PHYSICAL REVIEW D **83,** 079902(E) (2011)

Erratum: Information on the structure of the rho meson from the pion form factor [Phys. Rev. D 80, 114012 (2009)]

S. Leupold

(Received 23 March 2011; published 14 April 2011)

A numerical error requires a refit of the resonance parameters. The qualitative statements and the conclusions of the paper remain unchanged.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.83.079902 PACS numbers: 13.75.Lb, 11.30.Rd, 12.39.Fe, 14.40.−n, 99.10.Cd

The numerical evaluation of the loop function $J(s)$, given in Eq. (12) of the original paper, below the two-pion threshold turned out to be wrong. As a consequence, the values for the resonance parameters given in Eq. (28) of the original paper do not correspond to the figures. The curves shown in the figures can be obtained by the following parameter sets:

$$\text{para 1: } h_P = 0.300, \quad e_V = 0.230, \quad m_{\rho,\text{bare}} = 0.744\ \text{GeV} \qquad \text{para 2: } h_P = 0.308, \quad e_V = 0.230, \quad m_{\rho,\text{bare}} = 0.745\ \text{GeV}.$$

This should replace the old Eq. (28).

All statements and conclusions of the paper remain untouched except for the discussion in the last paragraph of the main text. There it was claimed that the resonance parameters remain basically unchanged if the renormalization point is modified. However, the bare resonance mass does change. Therefore, the last paragraph of the main text should be replaced with the following: Finally we explore the consequence of a small deviation from (15): Varying $\mu = \tilde{\mu}$ between $m_\pi/2$ and $2m_\pi$ leads to a change of the bare ρ-meson mass:

$$\mu = m_\pi/2\text{: } m_{\rho,\text{bare}} = 0.747\ \text{GeV} \qquad \mu = m_\pi\text{: } m_{\rho,\text{bare}} = 0.744\ \text{GeV} \qquad \mu = 2m_\pi\text{: } m_{\rho,\text{bare}} = 0.712\ \text{GeV}$$

Leaving the other resonance parameters untouched results in small variations in the scattering phase shift comparable in size to the differences between the full and the dotted curve of Fig. 9.

The author thanks C. Terschlüsen for pointing out the erroneous evaluation of the loop function.

