

$K \rightarrow \pi l \nu$ semileptonic form factors from two-flavor lattice QCDV. Lubicz,^{1,2} F. Mescia,³ S. Simula,² and C. Tarantino^{1,2}

(European Twisted Mass Collaboration)

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma Tre, Via della Vasca Navale 84, I-00146 Roma, Italy*²*Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Roma Tre, Via della Vasca Navale 84, I-00146 Roma, Italy*³*Dep. ECM and ICC, Universitat de Barcelona, Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain*

(Received 6 July 2009; published 30 December 2009)

We present new lattice results of the $K \rightarrow \pi l \nu$ semileptonic form factors obtained from simulations with two flavors of dynamical twisted-mass fermions, using pion masses as light as 260 MeV. Our main result is $f_+(0) = 0.9560(84)$, which, combined with the latest experimental data for $K_{\ell 3}$ decays, leads to $|V_{us}| = 0.2267(5)_{\text{exp}}(20)_{f_+(0)}$. Using the PDG(2008) determinations of $|V_{ud}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$ our result implies for the unitarity relation $|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{ub}|^2 = 1.0004(15)$. For the $O(p^6)$ term of the chiral expansion of $f_+(0)$ we get $\Delta f \equiv f_+(0) - 1 - f_2 = -0.0214(84)$.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.80.111502

PACS numbers: 11.15.Ha, 12.15.Hh, 12.38.Gc

The Cabibbo's angle, or equivalently the CKM matrix element $|V_{us}|$ [1], is one of the fundamental parameters of the standard model. The most precise determination of $|V_{us}|$ comes from $K \rightarrow \pi l \nu$ ($K_{\ell 3}$) decay. The PDG(2008) quotes $|V_{us}| = 0.2255(19)$ [2]. It is based on the new, very accurate experimental determination of the product $|V_{us}|f_+(0) = 0.21668(45)$ [2,3] and on the old estimate of the vector form factor at zero-momentum transfer $f_+(0) = 0.961(8)$ given in Ref. [4].

The determination of $f_+(0)$ using lattice QCD started only recently with the quenched calculation of Ref. [5], where it was shown how $f_+(0)$ can be determined at the physical point with a $\approx 1\%$ accuracy. The findings of Ref. [5] triggered various unquenched calculations of $f_+(0)$, namely, those of Refs. [6–8] with $N_f = 2$ and pion masses above ≈ 500 MeV and the recent one of Ref. [9] with $N_f = 2 + 1$ and pion masses starting from 330 MeV.

In this paper we present a new lattice result for $f_+(0)$ obtained from simulations with two flavors of dynamical twisted-mass quarks, using pion masses from 260 MeV up to 580 MeV. Our determination of $f_+(0)$ includes the estimates of all sources of systematic errors: discretization, finite size effects (FSEs), q^2 dependence, chiral extrapolation, and the effects of quenching the strange quark.

The chiral extrapolation and the related uncertainty are investigated using both SU(3) and, for the first time, SU(2) chiral perturbation theory (ChPT). In both cases, we consider the complete chiral expansion of the vector form factor up to the next-to-leading order (NLO) and a subset of terms entering at next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO). Within SU(3) ChPT, one can perform a systematic expansion of $f_+(0)$ of the type $f_+(0) = 1 + f_2 + f_4 + \dots$, where $f_n = \mathcal{O}[M_{K,\pi}^n/(4\pi f_\pi)^n]$ and the first term is equal to unity due to the current conservation in the SU(3) limit. Because of the Ademollo-Gatto (AG) theorem

[10], the first correction f_2 does not receive contributions from the local operators of the effective theory and can be computed unambiguously in terms of the kaon and pion masses (M_K and M_π) and the pion decay constant f_π . It takes the value $f_2 = -0.0226$ at the physical point [4]. The task is thus reduced to the problem of finding a prediction for

$$\Delta f \equiv f_4 + f_6 + \dots = f_+(0) - (1 + f_2). \quad (1)$$

Recently, SU(2) ChPT at the NLO has been applied to study the quark-mass dependence of $f_+(0)$ [11]. In SU(2) ChPT the strange quark field does not satisfy chiral symmetry and the dependence on the strange quark mass, m_s , is absorbed into the low-energy constants of the effective theory. The convergence of SU(2) ChPT is expected to be good when the u/d quark mass is significantly smaller than m_s . In the case of $f_+(0)$ one gets the NLO result [11]

$$f_+(0) = F_+ - \frac{3}{4} \frac{M_\pi^2}{(4\pi f_\pi)^2} \log\left(\frac{M_\pi^2}{\mu^2}\right) + c_+ M_\pi^2 + \mathcal{O}(M_\pi^4), \quad (2)$$

where F_+ and c_+ are low-energy constants functions of m_s , and c_+ depends also on the renormalization scale μ in such a way that the whole NLO result (2) is independent on μ .

For the extrapolation of our lattice data to the physical point we apply both SU(2) and SU(3) ChPT obtaining consistent results, which help in constraining the uncertainty of the chiral extrapolation.

We perform simulations with $N_f = 2$ flavors of dynamical twisted-mass quarks [12] generated with the tree-level Symanzik improved gauge action at a lattice spacing $a = 0.0883(6)$ fm [13,14] ($\beta = 3.9$), for six values of the (bare) sea quark mass, namely, $am_{\text{sea}} = 0.0030, 0.0040, 0.0064, 0.0085, 0.0100, 0.0150$ (see Ref. [15]). The valence light-quark mass is always kept equal to the sea quark mass

TABLE I. Results for $f_0(q_{\max}^2)$ and $f_+(0)$, obtained at the lattice spacing of the main simulations ($a \approx 0.088$ fm) using the pole (5) or quadratic (6) fits and interpolated at the reference kaon mass (7) for each simulated pion mass.

M_π (MeV)	M_K^{ref} (MeV)	$f_0(q_{\max}^2)$	$f_+(0)$ (pole)	$f_+(0)$ (quadratic)
260	520	1.030 97(224)	0.975 19 (499)	0.973 74 (505)
300	530	1.019 23 (121)	0.980 52 (440)	0.979 50 (390)
375	555	1.009 61 (123)	0.989 16 (264)	0.988 13 (248)
435	575	1.004 16 (43)	0.993 43 (130)	0.992 73 (131)
470	590	1.002 72 (34)	0.994 21 (79)	0.994 13 (85)
575	635	1.000 16 (6)	0.998 23 (15)	0.998 27 (19)

(unitary pions) and the simulated pion masses goes from ≈ 260 to ≈ 575 MeV. For each pion mass we use three values of the (bare) strange quark mass, namely, $am_s = 0.015, 0.022, 0.027$, to allow for a smooth, local interpolation of our results to the physical strange quark mass ($am_s^{\text{phys}} \approx 0.021$).

At the two lowest pion masses the lattice volume is $L^3 \cdot T = 32^3 \cdot 64$ in lattice units, while at the higher ones it is $24^3 \cdot 48$ in order to guarantee that $M_\pi L \geq 3.7$.

We perform three additional simulations: the first one at $M_\pi \approx 300$ MeV using the smaller volume and the others at $M_\pi \approx 470$ MeV using a finer lattice spacing $a \approx 0.069$ fm ($\beta = 4.05$) and a coarser one $a \approx 0.103$ fm ($\beta = 3.8$) in order to check FSEs and discretization errors, respectively.

The 2- and 3-point correlation functions relevant in this work are calculated using all-to-all quark propagators evaluated with the ‘‘one-end-trick’’ stochastic procedure. All the necessary formulae can be easily inferred from Ref. [13], where the degenerate case of the pion form factor is illustrated in details. At each value of the pion mass the statistical errors are evaluated with the jackknife procedure, while a bootstrap sampling is applied in order to combine the jackknives for different pion masses.

The matrix element of the weak vector current V_μ can be written as

$$\langle \pi(p') | V_\mu | K(p) \rangle = P_\mu f_+(q^2) + q_\mu f_-(q^2), \quad (3)$$

where $P_\mu = p_\mu + p'_\mu$ and $q_\mu = p_\mu - p'_\mu$, and the scalar form factor $f_0(q^2)$ is defined as

$$f_0(q^2) = f_+(q^2) + \frac{q^2}{M_K^2 - M_\pi^2} f_-(q^2). \quad (4)$$

Following Ref. [5] the scalar form factor at $q^2 = q_{\max}^2 \equiv (M_K - M_\pi)^2$ can be calculated on the lattice with very high statistical precision using a suitable double ratio of 3-point correlation functions. In the present simulations we get a precision better than $\approx 0.2\%$ (see Table I).

At each pion and kaon masses we determine both the vector $f_+(q^2)$ and the scalar $f_0(q^2)$ form factors for several values of $q^2 < q_{\max}^2$ in order to interpolate at $q^2 = 0$. We take advantage of the twisted boundary conditions (see Ref. [13] for details) to achieve values of q^2 quite close to $q^2 = 0$. The momentum dependencies of both form

factors are nicely fitted either by a pole behavior

$$f_{+,0}(q^2) = f_+(0)/(1 - s_{+,0}q^2) \quad (5)$$

or by a quadratic dependence on q^2

$$f_{+,0}(q^2) = f_+(0) \cdot (1 + \bar{s}_{+,0}q^2 + \bar{c}_{+,0}q^4), \quad (6)$$

where the condition $f_0(0) = f_+(0)$ is understood. The quality of the two fits is illustrated in Fig. 1.

The values obtained for $f_+(0)$ depend on both the pion and kaon masses. The dependence on the latter is shown in Fig. 2 at $M_\pi \approx 435$ MeV, and it appears to be quite smooth, so that an interpolation at the physical strange quark mass can be easily performed using quadratic splines. This is obtained by fixing the combination $(2M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)$ at its physical value, which at each pion mass defines a reference kaon mass M_K^{ref} :

$$2[M_K^{\text{ref}}]^2 - M_\pi^2 = 2[M_K^{\text{phys}}]^2 - [M_\pi^{\text{phys}}]^2 \quad (7)$$

with $M_\pi^{\text{phys}} = 135.0$ MeV and $M_K^{\text{phys}} = 494.4$ MeV.

Note that at the SU(3)-symmetric point $M_K = M_\pi$ the absolute normalization $f_+(0) = 1$ is imposed automatically by the double ratio method of Ref. [5].

The results for $f_+(0)$, obtained using the pole dominance (5) or the quadratic fit (6), and interpolated at the reference kaon mass (7), are given in Table I for each pion mass. It can be seen that the values of $f_+(0)$ corresponding




FIG. 1 (color online). Scalar $f_0(q^2)$ and vector $f_+(q^2)$ form factors obtained at $M_\pi \approx 300$ MeV and $M_K \approx 580$ MeV versus q^2 in physical units. The solid and dashed lines are the results of the fits based on Eqs. (5) and (6), respectively.


$K \rightarrow \pi l \nu$ SEMILEPTONIC FORM FACTORS ...


FIG. 2 (color online). Results for $f_+(0)$ versus M_K^2 at $M_\pi \approx 435$ MeV. The square corresponds to the value of $f_+(0)$ obtained by local interpolation via quadratic splines (dotted line) at the reference kaon mass $M_K^{\text{ref}} \approx 575$ MeV from Eq. (7).

to different q^2 dependencies of the form factors differ by less than half of the statistical errors.

The SU(3) chiral analysis of $f_+(0)$ starts by considering the NLO term f_2 , using the exact expression f_2^{PQ} evaluated for our partially quenched (PQ) setup in Ref. [16],

$$f_2^{\text{PQ}} = -\frac{2M_K^2 + M_\pi^2}{32\pi^2 f_\pi^2} - \frac{3M_K^2 M_\pi^2 \log(M_\pi^2/M_K^2)}{64\pi^2 f_\pi^2 (M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)} + \frac{M_K^2 (4M_K^2 - M_\pi^2) \log(2 - M_\pi^2/M_K^2)}{64\pi^2 f_\pi^2 (M_K^2 - M_\pi^2)}, \quad (8)$$

and by constructing the quantity Δf from Eq. (1). We then carry out the extrapolation to the physical point using a simple phenomenological ansatz in terms of M_π^2 :

$$\Delta f = \Delta_0 + \Delta_1 M_\pi^2 + \Delta_2 M_\pi^4 + \Delta_3 M_\pi^2 \log(M_\pi^2), \quad (9)$$

where $\Delta_{0,1,2,3}$ are fitting parameters. Since the strange quark mass has been already interpolated to its physical value in this fit, the dependence of the coefficients $\Delta_{0,1,2,3}$ on the strange mass is left implicit. It is understood, however, that this dependence is such that all terms in Eq. (9) are at least of NNLO in the chiral expansion.

The results obtained for $f_+(0)$ using two fits for Δf , one with $\Delta_3 = 0$ and the other with $\Delta_2 = 0$, are shown in Fig. 3(a). It can be seen that: i) the (absolute) size of Δf , whose chiral expansion starts from the NNLO term f_4 , is even larger than the one of the leading NLO term f_2^{PQ} at all pion masses, and ii) the impact of the logarithmic term at NNLO is quite small.

A relevant check on our fits (9) is that they turn out to be consistent with zero (within the statistical errors) at the point $M_\pi = M_K^{\text{ref}}$, as required by the AG theorem.

At the physical point we get

$$f_+(0)|_{\text{SU}(3)}^{\text{PQ}} = 0.9599(61)(32), \quad (10)$$

where the first error is statistical and the second one is systematic coming from the uncertainties of the mass extrapolation and the q^2 dependence of the form factors.


 PHYSICAL REVIEW D **80**, 111502(R) (2009)


FIG. 3 (color online). Results for $f_+(0)$, obtained using the pole fit (5), versus M_π^2 at $M_K = M_K^{\text{ref}}$ analyzed using SU(3) (a) and SU(2) (b) ChPT. In (a) the SU(3) LO + NLO term, $1 + f_2^{\text{PQ}}$, is shown by the dashed line. The solid and dot-dashed lines are the results of the fit (9) for Δf with $\Delta_3 = 0$ and $\Delta_2 = 0$, respectively. In (b) the dashed line is the SU(2) LO + NLO fit (2) applied to our data with $M_\pi \leq 0.4$ GeV, while the solid line corresponds to the result of fitting all lattice points adding to Eq. (2) a NNLO term proportional to M_π^4 . The vertical line corresponds to $M_\pi^{\text{phys}} = 135.0$ MeV.

We now discuss the analysis based on SU(2) ChPT. First we note that Eq. (2) holds for full QCD [11] as well as for the PQ theory with $N_f = 2$. In the latter case it can be verified by expanding f_2^{PQ} [see Eq. (8)] in powers of M_π^2/M_K^2 . Thus we consider a SU(2) fit of the form (2) treating F_+ and c_+ as fitting parameters, and we apply it to our data with $M_\pi \leq 0.4$ GeV. Alternatively we add to Eq. (2) a NNLO correction proportional to M_π^4 and apply the new fit to all lattice points. The results are shown in Fig. 3(b). It can be seen that the impact of the SU(2) NNLO correction is quite small up to $M_\pi \approx 0.5$ GeV at variance with the corresponding SU(3) result shown in Fig. 3(a). This finding signals a better convergence of SU(2) ChPT with respect to SU(3) for $f_+(0)$.

At the physical point we get

$$f_+(0)|_{\text{SU}(2)}^{\text{PQ}} = 0.9563(53)(13). \quad (11)$$

The application of SU(2) and SU(3) ChPT yields results for $f_+(0)$, Eqs. (10) and (11), which are consistent within the uncertainties. By averaging the two results and adding the systematic errors in quadrature we get

$$f_+^{\text{PQ}}(0) = 0.9581 \pm 0.0057_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.0035_{\text{syst}}. \quad (12)$$

We now present our estimates of the remaining sources of systematic effects.

Finite size. We have performed a simulation at $M_\pi = 300$ MeV using the volume $24^3 \cdot 48$, which corresponds to $M_\pi L \simeq 3.2$. We get $f_+(0) = 0.98633(362)$ using the pole-dominance fit (5) and $f_+(0) = 0.98597(337)$ using the quadratic fit (6). We combine these values with the results shown in the second row of Table I, corresponding to the volume $32^3 \cdot 64$ with $M_\pi L \simeq 4.2$. The results are shown in Fig. 4(a) versus the lattice size L/a . For matrix elements like the ones in Eq. (3), involving only one particle in the final states, FSEs are known to be exponentially suppressed. Assuming a volume dependence of the form $A + Be^{-M_\pi L}/L^{3/2}$ we obtain a residual FSE, corresponding to the difference between the value at infinite volume and the one calculated at the largest lattice volume, equal to 0.0018, which we add (in quadrature) to the systematic error of Eq. (12).

Discretization. We have performed simulations at $M_\pi \simeq 470$ MeV using both a finer ($a \simeq 0.069$ fm) and a coarser ($a \simeq 0.103$ fm) lattice. The results for $f_+(0)$, shown in




FIG. 4 (color online). Results for $f_+(0)$ versus the lattice size in lattice units (a) and the squared lattice spacing (b). The full dots and the open squares correspond to the values of $f_+(0)$ obtained with the pole (5) or quadratic (6) fits, respectively. The values of the pion mass are reported in the inset, while the kaon mass is fixed at the corresponding reference values given by Eq. (7). In (a) the dashed line is an exponentially suppressed fit of the form $A + Be^{-M_\pi L}/L^{3/2}$, while the dotted line is the value $f_+(0) = A = 0.97821(381)$ in the limit of infinite volume. In (b) the solid line is a linear fit in the squared lattice spacing, a^2 , consistent with the automatic $O(a)$ -improvement at maximal twist [17].

Fig. 4(b), exhibits a clear, linear (in a^2) increase toward the continuum limit, consistent with the automatic $O(a)$ -improvement at maximal twist [17]. The difference between the value in the continuum limit and the one at $a \simeq 0.088$ fm is equal to 0.0037, which we add both to the central value and (in quadrature) to the systematic error of Eq. (12). Clearly a more detailed study of the scaling property of $f_+(0)$ at various pion masses would be beneficial in order to estimate better and to reduce further the discretization error.

Quenching of the strange quark. The effect of our PQ setup can be estimated within SU(3) ChPT. Because of the AG theorem, valid also in both quenched Q [5] and PQ [16] setups, the NLO term f_2 can be computed unambiguously in terms of M_K , M_π and f_π . At the physical point it takes the values: $f_2^Q = +0.022$ in the quenched case $N_f = 0$ [5], $f_2^{\text{PQ}} = -0.0168$ for our PQ setup with $N_f = 2$ [16] and $f_2 = -0.0226$ for $N_f = 2 + 1$ [4]. Thus, the effect of quenching the strange quark is exactly known at NLO: at the physical point $f_2 - f_2^{\text{PQ}} = -0.0058$ ($\simeq 26\%$ of f_2). This correction is added to the central value of Eq. (12) and it has no error. Note that the difference between the values of f_2 at $N_f = 2 + 1$ and $N_f = 2$ is almost an order of magnitude less than the difference between those at $N_f = 2 + 1$ and $N_f = 0$. In our opinion this should be traced back to the facts that f_2 is dominated by meson loops and the pion contribution is the same in the $N_f = 2$ and $N_f = 2 + 1$ theories.

The task is thus reduced to the problem of estimating the quenching effect on the $O(p^6)$ term Δf . For this quantity we have found evidence that the chiral logs, which are the most sensitive to quenching effects, are small compared to the contribution of the local terms (see Fig. 3(a)). We estimate that the relative quenching effect on Δf is at most 50% of the same relative effect on f_2 . Thus we add (in quadrature) the value 0.0028 (i.e., $\simeq 13\%$ of Δf) to the systematic error of Eq. (12). Note that this value is of the same size of the difference between our estimate of Δf at $N_f = 2$ and the quenched one of Ref. [5]. Thus, we expect our estimate of the quenching error to be a quite conservative one.

Our final result is

$$\begin{aligned} f_+(0) &= 0.9560 \pm 0.0057_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.0062_{\text{syst}} \\ &= 0.9560 \pm 0.0084, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

TABLE II. Budget of the systematic error for $f_+(0)$.

Source	Syst. error	% of $[1 - f_+(0)]$
q^2 dependence and chiral extrapolation	0.0035	8
Finite size	0.0018	4
Discretization	0.0037	8
Quenching of the strange quark	0.0028	6
Total (in quadrature)	0.0062	14




FIG. 5 (color online). Results for the slopes s_0 (dots) and s_+ (squares), obtained at a lattice spacing equal to $a \approx 0.088$ fm using the pole fit (5), versus M_π^2 at $M_K = M_K^{\text{ref}}$. The solid (dashed) line corresponds to the fit (16) with $d_{+,0} = 0$ ($c_{+,0} = 0$). The vertical line corresponds to $M_\pi^{\text{phys}} = 135.0$ MeV.

which corresponds to $\Delta f = -0.0214(84)$. Our determination agrees very well with the Leutwyler-Roos result [4] and with previous lattice calculations at $N_f = 0$ [5], $N_f = 2$ [6–8] and $N_f = 2 + 1$ [9].

The budget for the systematic error of the result (13) is collected in Table II.

Using the latest experimental determination of the product $|V_{us}|f_+(0) = 0.21668(45)$ [2,3] we get from (13)

$$|V_{us}| = 0.2267 \pm 0.0005_{\text{exp}} \pm 0.0020_{f_+(0)}. \quad (14)$$

Combining this value with $|V_{ud}| = 0.97418(27)$ and $|V_{ub}| = 0.00393(36)$ from PDG(2008) [2] the CKM unitarity relation becomes

$$|V_{ud}|^2 + |V_{us}|^2 + |V_{ub}|^2 = 1.0004 \pm 0.0015. \quad (15)$$

In conclusion we present our results for the slopes of the scalar (s_0) and vector (s_+) form factors. Their light-quark-mass dependence is illustrated in Fig. 5 and it appears to be quite mild. We have tried simple fitting functions of the form

$$s_j = a_j + b_j M_\pi^2 + c_j M_\pi^4 + d_j M_\pi^2 \log(M_\pi^2), \quad (16)$$

where a_j , b_j , c_j and d_j are fitting parameters and $j = +, 0$. The results of two fits, one with $d_{+,0} = 0$ and the other with $c_{+,0} = 0$, are shown in Fig. 5.

In terms of the dimensionless quantities $\lambda_{+,0} \equiv M_\pi^2 s_{+,0}$ the extrapolation to the physical point and the evaluation of the systematic uncertainties yield

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &= (12.8 \pm 2.2_{\text{stat}} \pm 4.5_{\text{syst}}) \cdot 10^{-3}, \\ \lambda_+ &= (23.7 \pm 2.3_{\text{stat}} \pm 2.1_{\text{syst}}) \cdot 10^{-3}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where the large systematic error on λ_0 is dominated by discretization effects. Our results for both λ_0 and λ_+ agree very well with the latest experimental averages $\lambda_0^{\text{exp}} = (13.4 \pm 1.2) \cdot 10^{-3}$ and $\lambda_+^{\text{exp}} = (24.9 \pm 1.1) \cdot 10^{-3}$, obtained in Ref. [3] using data from KLOE, KTeV, ISTRA+, and NA48 experiments.

We thank all the ETMC members for fruitful discussions and the apeNEXT computer centers in Rome and Zeuthen for their invaluable technical help. This work has been supported in part by EU ITN Contract No. MRTN-CT-2006-035482, “FLAVIANet.” One of us (F.M.) also acknowledges the Consolider-Ingenio 2010 Program CPAN (Contract No. CSD2007-00042).

-
- [1] N. Cabibbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963); M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- [2] C. Amsler *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Lett. B **667**, 1 (2008).
- [3] M. Antonelli *et al.* (FlaviaNet Working Group on Kaon Decays), Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. **181-182**, 83 (2008).
- [4] H. Leutwyler and M. Roos, Z. Phys. C **25**, 91 (1984).
- [5] D. Becirevic *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B705**, 339 (2005).
- [6] N. Tsutsui *et al.* (JLQCD Collaboration), Proc. Sci. LAT2005 (2006) 357.
- [7] C. Dawson, T. Izubuchi, T. Kaneko, S. Sasaki, and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 114502 (2006).
- [8] D. Brommel *et al.* (The QCDSF collaboration), Proc. Sci. LAT2007 (2007) 364.
- [9] P. A. Boyle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 141601 (2008).
- [10] M. Ademollo and R. Gatto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13**, 264 (1964).
- [11] J. M. Flynn and C. T. Sachrajda (RBC/UKQCD Collaboration), Nucl. Phys. **B812**, 64 (2009).
- [12] R. Frezzotti, P. A. Grassi, S. Sint, and P. Weisz (Alpha collaboration), J. High Energy Phys. 08 (2001) 058.
- [13] R. Frezzotti, V. Lubicz, and S. Simula, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 074506 (2009).
- [14] P. Dimopoulos *et al.* (ETM Collaboration), arXiv: 0810.2873.
- [15] Ph. Boucaud *et al.* (ETM collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **650**, 304 (2007); Comput. Phys. Commun. **179**, 695 (2008).
- [16] D. Becirevic, G. Martinelli, and G. Villadoro, Phys. Lett. B **633**, 84 (2006).
- [17] R. Frezzotti and G. C. Rossi, J. High Energy Phys. 08 (2004) 007.