}, \vec{p})$  defined as

$$\begin{aligned} R(t, \tau; \vec{q}, \vec{0}) &= \frac{C_{NV_4\Sigma}(t, \tau; \vec{q}, \vec{0})}{C_{\Sigma\Sigma}(t; \vec{0})} \\ &\times \sqrt{\frac{C_{\Sigma\Sigma}(\tau; \vec{0}) C_{\Sigma\Sigma}(t; \vec{0}) C_{NN}(t - \tau; \vec{q})}{C_{NN}(\tau; \vec{q}) C_{NN}(t; \vec{q}) C_{\Sigma\Sigma}(t - \tau; \vec{0})}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2E_N(\vec{q}) 2M_\Sigma}} \langle N(\vec{q}) | \bar{u} \gamma_4 s | \Sigma(\vec{0}) \rangle_{\text{rel}}. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

A similar result holds for  $C_{\Sigma V_4^\dagger N}(t, \tau; \vec{0}, \vec{q})$  by swapping  $\Sigma \leftrightarrow N$  and considering the inverse process. At  $\vec{q} = \vec{0}$ , the “double ratio” method, e.g. [41] is employed

$$\begin{aligned} R(t, \tau; \vec{0}, \vec{0}) &= \sqrt{\frac{C_{NV_4\Sigma}(t, \tau; \vec{0}, \vec{0}) C_{\Sigma V_4^\dagger N}(t, \tau; \vec{0}, \vec{0})}{C_{\Sigma\Sigma}(t; \vec{0}) C_{NN}(t; \vec{0})}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2M_N 2M_\Sigma}} \langle N(\vec{q}) | \bar{u} \gamma_4 s | \Sigma(\vec{0}) \rangle_{\text{rel}}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

For this case this gives reduced error bars and a more prominent plateau.

In Fig. 12 various comparison ratios are shown for  $Q^2 \sim 0.27 \text{ GeV}^2$  for the 3-point correlation function approach, using Eq. (79). The individual results for a given  $t$  (i.e. difference between baryon source and sink times) have smaller error bars, but due to excited states in the three-point correlation functions we have to perform measurements for various  $t$  and extrapolate. An excited




FIG. 12. Comparing the three-point correlation function results to the Feynman-Hellmann results. Left to right the first three plots for the three-point function ratios for sink-source separation  $t = 10, 13$  and  $16$  (filled squares, diamonds and crosses respectively). Global fits including a single additional excited state are also shown. The horizontal band shows the global fit value for the matrix element. The fourth RH plot shows these results for the three  $t$  values together with their extrapolated value (cross). For comparison we also show the closest Feynman-Hellmann result, filled upper triangle for run #5.

state can be accounted for by expanding the two- and three-point correlation functions to include contributions from such an excited state and globally fitting for various  $t$  values, here  $t = 10, 13$  and  $16$ , simultaneously (following for example [45]). The masses (including the excited state masses) have been previously determined from the two-point correlation function. This gives the various fits in Fig. 12. The constant in the fit then gives the relevant matrix element as in Eq. (79). Again all calculations are performed on the same set of gauge configurations with 500 configurations used for each source-sink separation.

The Feynman-Hellmann approach has larger error bars, but as a two-point correlation function measurement we

TABLE II. The renormalized matrix element,  $\langle N(\vec{q}) | \bar{u} \gamma_4 s | \Sigma(\vec{0}) \rangle_{\text{rel}}^{\text{ren}}$  against  $Q^2$  in  $\text{GeV}^2$  for the six runs. We also give five additional  $Q^2$  results—runs #a–#e—using the methods described in Eqs. (78)–(80).

Run #	$Q^2$ [ $\text{GeV}^2$ ]	$\langle N(\vec{q})   \bar{u} \gamma_4 s   \Sigma(\vec{0}) \rangle_{\text{rel}}^{\text{ren}}$
1	-0.0095	0.897(27)
2	0.0048	0.878(32)
3	0.062	0.817(40)
4	0.17	0.684(49)
5	0.29	0.535(38)
6	0.35	0.486(42)
a	-0.01	0.883(16)
b	0.21	0.596(37)
c	0.27	0.548(38)
d	0.43	0.397(47)
e	0.52	0.390(51)




FIG. 13. Results for  $\langle N(\vec{q}) | \bar{u} \gamma_4 s | \Sigma(\vec{0}) \rangle_{\text{rel}}^{\text{ren}}$  versus  $Q^2$ . Runs #1–#6 are given as (filled) triangles. We also make a comparison for this result with results using standard approaches to the computation. The (open) circles are results obtained from the three-point correlation function, Eq. (79) or the double ratio, Eq. (80).

largely avoid this extrapolation. A comparison with the result of run #5 ( $Q^2 \sim 0.29 \text{ GeV}^2$ ) is also given in the figure both for the various  $t_{\text{sep}}$  and the extrapolated value. The results are compatible for the different approaches.

The results are given in Table II and in Fig. 13 we plot  $\langle N(\vec{q}) | \bar{u} \gamma_4 s | \Sigma(\vec{0}) \rangle_{\text{rel}}^{\text{ren}}$  for runs #1–#6 against  $Q^2$ . There is good overall agreement between the two methods and in particular confirm the values obtained from the approach using the Feynman-Hellmann theorem.

These results show that the Feynman-Hellmann theorem can be used for the calculation of transition form factors using two-point functions. This opens the way for more extensive calculations which can make use of the many tools and techniques available for controlling the contamination due to excited states in two-point functions.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this article we have extended the use of the Feynman-Hellmann theorem in calculating (nucleon) matrix elements with momentum transfer to situations where the relevant energy levels are not degenerate, but nearly degenerate or quasidegenerate as sketched in Fig. 1. While for flavor-diagonal matrix elements this increases the scope of application of the Feynman-Hellmann theorem, as the associated energy levels now do not have to be exactly degenerate, it now additionally allows for the computation of transition matrix elements. These latter matrix elements are naturally derived using quasidegenerate energy states.

In Sec. III, using the Dyson expansion in the Hamiltonian formalism, where the relevant operator is regarded as a perturbation in an expansion parameter  $\lambda$ , see Eq. (5), we gave a derivation of the basic result leading to Eq. (28). In Sec. IV several examples are discussed, first for flavor-diagonal matrix elements and then followed by flavor off-diagonal or transition matrix elements.

An example of the  $\Sigma \rightarrow N$  decay (i.e.  $s \rightarrow u$  transition) for the vector current is considered. This necessitates the generalization of the action to include flavor nondiagonal terms. To minimize numerical cost this is expanded to a sufficiently high order in  $\lambda$  and then the two-point correlation function is reconstructed allowing a range of  $\lambda$  to be considered. Numerical results are then discussed in Sec. V. Avoided level crossing is demonstrated for the quasidegenerate energy states. A comparison is made with results for the matrix element using the conventional three-point correlation function approach. Although in this article we only consider the vector-current transition matrix element, in the Appendixes, for completeness, we give the results for all possible Dirac structures of the currents.

The availability of a large range of source-sink separations and the fact that there is only one exponentially decreasing set of excited states to deal with reduces the complexity of this task compared to the equivalent three-point function calculations. Additionally, the expansion of the matrix inversion in terms of the perturbation parameter used in this method presents a convenient way to extend the applicable range of this method. Further calculations will be required to determine whether it remains viable when approaching the physical quark masses when there are larger mass splittings.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The numerical configuration generation (using the BQCD lattice QCD program [46]) and data analysis (using the CHROMA software library [47]) was carried out on the DiRAC Blue Gene Q and Extreme Scaling Service (Edinburgh Centre for Parallel Computing (EPCC), Edinburgh, UK), the Data Intensive Service (Cambridge Service for Data-Driven Discovery, CSD3, Cambridge, UK), the Gauss Centre for Supercomputing (GCS) supercomputers JUQUEEN and JUWELS (John von Neumann Institute for Computing, NIC, Jülich, Germany) and resources provided by the North-German Supercomputer Alliance (HLRN), the National Computer Infrastructure (NCI National Facility in Canberra, Australia supported by the Australian Commonwealth Government) and the Phoenix HPC service (University of Adelaide). K. U. C. is supported by the ARC Grant No. DP220103098. R. H. is supported in part by the STFC Grant No. ST/P000630/1. P. E. L. R. is supported in part by the STFC Grant No. ST/G00062X/1. G. S. is supported by DFG Grant No. SCHI 179/8-1. R. D. Y. and J. M. Z. are supported by the ARC Grants No. DP190100298 and No. DP220103098. For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any author accepted manuscript version arising from this submission.

## APPENDIX A: EUCLIDEAN MATRIX ELEMENTS

We take the Minkowski generalized currents to be given by

$$J^F(x) = (\bar{q}F\gamma q)(x) \equiv \sum_{f_1, f_2=1}^3 F_{f_1, f_2}(\bar{q}_{f_1}\gamma q_{f_2})(x), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $q$  is a flavor vector,  $q = (u, d, s)^T$ ,  $F$  is a flavor matrix and with  $\gamma = \gamma_\mu, \gamma_\mu\gamma_5, I, i\gamma_5, \sigma_{\mu\nu} = i/2[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$  for the vector, axial, scalar, pseudoscalar and tensor currents. (This ensures that  $J^{F\dagger} = J^{F^T}$ .) The further generalization to operators including covariant derivatives is straightforward. We then take the Minkowski form factors as given in [35].

The Euclidean matrix elements are given by<sup>11</sup>

$$\langle B'(\vec{p}', \sigma') | J^F(\vec{q}) | B(\vec{p}, \sigma) \rangle = \bar{u}_{B'}(\vec{p}', \sigma') \mathcal{J}^F(q) u_B(\vec{p}, \sigma), \quad (\text{A2})$$

where the generalized currents  $J^F(\vec{q})$ <sup>12</sup> also have the same flavor structure as defined by Eq. (A1) but now using the conventions in [32] with the Euclidean gamma matrices  $\gamma = \gamma_\mu, i\gamma_\mu\gamma_5, I, \gamma_5 = \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4, \sigma_{\mu\nu} = i/2[\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu]$  for vector  $V_\mu$ , axial  $A_\mu$ , scalar,  $S$ , pseudoscalar,  $P$ , and tensor,  $T_{\mu\nu}$ , respectively. The Euclidean gamma matrices,  $\gamma_\mu$ , are now all Hermitian,  $\gamma_\mu^\dagger = \gamma_\mu$ . The relation between the Euclidean formulation of the action and Hamiltonian (and hence also for matrix elements) is discussed in [48,49]. Suppressing the flavor matrix, the  $\mathcal{J}^F(q)$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_\mu(q) &= \gamma_\mu f_1^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2) + \sigma_{\mu\nu} q_\nu \frac{f_2^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2)}{M_{B'} + M_B} - i q_\mu \frac{f_3^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2)}{M_{B'} + M_B}, \\ \mathcal{A}_\mu(q) &= i\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 g_1^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2) + i\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_5 q_\nu \frac{g_2^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2)}{M_{B'} + M_B} \\ &\quad + q_\mu\gamma_5 \frac{g_3^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2)}{M_{B'} + M_B}, \\ \mathcal{S}(q) &= g_S^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2), \\ \mathcal{P}(q) &= g_P^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2), \\ \mathcal{T}_{\mu\nu}(q) &= \sigma_{\mu\nu} h_1^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2) + (q_\mu\gamma_\nu - q_\nu\gamma_\mu) \frac{h_2^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2)}{M_{B'} + M_B} \\ &\quad - (\sigma_{\mu\lambda}q_\nu - \sigma_{\nu\lambda}q_\mu) q_\lambda \frac{h_3^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2)}{(M_{B'} + M_B)^2} \\ &\quad + 2\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} q_\rho\gamma_\sigma\gamma_5 \frac{h_4^{\text{BB}'}(Q^2)}{M_{B'} + M_B}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

As we are using the conventions of [35] then we have taken in these expressions

$$q = p' - p = (i(E_{B'} - E_B), \vec{p}' - \vec{p}). \quad (\text{A4})$$

<sup>11</sup>We use in this Appendix the relativistic normalization, see Eqs. (14) and (15).

<sup>12</sup>Again we are simplifying the notation, from Eq. (6) we have  $\hat{O}(\vec{x}) \rightarrow J^F(\vec{x})$  and  $\hat{O}(\vec{q}) \rightarrow J^F(\vec{q})$ .

TABLE III. The  $\eta_\gamma$  factors.

$\gamma$	$\gamma_4$	$\gamma_i$	$i\gamma_4\gamma_5$	$i\gamma_i\gamma_5$	$I$	$\gamma_5$	$\sigma_{i4}$	$\sigma_{ij}$	$\sigma_{i4}\gamma_5$	$\sigma_{ij}\gamma_5$
$\eta_\gamma$	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	+

This is the convention for scattering processes, rather than the natural convention for decay processes where the opposite holds. However, for consistency we remain with the above.

We have also manipulated the tensor results from the expressions given in [35]. For completeness, we briefly describe this here. First to give them in a form as a function of  $q$ , only we use a Gordon identity which in Euclidean form is

$$p_\mu \pm p'_\mu = \gamma_\mu \not{p} \pm \not{p}' \gamma_\mu + i\sigma_{\mu\nu}(p_\nu \mp p'_\nu), \quad (\text{A5})$$

together with  $\not{p}u = iMu$  and  $\bar{u}\not{p} = iM\bar{u}$ . This means that  $h_2$  is replaced by  $h_2 + h_3$  and there is now a new structure  $(\sigma_{\mu\lambda}q_\nu - \sigma_{\nu\lambda}q_\mu)q_\lambda$ . Secondly we use the antisymmetric piece of the identity

$$\gamma_\mu\gamma_\rho\gamma_\nu = \gamma_\mu\delta_{\rho\nu} - \gamma_\rho\delta_{\mu\nu} + \gamma_\nu\delta_{\mu\rho} - \epsilon_{\mu\rho\nu\sigma}\gamma_\sigma\gamma_5, \quad (\text{A6})$$

with  $\epsilon_{1234} = +1$  to modify the  $h_4$  structure. Finally for the axial current for the  $g_2$  term we can use

$$\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_5 = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\lambda}\sigma_{\rho\lambda}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

With these additional manipulations all the terms in the matrix element decomposition are functions of  $q$  and also all the Dirac structure is in the standard gamma-matrix basis.

From the direct computation of the spinor bilinears, as detailed in Appendix B and then using Eq. (A2) together with Eq. (A3) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \langle B'(\vec{p}', -) | J^F | B(\vec{p}, -) \rangle &= \eta_\gamma \langle B'(\vec{p}', +) | J^F | B(\vec{p}, +) \rangle^*, \\ \langle B'(\vec{p}', -) | J^F | B(\vec{p}, +) \rangle &= -\eta_\gamma \langle B'(\vec{p}', +) | J^F | B(\vec{p}, -) \rangle^*, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

where  $\eta_\gamma = \pm$ . Explicitly we have the results as given in Table III. These can be helpful in determining whether the computed matrix element is real or imaginary.

## APPENDIX B: SPINOR BILINEAR RESULTS

The spinor bilinear forms are the most general possible, so to deal with this we shall consider a specific representation—the Dirac representation. Some more general results are given for example in [50–53]. Again we shall be in Euclidean space.

## 1. General

Sigma matrices

$$\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where

$$\sigma_i\sigma_j = \delta_{ij} + i\epsilon_{ijk}\sigma_k, \quad \sigma_i^\dagger = \sigma_i. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Gamma matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_i &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i\sigma_i \\ i\sigma_i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \gamma_5 &= \gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3\gamma_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

## 2. $u$ -spinors

Solving the (free) Dirac equation gives for the +ve energy spinors

$$u(\vec{p}, \sigma) = s \begin{pmatrix} \chi^{(\sigma)} \\ \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p}}{s^2} \chi^{(\sigma)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

where it is convenient to define in the following:

$$s(\vec{p}) = \sqrt{E(\vec{p}) + M}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

The spin is quantized along the third direction (due to the nature of the  $\sigma_3$  matrix in particular) so  $\sigma = \pm$  and the two component spinors at rest are given by

$$\chi^{(+)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \chi^{(-)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B6})$$

or in components

$$\chi_{\sigma_r}^{(\sigma)} = \delta_{\sigma\sigma_r}, \quad \sigma = \pm, \quad \sigma_r = \pm. \quad (\text{B7})$$

We also have

$$\bar{u}(\vec{p}, \sigma) = s \begin{pmatrix} \chi^{(\sigma)T}, -\chi^{(\sigma)T} \frac{\vec{\sigma} \cdot \vec{p}}{s^2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

As a check we have  $\not{p}u = iMu$ ,  $\bar{u}\not{p} = iM\bar{u}$  as expected, as the Minkowski-free Dirac equation  $(\not{p} - m)u = 0$  and upon Euclideanization  $\not{p} \rightarrow -i\not{p}$  where  $p_4$  is imaginary.

$\chi^{(\sigma)}$  has the (obvious) property  $\chi^{(\sigma)T}\chi^{(\sigma)} = \delta_{\sigma\sigma}$  which from Eqs. (B4) and (B8) gives the standard normalization of

$$\bar{u}(\vec{p}, \sigma')u(\vec{p}, \sigma) = 2M\chi^{(\sigma')T}\chi^{(\sigma)} = 2M\delta_{\sigma'\sigma}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

As  $\chi^{(\sigma')}$ ,  $\chi^{(\sigma)}$  just pick out the components of  $\sigma_k$  in  $\chi^{(\sigma')T}\sigma_k\chi^{(\sigma)}$  then we have

$$\chi^{(\sigma')T}\sigma_k\chi^{(\sigma)} = (\sigma_k)_{\sigma'\sigma} = \sigma\delta_{k3}\delta_{\sigma'\sigma} + (\delta_{k1} + i\sigma\delta_{k2})\delta_{\sigma',-\sigma}, \quad (\text{B10})$$

or in vector form

$$(\vec{\sigma})_{\sigma',\sigma} = \sigma\vec{e}_3\delta_{\sigma'\sigma} + (\vec{e}_1 + i\sigma\vec{e}_2)\delta_{\sigma',-\sigma}. \quad (\text{B11})$$

In the following we will find

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}'(\vec{p}', -)\gamma u(\vec{p}, -) &= \eta_\gamma[\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', +)\gamma u(\vec{p}, +)]^*, \\ \bar{u}'(\vec{p}', -)\gamma u(\vec{p}, +) &= -\eta_\gamma[\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', +)\gamma u(\vec{p}, -)]^*, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B12})$$

where  $\eta_\gamma = \pm$ . These will be the same factors as given in Table III.

### a. Bilinears: General case

*Vector:*  $\gamma_4, \gamma_i$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)\gamma_4 u(\vec{p}, \cdot) &= \left(s's + \frac{\vec{p}' \cdot \vec{p}}{s's}\right)I + \frac{i}{s's}(\vec{p}' \times \vec{p}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \\ \bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)\gamma_i u(\vec{p}, \cdot) &= -i\left(\frac{s'}{s}\vec{p} + \frac{s}{s'}\vec{p}'\right)_i I \\ &\quad + \left(\left(\frac{s'}{s}\vec{p} - \frac{s}{s'}\vec{p}'\right) \times \vec{\sigma}\right)_i, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B13})$$

where we have suppressed the spin  $\sigma$  index, to have a matrix equation in spin space [e.g. the  $\sigma', \sigma$  components of  $\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)\gamma_4 u(\vec{p}, \cdot)$  are  $\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \sigma')\gamma_4 u(\vec{p}, \sigma)$ ]. The above equation [Eq. (B13)] is written in a compact form. This can be “undone” by using Eq. (B10) [or Eq. (B11)] for  $\vec{\sigma}_{\sigma'\sigma}$ . This then allows the spin relation in Eq. (B12) to be shown with, for this case,  $\eta_{\gamma_4} = +$  and  $\eta_{\gamma_i} = -$ . As expected this result is independent of the kinematic factors  $\vec{p}'$  and  $\vec{p}$  and just depends on the factors  $i$  and  $\sigma$  and the combination  $i\sigma$ . The other cases follow a similar pattern.

*Axial:*  $i\gamma_4\gamma_5, i\gamma_i\gamma_5$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)i\gamma_4\gamma_5 u(\vec{p}, \cdot) &= -i\left(\frac{s'}{s}\vec{p} + \frac{s}{s'}\vec{p}'\right) \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \\ \bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)i\gamma_i\gamma_5 u(\vec{p}, \cdot) &= \frac{i}{s's}(\vec{p}' \times \vec{p})_i I - \left(s's\delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{s's}(p'_i p_j + p'_j p_i - \vec{p}' \cdot \vec{p}\delta_{ij})\right)\sigma_j, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B14})$$

with  $\eta_{i\gamma_4\gamma_5} = +$  and  $\eta_{i\gamma_i\gamma_5} = -$ .

*Scalar:*  $I$

$$\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)I u(\vec{p}, \cdot) = \left(s's - \frac{\vec{p}' \cdot \vec{p}}{s's}\right)I - \frac{i}{s's}(\vec{p}' \times \vec{p}) \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad (\text{B15})$$

with  $\eta_I = +$ .

*Pseudoscalar:*  $\gamma_5$

$$\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)\gamma_5 u(\vec{p}, \cdot) = -\left(\frac{s'}{s}\vec{p} - \frac{s}{s'}\vec{p}'\right) \cdot \vec{\sigma}, \quad (\text{B16})$$

with  $\eta_{\gamma_5} = -$ .

*Tensor:*

(i)  $\sigma_{i4} = i\gamma_i\gamma_4, \sigma_{ij} = i\gamma_i\gamma_j (i \neq j)$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)\sigma_{i4} u(\vec{p}, \cdot) &= -\left(\frac{s'}{s}\vec{p} - \frac{s}{s'}\vec{p}'\right)_i I - i\left(\left(\frac{s'}{s}\vec{p} + \frac{s}{s'}\vec{p}'\right) \times \vec{\sigma}\right)_i, \\ \bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \cdot)\sigma_{ij} u(\vec{p}, \cdot) &= -\frac{i}{s's}(p'_i p_j - p'_j p_i)I \\ &\quad + \epsilon_{ijk}\left(-s's\delta_{kl} + \frac{1}{s's}(p_k p'_l + p'_k p_l - \vec{p}' \cdot \vec{p}\delta_{kl})\right)\sigma_l, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B17})$$

with  $\eta_{\sigma_{i4}} = +$  and  $\eta_{\sigma_{ij}} = -$ .

(ii) An alternative tensor form for  $\sigma_{\mu\nu}\gamma_5$  and using the identity of Eq. (A7) is

$$\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \sigma')\sigma_{i4}\gamma_5 u(\vec{p}, \sigma) = -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ikl}\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \sigma')\sigma_{kl}u(\vec{p}, \sigma), \quad (\text{B18})$$

with  $\eta_{\sigma_{i4}\gamma_5} = -$ . A more explicit expression can then be given using Eq. (B17). Similarly,

$$\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \sigma')\sigma_{ij}\gamma_5 u(\vec{p}, \sigma) = -\epsilon_{ijk}\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \sigma')\sigma_{k4}u(\vec{p}, \sigma), \quad (\text{B19})$$

with  $\eta_{\sigma_{ij}\gamma_5} = +$ .

### b. Bilinears: Unpolarized/polarized cases

Useful combinations discussed here are

(i)  $\Gamma^{\text{unpol}} = (1 + \gamma_4)/2$  giving

$$\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \sigma')\Gamma^{\text{unpol}}u(\vec{p}, \sigma) = s's\delta_{\sigma'\sigma}; \quad (\text{B20})$$

(ii)  $\Gamma_{\pm 3}^{\text{pol}} = (1 + \gamma_4)/2 \times (1 \pm i\gamma_5\gamma_3)$  giving

$$\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \sigma')\Gamma_{\pm 3}^{\text{pol}}u(\vec{p}, \sigma) = s's(1 \pm \sigma)\delta_{\sigma'\sigma}; \quad (\text{B21})$$

(iii)  $\Gamma_{\pm}^{\text{pol}} = (1 + \gamma_4)/2 \times i\gamma_5(\gamma_1 \pm i\gamma_2)$  giving

$$\bar{u}'(\vec{p}', \sigma') \Gamma_{\pm}^{\text{pol}} u(\vec{p}, \sigma) = s' s (1 \mp \sigma) \delta_{\sigma', -\sigma}. \quad (\text{B22})$$

### APPENDIX C: GENERAL DERIVATION OF ENERGY STATES FOR THE $d_S = 2$ CASE

We give here an alternative derivation of the energy states in Sec. IV and in particular Eqs. (53), (54) which does not depend on the choice of a particular  $\Gamma$  matrix choice in Sec. III D. In Eq. (39) we now have a  $(2 \times 2) \times (2 \times 2)$  (i.e.  $d_S = 2$ ) matrix to diagonalize.

Including the spin index we now have

$$\langle B_r(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) | \hat{O}(\vec{q}) | B_s(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) \rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a^\dagger \\ a & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

where  $a$  is replaced by a  $2 \times 2$  matrix (and the complex conjugate  $a^*$  by the Hermitian conjugate  $a^\dagger$ ). Thus, using Eq. (A8) we replace

$$a \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} a_{++} & a_{+-} \\ a_{+-} & a_{--} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

with  $a_{+-} = -\eta a_{+ -}^*$  and  $a_{--} = \eta a_{+ +}^*$  where  $\eta$  is given in Table III. The eigenvalues of the resulting enlarged  $D$  matrix in Eq. (39) are easily found, by first writing  $D$  as a product of  $2 \times 2$  submatrices as in Eq. (E1) and then taking the determinant with the identification  $A \rightarrow (\epsilon_1 - \mu)I$ ,  $B \rightarrow (\epsilon_2 - \mu)I$ ,  $C \rightarrow a^\dagger$  and  $D \rightarrow a$ . We now have to solve the eigenvalue equation

$$\det((\epsilon_1 - \mu)(\epsilon_2 - \mu)I - \lambda^2 a a^\dagger) = 0, \quad (\text{C3})$$

for  $\mu$ . Furthermore, note that

$$a a^\dagger = (|a_{++}|^2 + |a_{+-}|^2)I = |\det a|I, \quad (\text{C4})$$

which is diagonal. So this means that each eigenvalue is doubly degenerate as expected (the double energy degeneracy) and leads to the replacement in Eqs. (52) and (54) of

$$|a| \rightarrow |\det a|^{1/2}, \quad (\text{C5})$$

(or  $|a| \rightarrow (|a_{++}|^2 + |a_{+-}|^2)^{1/2}$ ), together with the appropriate change in  $\kappa_{\pm}$ .

Matrix elements are either unpolarized or polarized (including spin flip) and either real or imaginary. But one of these corresponds to a matrix element picked out by a  $\Gamma$  matrix in Sec. III D. For example for  $\Gamma^{\text{unpol}}$  from Eq. (45) where we have the replacement  $a \rightarrow (a_{++} + a_{--})/2$  which also gives one matrix element for  $|a|^2$  (i.e.  $|a_{++}|^2$ ). Thus, Eq. (C5) may be considered the general result. Additionally the eigenvectors are found to be

$$e_{\sigma_r, r}^{(\pm\sigma)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta E_\lambda}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\kappa_{\pm}} \chi_{\sigma_r}^{(\sigma)} \\ \pm \text{sgn}(\lambda) \sqrt{\kappa_{\mp}} \frac{(a \chi^{(\sigma)})_{\sigma_r}}{\sqrt{|\det a|}} \end{pmatrix}_r. \quad (\text{C6})$$

Parallel to Eq. (46) we have

$$C_{\lambda r a, s \beta}(t) = \sum_{i=\pm} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} w_{r a}^{(i\sigma)} \bar{w}_{s \beta}^{(i\sigma)} e^{-E_\lambda^{(i)} t}, \quad (\text{C7})$$

with

$$w_{r a}^{(i\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma_r} \lambda \langle 0 | \hat{B}_{r a}(\vec{0}) | B_r(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) \rangle_\lambda e_{\sigma_r, r}^{(i\sigma)},$$

$$\bar{w}_{s \beta}^{(i\sigma)} = \sum_{\sigma_s} \lambda \langle B_s(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) | \hat{B}_{s \beta}(\vec{0}) | 0 \rangle_\lambda e_{\sigma_s, s}^{(i\sigma)*}. \quad (\text{C8})$$

This is the general result. In the simplification of Sec. III D using Eq. (41) gives

$$C_{\lambda r s}^\Gamma(t) = Z_r \bar{Z}_s \sum_{i=\pm} \sum_{\sigma=\pm} \sum_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s} \bar{u}^{(s)}(\vec{p}_s, \sigma_s) \times \Gamma u^{(r)}(\vec{p}_r, \sigma_r) e_{\sigma_r, r}^{(i\sigma)} e_{\sigma_s, s}^{(i\sigma)*} e^{-E_\lambda^{(i)} t}. \quad (\text{C9})$$

However, using Eq. (C6) we have

$$\sum_{\sigma=\pm} e_{\sigma_r, r}^{(\pm\sigma)} e_{\sigma_s, s}^{(\pm\sigma)*} = \frac{1}{\Delta E_\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_{\pm} \delta_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s} & \pm \lambda a_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s}^\dagger \\ \pm \lambda a_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s} & \kappa_{\mp} \delta_{\sigma_r, \sigma_s} \end{pmatrix}_{rs}. \quad (\text{C10})$$

With no spin index we use the result of Eq. (55) to give

$$e_r^{(\pm)} e_s^{(\pm)*} = \frac{1}{\Delta E_\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} \kappa_{\pm} & \pm \lambda a_{\pm}^* \\ \pm \lambda a_{\pm} & \kappa_{\mp} \end{pmatrix}_{rs}, \quad (\text{C11})$$

which with the substitutions of Eqs. (C2) and (C5) gives the spin case result in Eq. (C10).

More concretely if we set  $\Gamma = \Gamma^{\text{unpol}}$  and use Eqs. (44) and (C10) in Eq. (C9) and then rewrite it using Eq. (C11) this soon leads to Eq. (46) with  $a \rightarrow (a_{++} + a_{--})/2$  as found there. A similar result holds for  $\Gamma = \Gamma_3^{\text{pol}}$ . However, this equivalence between the results with spin and without spin is because as mentioned previously both Eqs. (B20) and (B21) are diagonal in  $\sigma_r, \sigma_s$ . If we consider a case where this is not true, for example  $\Gamma_{\pm}^{\text{pol}}$ , Eq. (B22) then we soon find that.<sup>13</sup>

$$C_{r s}^{\Gamma_{\pm}^{\text{pol}}}(t) = Z_r \bar{Z}_s \frac{\lambda}{\Delta E_\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{+-}^* \\ a_{+-} & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{rs} (e^{-E_\lambda^{(+)} t} - e^{-E_\lambda^{(-)} t}), \quad (\text{C12})$$

<sup>13</sup>Again we have redefined  $Z_r$  and  $\bar{Z}_s$  as in footnote 6.

(and similarly for  $\Gamma_{\pm}^{\text{pol}}$  with  $a_{+-}$  replaced by  $a_{-+}$ ). The diagonal terms have now vanished, so it cannot be rewritten as for the spinless case. Not only that, but we now have a difference of two exponentials (rather than a sum). Expanding gives

$$C_{rs}^{\Gamma_{\pm}^{\text{pol}}}(t) = Z_r \bar{Z}_s \lambda \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{+-}^* \\ a_{+-} & 0 \end{pmatrix}_{rs} t e^{-\bar{E}t}, \quad (\text{C13})$$

close to the form of the original Dyson expansion as discussed in Sec. III D.

## APPENDIX D: CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

The correlation functions in Eq. (61) are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\lambda\Sigma\Sigma}(t) &= \text{tr}_D \Gamma \langle \tilde{B}_{\Sigma}(t; \vec{p}) \bar{B}_{\Sigma}(0, \vec{0}) \rangle_{\lambda}, \\ C_{\lambda\Sigma N}(t) &= \text{tr}_D \Gamma \langle \tilde{B}_{\Sigma}(t; \vec{p}) \bar{B}_N(0, \vec{0}) \rangle_{\lambda}, \\ C_{\lambda N\Sigma}(t) &= \text{tr}_D \Gamma \langle \tilde{B}_N(t; \vec{p} + \vec{q}) \bar{B}_{\Sigma}(0, \vec{0}) \rangle_{\lambda}, \\ C_{\lambda NN}(t) &= \text{tr}_D \Gamma \langle \tilde{B}_N(t; \vec{p} + \vec{q}) \bar{B}_N(0, \vec{0}) \rangle_{\lambda}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D1})$$

with baryon wave functions given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_{\Sigma_a}(t; \vec{p}) &= \int_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} B_{\Sigma_a}(t, \vec{x}) = \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \epsilon^{abc} d_a^a(x) [d^b(x)^{T_D} C \gamma_5 s^c(x)], \\ \tilde{B}_{N_a}(t; \vec{p}) &= \int_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} B_{N_a}(t, \vec{x}) = \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \epsilon^{abc} d_a^a(x) [d^b(x)^{T_D} C \gamma_5 u^c(x)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

( $\alpha$  is a Dirac index,  $a$  is a color index and  $C = \gamma_4 \gamma_2$ ). As in Eq. (61) we have taken a trace over the Dirac indices with  $\Gamma = \Gamma^{\text{unpol}}$ . For the diagonal correlation functions this gives

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\lambda\Sigma\Sigma}(t) &= \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon_{a'b'c'} \langle \text{tr}_D [\Gamma G^{(dd)aa'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \text{tr}_D [\tilde{G}^{(ss)bb'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) G^{(dd)cc'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \\ &\quad + \text{tr}_D [\Gamma G^{(dd)aa'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) \tilde{G}^{(ss)bb'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) G^{(dd)cc'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D3})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\lambda NN}(t) &= \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-i(\vec{p}+\vec{q})\cdot\vec{x}} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon_{a'b'c'} \langle \text{tr}_D [\Gamma G^{(dd)aa'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \text{tr}_D [\tilde{G}^{(uu)bb'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) G^{(dd)cc'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \\ &\quad + \text{tr}_D [\Gamma G^{(dd)aa'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) \tilde{G}^{(uu)bb'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) G^{(dd)cc'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D4})$$

where we have defined a tilde by  $\tilde{X} = (C \gamma_5 X \gamma_5)^{T_D}$ . For the off-diagonal correlation functions we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\lambda\Sigma N}(t) &= \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon_{a'b'c'} \langle \text{tr}_D [\Gamma G^{(dd)aa'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \text{tr}_D [\tilde{G}^{(su)bb'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) G^{(dd)cc'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \\ &\quad + \text{tr}_D [\Gamma G^{(dd)aa'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) \tilde{G}^{(su)bb'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) G^{(dd)cc'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D5})$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\lambda N\Sigma}(t) &= \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-i(\vec{p}+\vec{q})\cdot\vec{x}} \epsilon_{abc} \epsilon_{a'b'c'} \langle \text{tr}_D [\Gamma G^{(dd)aa'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \text{tr}_D [\tilde{G}^{(us)bb'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) G^{(dd)cc'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \\ &\quad + \text{tr}_D [\Gamma G^{(dd)aa'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) \tilde{G}^{(us)bb'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) G^{(dd)cc'}(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0)] \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D6})$$

For simplicity we have taken the source for the Green's functions at  $(\vec{0}, 0)$ . For the more general smeared sources considered here we have

$$\sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot\vec{x}} \dots G(\vec{x}, t; \vec{0}, 0) \dots \rightarrow \sum_{\vec{x}_0} f(\vec{x}_0) \sum_{\vec{x}} e^{-i\vec{p}\cdot(\vec{x}-\vec{x}_0)} \dots G(\vec{x}, t; \vec{x}_0, 0) \dots \quad (\text{D7})$$

## APPENDIX E: THE FERMION MATRIX INVERSE

We give here some more details of the procedure described in Sec. VA.

### 1. General

To invert  $\mathcal{M}$  in general we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ D & B \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ D & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & A^{-1}C \\ D & B - DA^{-1}C \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{E1})$$

which gives

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ D & B \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (A - CB^{-1}D)^{-1} & -A^{-1}C(B - DA^{-1}C)^{-1} \\ -B^{-1}D(A - CB^{-1}D)^{-1} & (B - DA^{-1}C)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{E2})$$

Equivalent forms, as can be seen by expanding the off-diagonal elements as a power series, is to rewrite them as

$$\begin{aligned} B^{-1}D(A - CB^{-1}D)^{-1} &= (B - DA^{-1}C)^{-1}DA^{-1}, \\ A^{-1}C(B - DA^{-1}C)^{-1} &= (A - CB^{-1}D)^{-1}CB^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E3})$$

(Other variations are possible.) Note that we never need that  $C^{-1}$  and  $D^{-1}$  exist.

### 2. Specific

Thus, here we have

$$A \rightarrow D_u, \quad B \rightarrow D_s, \quad C \rightarrow -\lambda T, \quad D \rightarrow -\lambda\gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5, \quad (\text{E4})$$

giving

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} (\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{uu} & (\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{us} \\ (\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{su} & (\mathcal{M}^{-1})_{ss} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} (D_u - \lambda^2 T D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5)^{-1} & \lambda D_u^{-1} T (D_s - \lambda^2 \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 D_u^{-1} T)^{-1} \\ \lambda D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 (D_u - \lambda^2 T D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5)^{-1} & (D_s - \lambda^2 \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 D_u^{-1} T)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E5})$$

Hence we have, upon rewriting

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(uu)} &= (1 - \lambda^2 D_u^{-1} T D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5)^{-1} D_u^{-1}, \\ G^{(ss)} &= (1 - \lambda^2 D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 D_u^{-1} T)^{-1} D_s^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E6})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(us)} &= \lambda D_u^{-1} T G^{(ss)}, \\ G^{(su)} &= \lambda D_s^{-1} \gamma_5 T^\dagger \gamma_5 G^{(uu)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E7})$$

as given in the main text. Note that, as built in, we have

$$\gamma_5 G^{(su)\dagger} \gamma_5 = G^{(us)}. \quad (\text{E8})$$

- [1] Y. Aoki *et al.*, FLAG review 2021, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 869 (2022).
- [2] A. S. Meyer, A. Walker-Loud, and C. Wilkinson, Status of lattice QCD determination of nucleon form factors and their relevance for the few-GeV neutrino program, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **72**, 205 (2022).
- [3] D. Djukanovic, Recent progress on nucleon form factors, *Proc. Sci. LATTICE2021* (2022) 009.
- [4] K. U. Can, Lattice QCD study of the elastic and transition form factors of charmed baryons, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **36**, 2130013 (2021).
- [5] M. Constantinou *et al.*, Parton distributions and lattice-QCD calculations: Toward 3D structure, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **121**, 103908 (2021).
- [6] K. Cichy and M. Constantinou, A guide to light-cone PDFs from Lattice QCD: An overview of approaches, techniques and results, *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2019**, 3036904 (2019).
- [7] P. Gambino, S. Hashimoto, S. Mächler, M. Panero, F. Sanfilippo, S. Simula, A. Smecca, and N. Tantalo, Lattice QCD study of inclusive semileptonic decays of heavy mesons, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07** (2022) 083.
- [8] A. J. Chambers, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, K. Somfleth, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF Collaboration), Nucleon Structure Functions from Operator Product Expansion on the Lattice, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 242001 (2017).
- [9] K. F. Liu, Parton distribution function from the hadronic tensor on the lattice, *Proc. Sci. LATTICE2015* (2016) 115.
- [10] C. Y. Seng, D. Galviz, W. J. Marciano, and U. G. Meißner, Update on  $|V_{us}|$  and  $|V_{us}/V_{ud}|$  from semileptonic kaon and pion decays, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 013005 (2022).
- [11] S. Gottlieb, Lattice QCD impact on determination of CKM matrix: Status and prospects, *Proc. Sci. LATTICE2019* (2020) 275.
- [12] Z. Davoudi, W. Detmold, K. Orginos, A. Parreño, M. J. Savage, P. Shanahan, and M. L. Wagman, Nuclear matrix elements from lattice QCD for electroweak and beyond-standard-model processes, *Phys. Rep.* **900**, 1 (2021).
- [13] N. Severijns, M. Beck, and O. Naviliat-Cuncic, Tests of the standard electroweak model in beta decay, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 991 (2006).
- [14] M. González-Alonso, O. Naviliat-Cuncic, and N. Severijns, New physics searches in nuclear and neutron  $\beta$  decay, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **104**, 165 (2019).
- [15] V. Cirigliano, W. Detmold, A. Nicholson, and P. Shanahan, Lattice QCD inputs for nuclear double beta decay, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **112**, 103771 (2020).
- [16] R. E. Smail, M. Batelaan, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF/UKQCD/CSSM Collaboration), Constraining beyond the standard model nucleon isovector charges, [arXiv:2304.02866](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.02866).
- [17] R. Horsley, R. Millo, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, F. Winter, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF-UKQCD Collaboration), A lattice study of the gluon in the nucleon, *Phys. Lett. B* **714**, 312 (2012).
- [18] A. J. Chambers, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (CSSM and QCDSF/UKQCD Collaborations), Feynman–Hellmann approach to the spin structure of hadrons, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 014510 (2014).
- [19] A. J. Chambers, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (CSSM and QCDSF/UKQCD Collaborations), Disconnected contributions to the spin of the nucleon, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 114517 (2015).
- [20] C. Bouchard, C. C. Chang, T. Kurth, K. Orginos, and A. Walker-Loud, On the Feynman–Hellmann theorem in quantum field theory and the calculation of matrix elements, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 014504 (2017).
- [21] A. J. Chambers, J. Dragos, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, K. Somfleth, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF/UKQCD/CSSM Collaborations), Electromagnetic form factors at large momenta from lattice QCD, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 114509 (2017).
- [22] M. Lüscher and U. Wolff, How to calculate the elastic scattering matrix in two-dimensional quantum field theories by numerical simulation, *Nucl. Phys.* **B339**, 222 (1990).
- [23] B. Blossier, M. Della Morte, G. von Hippel, T. Mendes, and R. Sommer (ALPHA Collaboration), On the generalized eigenvalue method for energies and matrix elements in lattice field theory, *J. High Energy Phys.* **04** (2009) 094.
- [24] B. J. Owen, J. Dragos, W. Kamleh, D. B. Leinweber, M. S. Mahbub, B. J. Menadue, and J. M. Zanotti, Variational approach to the calculation of  $g_A$ , *Phys. Lett. B* **723**, 217 (2013).
- [25] D. Guadagnoli, V. Lubicz, M. Papinutto, and S. Simula, First lattice QCD Study of the  $\Sigma^- \rightarrow n$  axial and vector form factors with  $SU(3)$  breaking corrections, *Nucl. Phys.* **B761**, 63 (2007).
- [26] P. E. Shanahan, A. N. Cooke, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, A. W. Thomas, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti,  $SU(3)$  breaking in hyperon transition vector form factors, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 074029 (2015).
- [27] S. Sasaki, Continuum limit of hyperon vector coupling  $f_1(0)$  from  $2+1$  flavor domain wall QCD, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 074509 (2017).
- [28] J. M. Bickerton, A. N. Cooke, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF-UKQCD-CSSM Collaboration), Patterns of flavour symmetry breaking in hadron matrix elements involving  $u$ ,  $d$  and  $s$  quarks, *Proc. Sci. LATTICE2021* (2022) 490.
- [29] R. Horsley, M. Batelaan, K. U. Can, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF-UKQCD-CSSM Collaborations), Quasi-degenerate baryon energy states, the Feynman–Hellmann theorem and transition matrix elements, *Proc. Sci. LATTICE2022* (2022) 412.
- [30] M. Lüscher and P. Weisz, Definition and general properties of the transfer matrix in continuum limit improved lattice gauge theories, *Nucl. Phys.* **B240**, 349 (1984).
- [31] K. U. Can, A. Hannaford-Gunn, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, K. Y. Somfleth, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF/UKQCD/CSSM Collaborations), Lattice evaluation of the Compton amplitude employing the Feynman–Hellmann theorem, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 114505 (2020).

- [32] C. Best, M. Göckeler, R. Horsley, E. M. Ilgenfritz, H. Perlt, P. E. L. Rakow, A. Schäfer, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, and S. Schramm, Pion and rho structure functions from lattice QCD, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 2743 (1997).
- [33] K. U. Can, A. Hannaford-Gunn, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, P. E. L. Rakow, E. Sankey, G. Schierholz, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti, The Compton amplitude, lattice QCD and the Feynman–Hellmann approach, *SciPost Phys. Proc.* **6**, 003 (2022).
- [34] K. U. Can (QCDSF-UKQCD Collaboration), The Compton amplitude and nucleon structure functions, *Proc. Sci. LATTICE2022* (2023) 237.
- [35] J. M. Bickerton, R. Horsley, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, H. Stüben, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF-UKQCD-CSSM Collaboration), Patterns of flavor symmetry breaking in hadron matrix elements involving  $u$ ,  $d$ , and  $s$  quarks, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 114516 (2019).
- [36] N. Cundy, M. Göckeler, R. Horsley, T. Kaltenbrunner, A. D. Kennedy, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, A. Schäfer, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, H. Stüben, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF-UKQCD Collaboration), Non-perturbative improvement of stout-smear three flavour clover fermions, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 094507 (2009).
- [37] W. Bietenholz, V. Bornyakov, M. Göckeler, R. Horsley, W. G. Lockhart, Y. Nakamura, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, T. Streuer, H. Stüben, F. Winter, and J. M. Zanotti (QCDSF-UKQCD Collaboration), Flavour blindness and patterns of flavour symmetry breaking in lattice simulations of up, down and strange quarks, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 054509 (2011).
- [38] P. F. Bedaque, Aharonov-Bohm effect and nucleon nucleon phase shifts on the lattice, *Phys. Lett. B* **593**, 82 (2004).
- [39] C. T. Sachrajda and G. Villadoro, Twisted boundary conditions in lattice simulations, *Phys. Lett. B* **609**, 73 (2005).
- [40] P. F. Bedaque and J. W. Chen, Twisted valence quarks and hadron interactions on the lattice, *Phys. Lett. B* **616**, 208 (2005).
- [41] J. M. Flynn, A. Jüttner, C. T. Sachrajda, P. A. Boyle, and J. M. Zanotti, Hadronic form factors in Lattice QCD at small and vanishing momentum transfer, *J. High Energy Phys.* **05** (2007) 016.
- [42] P. A. Boyle, J. M. Flynn, A. Jüttner, C. Kelly, H. P. de Lima, C. M. Maynard, C. T. Sachrajda, and J. M. Zanotti (UKQCD Collaboration), The Pion’s electromagnetic form-factor at small momentum transfer in full lattice QCD, *J. High Energy Phys.* **07** (2008) 112.
- [43] B. Yoon, R. Gupta, T. Bhattacharya, M. Engelhardt, J. Green, B. Joó, H. W. Lin, J. Negele, K. Orginos, A. Pochinsky, D. Richards, S. Syritsyn, and F. Winter (NME Collaboration), Controlling excited-state contamination in nucleon matrix elements, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 114506 (2016).
- [44] M. Göckeler, T. R. Hemmert, R. Horsley, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, A. Schäfer, and G. Schierholz (QCDSF Collaboration), Nucleon electromagnetic form-factors on the lattice and in chiral effective field theory, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 034508 (2005).
- [45] J. Dragos, R. Horsley, W. Kamleh, D. B. Leinweber, Y. Nakamura, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, R. D. Young, and J. M. Zanotti, Nucleon matrix elements using the variational method in lattice QCD, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 074505 (2016).
- [46] T. R. Haar, Y. Nakamura, and H. Stüben, An update on the BQCD hybrid Monte Carlo program, *EPJ Web Conf.* **175**, 14011 (2018).
- [47] R. G. Edwards and B. Joó, The Chroma software system for lattice QCD, *Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl.* **140**, 832 (2005).
- [48] M. Creutz, Gauge fixing, the transfer matrix, and confinement on a lattice, *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 1128 (1977).
- [49] I. Montvay and G. Münster, *Quantum Fields on a Lattice* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1994).
- [50] A. S. Wightman, Three formulas for the off-diagonal density matrix of a Dirac spinor with an application, *J. Math. Phys. (N.Y.)* **674**, 674 (2001).
- [51] P. B. Pal, Representation-independent manipulations with Dirac spinors, [arXiv:physics/0703214](https://arxiv.org/abs/physics/0703214).
- [52] C. Lorcé, New explicit expressions for Dirac bilinears, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 016005 (2018).
- [53] M. A. Olpak and A. Ozpineci, On the calculation of covariant expressions for Dirac bilinears, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 798 (2021).