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Abstract. Discovered more than forty years ago and from the very start a stumbling block for the naive quark–antiquark model, light scalar mesons are virtually universally believed to be nontrivial in nature today. A major contribution to understanding the nature of light scalar mesons has come from the physics of photon–photon collisions, a field which has recently entered the era of high-precision statistics. In this paper, conclusions from current experimental data concerning the mechanisms of the two-photon creation of light scalar mesons are reviewed.

1. Introduction

Hadron scalar channels in an energy range of up to 1 GeV became a stumbling block in quantum chromodynamics (QCD) because neither perturbation theory nor sum rules work in these channels. In this energy range, scalar channels, unlike classical vector channels, work in these channels. At the same time, knowledge of the mechanisms behind chiral symmetry resulting from the confinement, and therefore to understanding the confinement itself. Searching for light σ- and χ-mesons began away back in the 1960s and preliminary information about them appeared at approximately that time in the reviews of the Particle Data Group (PDG) [12–14]. The theoretical basis of the search for scalar mesons was provided by the linear σ model (LSM) [15–17] that takes into account the spontaneous break of chiral symmetry and considers pseudoscalar mesons as Goldstone bosons. Surprisingly, it turned out that this model can be one of the efficient realizations of QCD at low energies. In the late sixties and early seventies [13, 18, 19], narrow scalar resonances [isovector a0(980) and isoscalar f0(980) resonances] were discovered. As far as σ- and χ-mesons are concerned, numerous unsuccessful attempts to conclusively prove their existence led to general disappointment, and information on these resonances have become true ‘beloved children’ of light quark spectroscopy.

1 In this energy range, scalar channels, unlike classical vector channels, contain no solitary resonances, i.e., resonances unaccompanied by a large background inseparable from them. Specifically, in the case of solitary a0(980) and f0(980) resonances, the resonance peaks in φ → γa0(980) → γη and ϕ → γf0(980) → γππ decays would be not observed at all because the differential probabilities of these decays in the soft photon region decrease in proportion to the cube of the photon energy by virtue of gauge invariance [1–5] (see Section 2). The key role of the chiral background in the ‘fate’ of the σ(600) resonance was demonstrated in the linear σ model [6–9]. The solitary resonance approximation in the case of light scalar mesons is nothing more than an academic exercise.

2 In 1977, R L Jaffe described a nonet of light four-quark scalar states in the MIT bag model that phenomenologically incorporates confinement [20]. He also suggested that a0(980) and f0(980) might be such states with symbolic quark structures in the form a0(980) = udds, f0(980) = (ui−di)ss/√2, a0(980) = dss, and f0(980) = (ui + di)ss/√2. Since that time, a0(980) and f0(980) resonances have become true ‘beloved children’ of light quark spectroscopy.
states disappeared from PDG reviews. One of the principal arguments against $\sigma$- and $\kappa$-mesons was the fact that the $S$-wave scattering phase shifts, both $\pi\pi$ and $K\pi$, fail to pass through $90^\circ$ in expected masses of resonance. Nevertheless, experimental and theoretical investigations of the processes in which the $\sigma$- and $\kappa$-states could manifest themselves continued.

The situation changed drastically after it had been shown that the $S$-wave amplitude of $\pi\pi$ scattering with isospin $I = 0$ in the linear $\sigma$ model contains a negative background phase [6] that hides the $\sigma$-meson, making it impossible for the $\pi\pi$ scattering phase shift to pass through $90^\circ$ at an expected mass of the resonance. It became clear that shielding the wide lightest scalar resonances (by the background) is quite natural in chiral dynamics. This idea was picked up and triggered a new wave of theoretical and experimental searches for $\sigma$- and $\kappa$-mesons (see, for example, Refs [21–28]). As a result, the light $\sigma$-resonance and the light $\kappa$-resonance have again appeared in PDG reviews (since 1996 and 2004, respectively) [29, 30].

There is now an impressive wealth of data about light scalar mesons [10, 11, 31, 32]. The nontrivial nature of these states is almost universally recognized. In particular, there is much evidence in favor of their four-quark structure, widely discussed in the literature [1, 4, 31–84] (see Sections 2–6 below).

One such piece of evidence is the suppression of production of $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances in $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ reactions, respectively, predicted in 1982 [85, 86] and confirmed in later experiments [10, 11]. There is a close relationship between mechanisms of $\sigma(600)$, $f_0(980)$, and $a_0(980)$ resonances production in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions and their quark structure. That is why investigations into two-photon processes is an important part of light scalar meson physics.

It should be noted that reactions of hadron production in photon–photon collisions are measured in electron–positron colliders; in other words, information about $\gamma\gamma \to \text{hadron}$ transitions is extracted from the data on $e^+e^- \to (e^+e^-, \text{hadrons})$ processes (Fig. 1). The biggest amount of statistics is obtained by the 'nontag' method that detects hadrons, but not scattered electrons. In this case, the main contribution to the cross section of $e^+e^- \to (e^+e^-, \text{hadrons})$ process is made by photons with very small virtualities, which yields data on hadron production in collisions between almost real photons. It is by this method that the majority of data on exclusive $\gamma\gamma \to \text{hadron}$ channels were obtained. Recoding scattered electrons (with the loss of some statistics) makes it possible to additionally study the dependence of the hadron production cross section in $\gamma\gamma(Q^2)$ collisions on virtuality; $^3$ here, $\gamma$ is the real photon, and $\gamma^*$(Q) is the virtual photon with virtuality $Q^2 = (p_1^2 - p_1'^2)$.

Recently, a qualitative leap has been made in experimental investigations of $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ processes [89–93], which confirmed theoretical predictions based on the four-quark nature of light scalar mesons [85, 86]. The Belle Collaboration published new data on the cross sections of $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ [90, 91], $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta^0$ [92], and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta^0$ [93] reactions the statistics on which are hundreds of times larger than those of all previous experiments. The Belle Collaboration also observed for the first time clear signals of $f_0(980)$ resonance in $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta^0$ channels. The previous indications of $f_0(980)$ production in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions [94–100] were very uncertain.

The review outline is as follows. In Sections 3–5, we present the results of investigations into the mechanisms of $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta^0$, and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta^0$ reactions based on an analysis of the Belle data [89–93] and our previous research on scalar meson physics in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions [9, 48, 85, 86, 110–111]. We also briefly (sometimes critically) discuss the analyses of other authors.

A combined analysis of the high-statistics Belle data on $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta^0$ reactions is presented, and the principal dynamic mechanisms of these processes are elucidated in an energy range up to 1.5 GeV. Also, the analysis of the high-statistics Belle data on the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta^0$ cross section is also presented. It is shown that the $\sigma(600) \to \gamma\gamma$, $f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma$, and $a_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma$ decays of the lightest scalar resonances are largely governed by rescattering mechanisms

$$\sigma \to \pi^+\pi^- \to \gamma\gamma,$$

$$f_0(980) \to (K^+K^- + \pi^+\pi^-) \to \gamma\gamma,$$

$$a_0(980) \to (KK + \pi^0\eta + \pi^0\eta^0) \to \gamma\gamma,$$

i.e., they are four-quark transitions, in contrast to two-photon decays of classical $P$-wave tensor qq-mesons $a_2(1320)$, $f_2(1270)$, and $f_3(1525)$ that primarily occur as a consequence of the direct two-quark transition $q\bar{q} \to \gamma\gamma$. Direct coupling constants between $\sigma(600)$, $f_0(980)$, and $a_0(980)$ resonances and the $\gamma\gamma$ system are rather small. The following estimates are obtained for the two-photon widths averaged over resonance mass distributions: $\langle |\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{a_0(980)}| \rangle \approx 0.19$ keV, $\langle |\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{f_0(980)}| \rangle \approx 0.4$ keV, and $\langle |\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{a_0(980)}| \rangle \approx 0.45$ keV.

Section 7 draws reader’s attention to the additional possibilities for studying the properties of $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances associated with $\gamma\gamma \to K^+K^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \to K^0\bar{K}^0$ reactions, thus far unexplored experimentally, and to the highly promising research on $\sigma(600)$, $f_0(980)$, and $a_0(980)$ resonances in $\gamma\gamma(Q^2)$ collisions.

---

$^3$ Detailed formulas for experimental studies of $e^+e^- \to (e^+e^-, \text{hadrons})$ reactions can be found in the reviews [87, 88].

---

**Figure 1.** The process of hadron production in photon–photon collisions in electron–positron colliders; $p_1$, $p_1'$ and $p_2$, $p_2'$ are the 4-momenta of electrons and positrons.
2. The special place of light scalar mesons in
the realm of hadron physics.
Evidence of their four-quark structure

Even a cursory examination of PDG reviews suggests the
q^2q^2-structure of the nonet of light scalar mesons \sigma(600),
\kappa(800), a_0(980), and f_0(980).\footnote{4}

Indeed, this nonet is found to be inverted \cite{49}:
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\sigma \\
\kappa
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
a_0 & a_0^0 & a_0^i \\
a_0^i & a_0 & a_0^0
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\sigma \\
\kappa
\end{pmatrix},
\]
\eqref{1}

with respect to the classical P-wave qq-nonet of tensor
mesons \a(1320), \f(1270), \K(1420), and \f(1525):
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\K^+ \\
\K^0
\end{pmatrix}
= \begin{pmatrix}
\a & \a^0 & \a^i \\
\a^i & \a & \a^0
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
\K^+ \\
\K^0
\end{pmatrix},
\]
\eqref{2}

and the classical S-wave qq-nonet of vector mesons \rho(770),
\omega(782), K^*(892), and \phi(1020).\footnote{5}

In the naive quark model, such a scalar nonet cannot be interpreted as a P-wave nonet of
qq-mesons, but it can be readily understood as a q^2q^2-nonet in
which \sigma(600) contains no strange quarks, \kappa(800) has the
s-quark, and \a(980) and \f(980) each have the \ss-pair.

Scalar mesons \f(980) and \a(980) discovered about forty
years ago became a difficult problem from the very beginning
for the naive qq model.\footnote{6}

Indeed, almost exact de generation of the masses of the
isovector, \a(980), and isoscalar, \f(980),
states seems, on the one hand, to be consistent with the
structure \a(980) = ud, \a(980) = (u - d)/\sqrt{2},
\a(980) = d\bar{u}, and \f(980) = (u + d)/\sqrt{2}, similar to the
structure of vector \rho- and \omega-mesons or tensor \a(1320)-
and \f(1270)-mesons. On the other hand, however, the strong
coupling of \f(980) with \K K suggests the presence of
a significant \ss-component in the wave function of \f(980).

In the early 1980s, it was demonstrated in a series of
papers \cite{34, 123, 132–136} that the data on \f(980) and
\a(980) resonances can be interpreted in favor of the q^2q^2-
m model, i.e., can be explained assuming the \f(980) and
\a(980) states exhibit Okubo–Zweig–Iizuka (OZI)-super-
allowed coupling to the pairs of pseudoscalar mesons and

\footnote{4}{To recall, LSM does not contradict the non-qq-nature of light scalar mesons, because quantum fields may contain different virtual particles in different regions of virtuality.}

\footnote{5}{In diagrams (1) and (2), the mass and the third component of the isotopic
spin of the states grow from bottom to top and from left to right, respectively.}

\footnote{6}{Worthy of mention is a series of important experiments performed in
the 1970s, in which \f(980) and \a(980) resonances were investigated \cite{111–116}, as well as a few theoretical analyses of scalar meson
properties dating to the same period \cite{20, 117–122}. Reference \cite{122}
reports the theoretical discovery of a beautiful threshold phenomenon,
\f(980) – \a(980) mixing, that breaks isotopic invariance (see also paper
\cite{123}). Recently, interest in the \f(980) – \a(980) mixing revived, as
appears from new suggestions for the search for this phenomenon (see
papers \cite{124–127} and references cited therein), along with the first
evidence of its manifestation in the \f(1285) \rightarrow \pippim decay measured
with the VES detector at the Institute of High Energy Physics
(Protvino) \cite{128–130}, in \fz(980) \rightarrow \fz(980) \rightarrow \phi \gamma
and \fz(980) \rightarrow \phi(980) \rightarrow \pimpim decays studied at BES III
(China) \cite{131}.

using for the corresponding coupling constants relations
predicted by the q^2q^2 model. In particular, the authors of
the above papers obtained and specified formulas for scalar
resonance propagators, taking into account corrections for
the finite width in the case of strong coupling with two-
particle decay channels. Later on, these formulas were
applied to fitting the data of a series of experiments on
\f(980) and \a(980) resonance production (see, e.g., Refs \cite{90–
92, 137–151}). Recently, it has been shown that the
 aforementioned scalar resonance propagators satisfy the
Kaellen–Lehmann representation in the domain of usually
used values of coupling constants \cite{152}.

In the late 1980s, it was shown that the study of radiative
decays \(\phi \rightarrow g\a(980) \rightarrow g\gamma\pi\pi\) and \(\phi \rightarrow g\f(980) \rightarrow g\gamma\pi\pi\) can
shel light on the problem of \a(980)- and \f(980)-mesons \cite{1}.\n
Over the next ten years preceding the first experiments (1998),
the question was considered from different standpoints [153–
165].

To date, these decays have been studied not only
theoretically but also in experiments with the help of the
Spherical Neutral Detector (SND) \cite{137–140} and the Calorimetric
Magnetic Detector (CMD-2) \cite{141, 142} at the Institute
of Nuclear Physics (Novosibirsk), and the KLOE detector
(K Long experiment) at the Frascati \(\phi\)-factory (Italy) \cite{143, 144, 146–148, 151, 166–168}.

Experimental findings gave impetus to a number of
theoretical studies \cite{2–5, 49, 169–172} that yielded evidence
in support of the four-quark nature of the \f(980) and \a(980)
states. Here is clear qualitative proof of this fact. The
isovector \a(980) resonance is produced in the radiative
decay of the \(\phi\)-meson as intensely as the isoscalar \(\eta(958)\)
meson that is roughly 66% composed of the \ss contribution
responsible for the \(\phi \rightarrow g\gamma\eta(958)\) decay. In the

\textbf{Figure 2.} K^-K^+ loop mechanism of radiative \(\phi(1020) \rightarrow \gamma(a_0(980))/\f(980)\) decays.
Both real and imaginary parts of the $\phi \to \gamma R$ transition amplitude are determined by the K$^+K^-$ intermediate state. The imaginary part is due to the real K$^+K^-$ intermediate state, while the real part is due to the virtual compact K$^+K^-$ intermediate state; in other words, we are dealing here with a four-quark transition [4, 5, 39, 40]. Needless to say, radiative four-quark transitions may occur both between two qq-states and between qq- and q$^2q^2$-states, but their intensities strongly depend on the type of transition. A radiative four-quark transition between two qq-states requires the creation and annihilation of an additional qq pair, i.e., such a transition is forbidden according to the OZI rule, whereas a radiative four-quark transition between the qq- and q$^2q^2$-states requires only the creation of an additional qq-pair, i.e., it is allowed by the OZI rule. The consideration of this question from the standpoint of large $N_c$ expansion [4, 5] confirms the suppression of radiative four-quark transition between two qq-states in comparison with the radiative four-quark transition between the qq and q$^2q^2$ states. Thus, both the intensity and the mechanism of $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ production in radiative decays of the $\phi(1020)$-meson point to their four-quark nature.

Note also the intriguing absence of $J/\psi \to \gamma f_0(980)$, $J/\psi \to a_0(980)p$, and $J/\psi \to f_0(980)\bar{p}$ decays in the presence of rather intensive $J/\psi \to \gamma f_2(1270)$ (or even $J/\psi \to \gamma f_2(1525)$), $J/\psi \to a_1(1230)p$, $J/\psi \to f_2(1270)\bar{p}$ decays involving the corresponding classical P-wave tensor qq-resonances; this testifies to the q$^2$q$^2$-structure of the $a_0(980)$- and $f_0(980)$-states and against their P-wave q$^2$-structure [36–38, 41].

3. Light scalar mesons in view of photon–photon collisions

3.1 The history of investigations

Experimental investigations of light scalar mesons in $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$, and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ reactions in $e^+e^-$-colliders began in the 1980s and have continued since then. In the first decade, a then-record number of groups (DM1, DM1/2, PLUTO, TASSO, CELLO, JADE, Crystal Ball, MARK II, DELCO, and TPC/2) participated in them. Only Crystal Ball and JADE could study both $\pi^0\pi^0$ and $\pi^0\eta$ channels, while all the others (and JADE) confined themselves to the $\pi^0\eta$ channel. Those wishing to read more widely on this interesting period in scalar mesons physics are referred to Refs [48, 85, 86, 88, 101, 102, 176–197].

The very first data on $f_0(980)$-resonance production are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Naturally, the first conclusions had a qualitative character and the data on the $f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma$ decay width either had large errors or were upper bounds. Note for the reference point that the TASSO and Crystal Ball measurement results (Table 2)

| Experiments | Conclusions |
|-------------|-------------|
| Crystal Ball | No significant $f_0(980)$ signal |
| CELLO | Hint of $f_0(980)$ |
| JADE | No evidence of $f_0(980)$ |
| TASSO | Good fit to PDG parameters for $f_2(1270)$ includes $f_0(980)$ (3e-effect) |
| MARK II | No significant $f_0(980)$ signal |

The photon energy $\omega(m)$. The key moment is cessation of $[\omega(m)]^2$ growth in mass distributions at $\omega(990\text{MeV}) = 29$ MeV. Figure 4 illustrates how the K$^+K^-$-loop model resolves this problem in an elegant manner [2–5, 39, 49]. In truth, it means that $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances are seen in radiative decays of the $\phi(1020)$-meson owing to the K$^+K^-$ intermediate state. Thus, the mechanism of $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ production in radiative $\phi(1020)$ decays is established at least at the physical level of proof.

Figure 3. The fit to the KLOE data for the $\pi^0\eta$ and $\pi^0\pi^0$ mass spectra in (a) $\phi \to \pi^0\eta$ [143] and (b) $\phi \to \gamma\pi^0\eta$ [144] decays. (See Refs [169–172] for details.)

Figure 4. A new threshold phenomenon in the $\phi \to K^+K^- \to \gamma R$ decay. Function $g([m]^2) = [g([m]^2)]_{\text{BK K^+K^-}}$, universal in the K$^+K^-$-loop model, is shown by the solid line. The dashed and dotted lines indicate contributions of the imaginary and real parts of $g([m])$, respectively.
were based on an integral luminosity of 9.24 and 21 pb\(^{-1}\), respectively.

As for the \(a_0(980)\) resonance, it was observed in the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta\) reaction only in three experiments. The Crystal Ball group [189], having collected during two years an integrated luminosity of 110 pb\(^{-1}\) and selected 336 events relevant to the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta\) reaction in the \(a_0(980)\) and \(a_2(1320)\) resonance regions (Fig. 5), published the following result in 1986:

\[
\Gamma_{a_0 \to \gamma\gamma} B(a_0 \to \pi^0\eta) = (0.19 \pm 0.07^{+0.10}_{-0.07}) \text{ keV},
\]

where \(\Gamma_{a_0 \to \gamma\gamma}\) is the \(a_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma\) decay width, and \(B(a_0 \to \pi^0\eta)\) is the relative fraction or probability of the \(a_0(980) \to \pi^0\eta\) decay. The measured product \(\Gamma_{a_0 \to \gamma\gamma} B(a_0 \to \pi^0\eta)\) characterizes the intensity of \(a_0(980)\) resonance production in the \(\gamma\gamma \to a_0(980) \to \pi^0\eta\) channel. (See Refs [179, 185, 186] for the prehistory of this result).

In 1990, the JADE group added the result for \(\Gamma_{a_0 \to \gamma\gamma} B(a_0 \to \pi^0\eta) = (0.28 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.10)\text{ keV} [96]\) (see also paper [184]) based on the integrated luminosity of 149 pb\(^{-1}\) and 291 events for \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta\). The Crystal Ball and JADE data on the \(a_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma\) decay have aroused great interest (see, for example, Refs [102, 182–184, 187, 192, 195, 196, 198, 199]). Thereafter, the need for statistically more significant data naturally arose. However, no new experiments on the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta\) reaction have been undertaken until recently. The mean value of \(\Gamma_{a_0 \to \gamma\gamma} B(a_0 \to \pi^0\eta) = (0.24^{+0.05}_{-0.07})\text{ keV}\) deduced from the first two experiments was cited in PDG reviews for 18 consecutive years [10, 196]. Only in 2009 was the third experiment on the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta\)-reaction [93], with statistics three orders of magnitude more than those of the Crystal Ball and JADE experiments, conducted at the B-factory, KEK, using the Belle detector. These data will be analyzed in more detail in Section 5. Here, only the estimate of

\[
\Gamma_{a_0 \to \gamma\gamma} B(a_0 \to \pi^0\eta) = (0.128^{+0.003+0.002}_{-0.002-0.003}) \text{ keV}
\]

reported by the authors of the experiment [93] is presented along with the average value of

\[
\langle \Gamma_{a_0 \to \gamma\gamma} B(a_0 \to \pi^0\eta) \rangle = (0.21^{+0.08}_{-0.04}) \text{ keV}
\]

taken from the last PDG review [11].

The JADE group measured not only the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta\) cross section but also the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta\) cross section [96]; observing (60 \pm 8) events in the \(f_0(980)\) resonance region [to compare], there were (2177 \pm 47) events in the \(f_2(1270)\) region, it obtained \(\Gamma_{f_0 \to \gamma\gamma} = (0.42 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.01)\text{ keV}\) for the \(f_0 \to \gamma\gamma\) decay width (which corresponds to \(\Gamma_{f_0 \to \gamma\gamma} \leq 0.6 \text{ keV at 95\% CL}\). What is more, similar results for \(\Gamma_{f_0 \to \gamma\gamma}\) were obtained in 1990 by the MARK II group in an experiment on the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-\) reaction with an integrated luminosity of 209 pb\(^{-1}\) [95], and in 1990–1992 by the Crystal Ball group in experiments on the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0\) reaction with integrated luminosities of 97 pb\(^{-1}\) [94] and 255 pb\(^{-1}\) [98, 200]. These data are given in Table 3. Figure 6 illustrates manifestations of \(f_0(980)\) and \(f_2(1270)\) resonances in the cross sections of \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi\) reactions observed by MARK II and Crystal Ball. Although the statistical significance of the \(f_0(980)\)-signal in the cross sections and invariant \(\pi\pi\) mass resolutions left much to be desired, the existence of a ‘shoulder’ in the region of \(f_0(980)\) resonance during \(\gamma\gamma\) collisions was beyond question (see Fig. 6).

### Table 2. Early data on the \(f_0(980) \to \gamma\gamma\) decay width (see reviews [88, 176, 177, 179, 180, 184]).

| Experiments   | \(\Gamma_{f_0 \to \gamma\gamma}\), keV |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| TASSO         | \((1.3 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.6)/B(t_0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)\) |
| Crystal Ball  | \(< 0.8/B(t_0 \to \pi\pi)\) (95\% CL) |
| JADE          | \(< 0.8 \text{ (95\% CL)}\)          |
| Kolosniski (1988) [184] | \(0.27 \pm 0.12\) (average value) |

![Figure 5](image_url)  
Figure 5. Cross section of the \(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta\) reaction as a function of \(\sqrt{s}\) in the \(|\cos \theta| \leq 0.9\) region. \(\sqrt{s}\) is the invariant mass of the \(\pi^0\eta\) system. \(\theta\) is the polar take-off angle of \(\pi^0\)-meson in the \(\gamma\gamma\) center-of-mass system. (Crystal Ball data [189].)

Experiments of the 1980s and early 1990s showed that the two-photon widths of scalar \(f_0(980)\) and \(a_0(980)\) resonances were smaller than the two-photon widths of tensor \(f_2(1270)\) and \(a_2(1320)\) resonances for which \(\Gamma_{f_2 \to \gamma\gamma} \approx 2.6 \pm 3 \text{ keV}\) [94–97] (see also Refs [10, 11]) and \(\Gamma_{a_2 \to \gamma\gamma} \approx 1 \text{ keV}\) [96, 189] (see also Refs [10, 11]). This fact pointed to the four-quark nature of the \(f_0(980)\) and \(a_0(980)\) states [94, 96, 182–184, 187, 189, 192, 195, 196, 199, 201, 202].

As mentioned, it was predicted in the early 1980s [85, 86], that, given the four-quark structure of \(a_0(980)\)- and \(f_0(980)\)-mesons, the intensity of their production in photon–photon collisions must be suppressed by a factor of ten in comparison with mesons having the two-quark structure. The estimate of

\[
\Gamma_{a_0 \to \gamma\gamma} \sim \Gamma_{f_0 \to \gamma\gamma} \sim 0.27 \text{ keV},
\]

obtained in the four-quark model [85, 86], was confirmed in experiment. As regards the \(q\bar{q}\) model, it predicted that

\[
\frac{\Gamma_{0^+ \to \gamma\gamma}}{\Gamma_{2^+ \to \gamma\gamma}} = \frac{15}{4} \times \text{corrections} \approx 1.3 \sim 5.5
\]

for the states with \(J^{PC} = 0^{++}\) and \(2^{++}\) pertaining to the same \(P\)-wave family (see, for example, Refs [36, 94, 102, 187, 192],...
Let us consider in addition predictions of the molecular model in which \( a_0(980) \)- and \( f_0(980) \)-mesons are bound states of the KK system [212, 213]. Similar to the \( q^4q^\bar{q} \) model, the molecular model explains mass degeneration of the states and their strong coupling with the KK-channel; moreover, there are no problems with the small values of the \( B(\phi \to a_0(980)\pi) \) and \( B(\phi \to f_0(980)\pi) \) ratios (see Refs. [36, 38] for details). However, the predictions of this model for two-photon widths [187, 198]

\[
\Gamma_{a_0(KK)\to \gamma\gamma} = \Gamma_{f_0(KK)\to \gamma\gamma} \approx 0.6 \text{ keV}
\]

are at variance with the experimental data in Table 3 within two standard deviations. Moreover, the hadron widths of KK molecules must be smaller (strictly speaking, much smaller) than the binding energy \( \epsilon \approx 10 \text{ MeV} \). But recent data [11] are in conflict with this requirement: \( \Gamma_{a_0} \approx (50-100) \text{ MeV} \) and \( \Gamma_{f_0} \approx (40-100) \text{ MeV} \). Also, the KK model predicts [157, 162] that \( B(\phi \to a_0(980)) \approx 10^{-3} \), which disagrees with experimental findings [11]. Besides, as shown recently [214, 215], the kaon-loop model verified in experiment describes the production of a compact state rather than a loose molecule. Finally, experiments in which \( a_0(980) \)- and \( f_0(980) \)-mesons were produced in reactions \( \pi^+ p \to \pi^0 n \) and \( \pi^- p \to \pi^0 n \) within a broad range of the transferred 4-momentum squared, \( 0 < t < 1 \text{ GeV}^2 \), showed that these states are compact, e.g., like two-quark mesons, \( \rho, \omega, a_2(1320), f_2(1270), \) etc., rather than loose KK-state molecules with form factors attributed to wave functions. These experiments leave no chances for the KK model. As far as four-quark states are concerned, they are as compact as two-quark ones. (An additional argument against the molecular model for the \( a_0(980) \) resonance is put forward in Section 5.)

The Particle Data Group has provided information on the average value of \( \Gamma_{f_0\to \gamma\gamma} \) since 1992. Note that no new experimental data on \( \Gamma_{f_0\to \gamma\gamma} \) were reported between 1992 and 2006; nevertheless, its average value in PDG reviews evolved substantially during this period. Based on the data in Table 3, the current average \( \Gamma_{f_0\to \gamma\gamma} \) value would be \( (0.26 \pm 0.08) \text{ keV} \). In 1992, PDG [196] derived the average value of \( \Gamma_{f_0\to \gamma\gamma} = (0.56 \pm 0.11) \text{ keV} \) by combining the JADE (1990) result [96] (see Table 3) with the value of \( \Gamma_{f_0\to \gamma\gamma} = (0.63 \pm 0.14) \text{ keV} \) found by Morgan and Pennington (1990) [208] from theoretical analysis of the MARK II (1990) and Crystal Ball (1990) [94] data. In 1999, Boglione and Pennington [222] carried out a new theoretical analysis of the situation, and halved the desired value: \( \Gamma_{f_0\to \gamma\gamma} = (0.28^{+0.09}_{-0.17}) \text{ keV} \) (see also paper [223]). The Particle Data Group noted that the Boglione and Pennington (1999) result replaces that of Morgan and Pennington (1990), but utilized both together with the JADE (1990) data for the calculation of the average \( f_0 \to \gamma\gamma \) decay width. In this way, the value of \( \Gamma_{f_0\to \gamma\gamma} = (0.39^{+0.10}_{-0.13}) \text{ keV} \) emerged in the PDG (2000) review [224].

In 2003, preliminary unprecedentedly high-statistics Belle data on the \( \gamma\gamma \to \pi^+ \pi^- \) reaction were reported. They contained a well-apparent signal from the \( f_0(980) \) resonance...
[89]. In 2005, the first comments on these data appeared in paper [105]. It became clear that $\Gamma_{f_0\to\gamma\gamma}$ cannot be large. In 2006, PDG excluded the Morgan and Pennington (1990) result $[\Gamma_{f_0\to\gamma\gamma} = (0.63 \pm 0.14) \text{ keV}]$ from its sample and suggested a new value of $\Gamma_{f_0\to\gamma\gamma} = (0.31^{+0.08}_{-0.11}) \text{ keV}$ [225] based only on the JADE (1990) data and the Boglione–Pennington (1999) result. We shall consider in Sections 3.2, 3.4 what happened with the average $\Gamma_{f_0\to\gamma\gamma}$ value afterward and trace its further fate.

3.2 Recent experimental results

In 2007, the Belle Collaboration published data on the cross section of reaction $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ in the region of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ invariant mass, $\sqrt{s}$, from 0.8 to 1.5 GeV, based on the integrated luminosity of 85.9 fb$^{-1}$ [90, 91]. These data are presented in Fig. 7. Owing to the huge statistics and high energy resolution in the Belle experiment, a clear signal of the $f_0(980)$ resonance was detected for the first time. Its amplitude proved to be small, which agrees qualitatively with the four-quark model prediction [85, 86]. The visible height of the $f_0(980)$ peak was only 15 nb above a smooth background around 100 nb. Its visible (effective) width proved to be about 30–35 MeV (see Fig. 7).

Then, the Belle Collaboration published the data on the cross section of the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ reaction mainly for the energy interval in the center-of-mass system, $\sqrt{s}$, from 0.6 to 1.6 GeV, based on the integrated luminosity of 95 fb$^{-1}$ [92] (see also Refs [226–228]). Here, the clear signal of the $f_0(980)$ resonance was detected for the first time, too. Note that the background conditions for the manifestation of $f_0(980)$ resonance in the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ channel are more favorable than in $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$. Figure 8 illustrates the overall picture of the data on cross sections of $\pi^+\pi^-$ and $\pi^0\pi^0$ production in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions in the $\sqrt{s}$ region from the $\pi\pi$ threshold up to 1.5 GeV after the Belle experiments. It is worth comparing this figure with Fig. 6 illustrating the situation in the preceding period.

Current information about $\Gamma_{f_0\to\gamma\gamma}$ decay widths is presented in Table 4. The Belle Collaboration determined $\Gamma_{f_0\to\gamma\gamma}$ (see Table 4) by fitting mass distributions (Figs 7b and 8b), taking into account the contributions from $f_0(980)$ and $f_2(1270)$ resonances and smooth nonresonant background.
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**Figure 7.** (a) High-statistics Belle data on the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction cross section for $|\cos \theta| < 0.6$ [91]. Plot (b) depicts the $f_0(980)$ peak region. Only relative values of statistical errors ranging from 0.5% to 1.5% are shown. The step in $\sqrt{s}$ is equal to 5 MeV (experimental invariant mass resolution reaches $\approx 2$ MeV).
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**Figure 8.** (a) MARK II [94] and CELLO [97] data for $\sqrt{s} \leq 0.85$ GeV and Belle [91] data for $0.8 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 1.5$ GeV on the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction cross section. (b) Crystal Ball data [95] for $\sqrt{s} \leq 0.8$ GeV and Belle data [92] for $0.8 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 1.5$ GeV on the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ reaction cross section. Plots (a) for $\sqrt{s} > 0.85$ GeV and (b) for $\sqrt{s} > 0.8$ GeV show only the Belle data to better expose the detected weak signals from the $f_0(980)$ resonance. The theoretical curves shown on plot (a) indicate the cross sections of the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction for $|\cos \theta| \leq 0.6$ (the total integrated cross section $\sigma^{\text{Born}} = \sigma_{0}^{\text{Born}} + \sigma_{2}^{\text{Born}}$ and integrated cross sections $\sigma_{i}^{\text{Born}}$ with the helicity $i = 2$ and 0) corresponding to the Born mechanism of the elementary one-pion exchange.
contributions that play an important role in the fitting and simultaneously are a source of large model-spawned uncertainties in $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma\rightarrow\pi^+\pi^-}$ (see Refs [90–92] for details).

3.3 Dynamics of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ reactions: Born contributions and angular distributions
The magnitudes of experimental cross sections can be explained by referring to Fig. 8a which displays as the guiding line the curves corresponding to the purely Born cross section of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ process, $\sigma_{\text{Born}} = \sigma_{\text{Born}}^I + \sigma_{\text{Born}}^D$, and its constituent cross sections, $\sigma_{\text{Born}}^I$, where $\lambda = 2$ and 0 are the absolute values of the difference between initial photon helicities. These cross sections are determined by the elementary charged one-pion exchange mechanism (Fig. 9). By virtue of the Low theorem and chiral symmetry, the Born contributions should dominate in the near-threshold region of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction. As shown in Fig. 8a, this expectation does not contradict the current data obtained near the threshold, although rather large errors still exist. Moreover, in the entire resonance region including $f_2(1270)$ resonance, the Born contributions can be regarded as a reasonable approximation of background (nonresonance) contributions to the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ amplitudes. Also, the Born electromagnetic contributions provide a basis for the construction of amplitudes including final-state strong interactions [9, 105, 181, 190, 193, 194, 232–239].

The Born contributions have the following features. First, $\sigma_{\text{Born}}^I$ has a maximum at $\sqrt{s} \approx 0.3$ GeV, where $\sigma_{\text{Born}}^I \approx 2\sigma_{\text{Born}}^D$; however, $\sigma_{\text{Born}}^D$ quickly falls with increasing $\sqrt{s}$, so that $\sigma_{\text{Born}}$ is totally dominated by the $\sigma_{\text{Born}}^D$ contribution for $\sqrt{s} > 0.5$ GeV (Fig. 8a). Second, although roughly 80% of $\sigma_{\text{Born}}^D$ is determined by the $D$-wave amplitude, its interference with the contributions from higher partial waves is considerable in the differential cross section $d\sigma_{\text{Born}}^D (\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)/d|\cos \theta|$ (Fig. 10). The interference, being destructive in the first half of the experimentally accessible interval $|\cos \theta| < 0.6$ and constructive in the second one, flattens out the $|\cos \theta|$ distribution in this interval, so that this effect enhances with increasing $\sqrt{s}$ (see Fig. 10a).

Since the first resonance with $I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(4^{++})$ has a mass near 2 GeV [10,11], the contributions from $S$- and $D$-waves alone must supposedly dominate for $\sqrt{s} < 1.5$ GeV, and the differential cross section of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ process can be represented as [91]

$$\frac{d\sigma(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)}{d\Omega} = |S + D_0 Y_2^0|^2 + |D_2 Y_2^2|^2,$$  \hspace{3cm} (6)

where $S$, $D_0$, and $D_2$ are $S$- and $D_2$-wave amplitudes with helicity $\lambda = 0$ and 2, and $Y_2^m$ are the usual spherical harmonics. However, the above discussion shows that the smooth background in the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ cross section contains higher partial waves due to the one-pion exchange mechanism, so it can imitate a large $S$-wave contribution in the $|\cos \theta| \leq 0.6$ region.

The one-pion exchange makes no contribution in the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ channel and the representation of the cross section of this reaction in the form similar to Eqn (6) is a

8 According to the Low theorem [229–231], the Born contributions give the exact physical amplitude of the crossing-reaction $\gamma\pi^\mp \rightarrow \gamma\pi^\pm$ near its threshold.
9 Chiral symmetry guarantees weakness of $\pi\pi$ interaction at low energies.

| Table 4. Current data on the $f_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width. |
|------------------|------------------|
| Experiments     | $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma\rightarrow\pi^+\pi^-}$, keV |
| $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, Belle (2007) [90] | $0.209^{+0.005+0.147}_{-0.038-0.117}$ |
| $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$, Belle (2008) [92] | $0.286 \pm 0.017^{+0.075}_{-0.071}$ |
| PDG [10, 11], average value | $0.29^{+0.07}_{-0.06}$ |

Figure 9. The Born diagrams of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ process.

Figure 10. The Born differential cross section of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and its components for different $\sqrt{s}$ values. The vertical straight lines $|\cos \theta| = 0.6$ show the upper boundary of the region accessible for measurements.

Equation (6) corresponds to the ’untagged’ situation (taking place in all experiments under discussion) in which the dependence on the pion azimuth take-off angle $\varphi$ is not measured.
Figure 11. Belle data on the angular distributions for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ events [92]. The solid lines exhibit their approximations. The vertical straight lines $|\cos \theta| = 0.8$ show the upper boundary of the region accessible for measurements.

The main physically meaningful contention that can be made from the analysis of the production mechanisms of light scalars in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions is as follows [45].

The classical $P$-wave tensor qq-mesons $f_2(1270)$, $a_2(1320)$, and $f_2^0(1525)$ are produced in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions largely due to direct $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow qq$ transitions, whereas light scalar $\sigma(600)$-, $f_0(980)$-, and $a_0(980)$-mesons are mainly produced by rescatterings $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \rightarrow \sigma$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow f_0$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow (K^0\overline{K}^0, \pi^0\pi^0) \rightarrow a_0$, etc., i.e., due to four-quark transitions. The direct $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \sigma$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow f_0$, and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow a_0$ transitions are strongly suppressed, in agreement with the four-quark model.

This contention introduces a new seminal view of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ reaction dynamics at low energies. Let us consider it in more detail.

To begin with, here are a few elementary facts about interactions of $C$-even mesons with photons based on the quark model [11, 88, 183, 184]. Coupling of the $\gamma\gamma$ system with classical qq-states, including the lightest pseudoscalar ($J^{PC} = 0^{-+}$) and tensor $(2^{++})$ mesons, is proportional to the fourth power of the charges of constituent quarks.

As it is, only the probability of a $\pi^0$-meson production in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions (or the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width) is purely evaluated from the first principles [259–262]. $I_{\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}$ is determined completely by the Adler–Bell–Jackiw axial anomaly, and in this case the theory (QCD) is in excellent agreement with the experiment [263, 264]. The relations between the widths of $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, and $\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays are obtained in the qq-model, taking into account the mixing and SU(3) symmetry breaking effects [183, 262, 265].

As far as tensor mesons are concerned, in the case of ideal mixing [i.e., when $f_2 = (u\bar{u} + d\bar{d})/\sqrt{2}$ and $f_2^0 = ss$], the quark model predicts the following ratios for the coupling constant squared:

$$g_{B_{\gamma\gamma}}^2 : g_{B_{\gamma\gamma}}^{2} : g_{B_{\gamma\gamma}}^{2} = 25 : 9 : 2.$$  (9)

Although absolute values of two-photon widths of light tensor meson decays cannot be obtained from the first principles [88, 183, 192, 203, 206, 266–268] as in the case of pseudoscalars, the prediction (9) of the qq model underlies the relations actually used between the widths of $f_2(1270) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, $a_2(1320) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, and $f_2^0(1525) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays that take account of the deviations from the ideal mixing and SU(3) symmetry breaking effects [11, 88, 183, 191, 269].

3.4 Mechanisms for the production of scalar resonances

The anticipation of new Belle data and their advent have given rise to a series of theoretical papers studying the dynamics of $f_0(980)$, $\sigma(600)$, and $a_0(980)$ resonance production in the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ processes by various methods and discussing the nature of these states [9, 45, 46, 65, 73, 77, 78, 105–109, 211, 239, 246–258].

$\text{g} + \text{d} \rightarrow \text{b} + \text{f}$.
270]. Roughly speaking, the situation for light tensor mesons generally agrees with the prediction of the qq model (9). This implies that the contributions to \(g_{2}^{\gamma\gamma}, g_{1}^{\gamma\gamma}\), and \(g_{0}^{\gamma\gamma}\) taking account of the finiteness of the widths of \(f_{2}(1270), a_{0}(1320),\) and \(f_{1}(1525)\) resonance decays [i.e., contributions from \(f_{2}(1270) \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\gamma\gamma\) type rescatterings, and so forth] are small compared with the contributions of direct annihilation \(q\bar{q}(2^{++}) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\) transitions.

The observed smallness of the two-photon widths of scalar \(a_{0}(980)-\) and \(f_{0}(980)-\)mesons in comparison with those of tensor mesons (and the resulting failure of the qq model prediction of relation (4) between the widths of direct 0++ and 2++ \(\rightarrow \gamma\gamma\) transitions) indicates that \(a_{0}(980)\) and \(f_{0}(980)\) resonances are not the quark and antiquark bound states. Once the qq component is absent in the wave functions of light scalars, and their \(q\bar{q}q\bar{q}\) component contains practically no white neutral vector mesons (as in the MIT-bag model [85, 86]), the \(\sigma(600) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, f_{0}(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma,\) and \(a_{0}(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\) decays must be four-quark transitions caused by mechanisms of \(\sigma(600) \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma, f_{0}(980) \rightarrow K^{+}K^{-} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma,\) and \(a_{0}(980) \rightarrow (K^{+}K^{-}, \pi^{+}\pi^{-}) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\) rescatterings. Such a scenario was for the first time hypothesized as early as 1988 based on an analysis of the Crystal Ball data [189] on the \(a_{0}(980)\)-resonance production in the \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}\) reaction [102] (see also the discussion of the mechanisms of \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow KK\) reactions [103, 104]). Fifteen years later, when the preliminary high-statistics Belle data on \(f_{0}(980)\) resonance in the \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) reaction were reported [89], we undertook a study on the role of rescattering mechanisms [specifically, the \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^{+}K^{-} \rightarrow f_{0}(980) \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) mechanism] in the \(f_{0}(980)\) production. As a result, we showed that it is this mechanism that plays very important, unless dominating, role and accounts for a natural and reasonable scale of \(f_{0}(980)\) resonance manifestations in \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) and \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}\) cross sections [105].

Then, it was shown in the framework of the SU(2)\(_{L}\) \(\times\) SU(2)\(_{R}\) for a linear \(\sigma\) model that the \(\sigma\) field is described by its four-quark component [at least in the energy (virtuality) range of \(\sigma\)-resonance] and that the \(\sigma(600)\)-meson decay in \(\gamma\gamma\) collisions is caused by the \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) transition. The \(\sigma(600) \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\) exponential decay in \(\gamma\gamma\) collisions is the four-quark transition: \(\sigma(600) \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma\) [9]. It was emphasized that the \(\sigma\)-meson contribution to the \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}\) amplitudes is shielded due to its strong destructive interference with the background contributions [12] as in the \(\pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) amplitudes. In other words, production of \(\pi\)-mesons by rescattering in \(\gamma\gamma\) collisions is always accompanied by a large chiral background: \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-} \rightarrow (\pi^{0}\text{background}) \rightarrow \pi^{0}\). As a result, the \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}\) cross section in the \(\sigma\)-resonance region proves to be small and ranges \((5-10)\) nb (see Fig. 8b and Section 4 for details).

The above considerations concerning the dynamics of \(\sigma(600)-, f_{0}(980)-,\) and \(f_{1}(1270)-\)resonance production were further developed in the combined analysis of final high-statistics Belle data on \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) and \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}\) reactions [106, 107] discussed in the next section.

4. Analysis of high-statistics Belle data on \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) and \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}\) reactions. Manifestations of \(\sigma(600)\) and \(f_{0}(980)\) resonances

In the region of interest with \(\sqrt{s} < 1.5\) GeV, the partial \(S\)- and \(D_{1}\) wave contributions dominate in the Born cross sections \(\sigma^{0}_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{Born}}\) and \(\sigma_{\pi\pi}^{\text{Born}}\) for \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) and \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}\) reactions, respectively. Because the \(\pi\pi\) interaction for \(\sqrt{s} < 1.5\) GeV is strong only in \(S\)- and \(D_{1}\)-waves, it is these Born contributions to \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) processes that are essentially modified by the strong final-state interaction [13]. In addition, the contribution of inelastic \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^{+}K^{-} \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) rescattering plays an important role in \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}\) processes, at least in the \(f_{0}(980)\)-resonance region (this fact was noticed for the first time in papers [85, 86]).

Thus, we shall use the model for helicity \((M_{\gamma})\) and partial \((M_{\pi})\) amplitudes of the \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) scattering taking account of Born electromagnetic contributions corresponding to charged \(\pi\) and \(K\)-exchanges modified in \((S\text{-}D_{1})\)-waves by strong final-state interactions, and contributions from direct resonance–photon interactions (see also Refs [9, 102–107, 164, 181, 247, 249, 253]):

\[ M_{\gamma}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}; s, \theta) = M_{\gamma}^{\text{Born}}(s, \theta) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{I}_{1}^{\gamma\gamma}(s) T_{\pi^{-}\pi^{-}} (\pi^{-}\pi^{-})(s) + \frac{1}{2} \hat{I}_{2}^{\gamma\gamma}(s) T_{K^{-}K^{-}} (K^{-}K^{-})(s) + M_{\text{res}}(s), \]

\[ M_{\pi}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}; s, \theta) = M_{\pi}^{\gamma\gamma}(s, \theta) + 80\pi d_{2}^{\pi}(\theta) M_{\pi}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}; s, \theta) \]

\[ M_{\pi}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}; s, \theta) = \frac{d_{2}^{\pi}(\theta)}{s} M_{\pi}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0}\pi^{0}; s, \theta) \]

where \(d_{2}^{\pi}(\theta) = (\sqrt{6}/4)\sin^{2}\theta\). Figures 9, 12–14 are diagrammatic representations of these amplitudes. The first terms on the right-hand sides of Eqsns (10) and (11) are the Born helicity amplitudes of the \(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+}\pi^{-}\) scattering corresponding to the elementary one-pion exchange mechanism (see Fig. 9). Their explicit forms are presented in Appendix A.1. The terms in Eqsns (10) and (12) containing the \(S\)-wave amplitudes of \(\pi\pi\) scattering are strongly suppressed by the chiral background, which ensures the observed smallness of the \(\pi\pi\) scattering length \(a_{\pi}^{\pi}\) and the presence of Adler zero in \(T_{\pi\pi}^{\pi\pi}(s)\) at \(s \approx m_{\pi}^{2}/2\) [6, 9, 171, 172, 217] reaches the unitary limit in the energy region from 0.85 to 0.9 GeV and exhibits a narrow, deep (practically down to zero) dip caused by the destructive interference of the \(f_{0}(980)\)-resonance contribution with a large smooth background.

Also, it is established that \(\pi\pi\) scattering in the \(I = 0\) channel is elastic in a very good approximation up to the KK-channel threshold. However, inelastic \(\eta_{f}(s)\) shows a sharp jump just above the KK threshold due to the production of \(f_{0}(980)\)-resonance strongly coupled with the KK channel.
amplitudes in the \( gg \) reactions, viz. Figure 13.

\[
T_{\pi^+\pi^-} = \frac{2T_{00}^0(s) + T_{02}^0(s)}{3}, \\
T_{\pi^+\pi^-\rho^0\rho^0} = \frac{2[T_{00}^0(s) - T_{02}^0(s)]}{3}, \\
T_{K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^-} = T_{K^+K^-\rho^0\rho^0}(s),
\]

determined by direct coupling constants of \( \sigma(600) \) - and \( f_0(980) \)-resonances with photons and the \( f_2(1270) \)-production amplitudes in Eqns (11) and (13), \( M_{\gamma\gamma-f_2(1270)-\pi^+\pi^-}(s) = M_{\gamma\gamma-f_2(1270)-\rho^0\rho^0}(s) \), are described at greater length below.

Let us demonstrate, using the example of S-wave amplitudes \( M_{00}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-; s) \) and \( M_{00}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \rho^0\rho^0; s) \), that the requirements of the unitary condition or the Watson theorem of final-state interaction are fulfilled in the model under consideration [273]. First of all, note that the contribution of the inelastic \( 4\pi \) and \( 6\pi \) channels in \( \pi \pi \) scattering for \( \sqrt{s} < 1 \) GeV is small [112-114]; therefore, in the entire \( 2m_{\pi} \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 2m_{K} \) region, we have [9, 105, 167, 172]

\[
T_{\pi^+\pi^-} = \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right) T_{\pi^+\pi^-} \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right), \\
M_{\pi^+\pi^-} = \pm \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right) M_{\pi^+\pi^-} \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right).
\]

Taking into account that \( \text{Im} \ T_{\pi^+\pi^-} = \rho_{\pi^+\pi^-} M_{00}^{\text{Born}}(\pi^+\pi^-) \), we arrive at

\[
M_{00}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-; s) = M_{00}^{\text{Born}}(\pi^+\pi^-) + i\delta_0^0(s) A(s) + \frac{1}{2} \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right) B(s); \\
M_{00}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \rho^0\rho^0; s) = \frac{3}{2} \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right) A(s) - \frac{3}{2} \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right) B(s),
\]

and for \( 2m_{\pi} \leq \sqrt{s} \leq 2m_{K} \),

\[
M_{00}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \rho^0\rho^0; s) = \frac{3}{2} \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right) A(s) - \frac{3}{2} \exp \left( i\delta_0^0(s) \right) B(s),
\]

where \( A(s) \) and \( B(s) \) are the real functions:

\[
A(s) = M_{00}^{\text{Born}}(\pi^+\pi^-) \cos \delta_0^0(s) + \frac{1}{\rho_{\pi^+\pi^-}(s)} \text{Re} \left[ T_{\pi^+\pi^-} \right] \sin \delta_0^0(s) + \frac{3}{2} \left| \delta_0^0(s) \right| \sin \delta_0^0(s), \\
B(s) = M_{00}^{\text{Born}}(\pi^+\pi^-) \cos \delta_0^0(s) + \frac{1}{\rho_{\pi^+\pi^-}(s)} \text{Re} \left[ T_{\pi^+\pi^-} \right] \sin \delta_0^0(s).
\]

Expressions (14) and (15) indicate that, in accordance with the Watson theorem, the phases of S-wave amplitudes of \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi \) processes with \( f = 0 \) and 2 in the elastic region (below the KK threshold) coincide with the phases of \( \pi\pi \) scattering, \( \delta_0^0(s) \) and \( \delta_0^0(s) \) respectively.

We use the following notation and normalizations for the \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi \) cross sections:

\[
\sigma(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-; |\cos \theta| \leq 0.6) = \sigma = \sigma_0 + \sigma_2, \\
\sigma(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \rho^0\rho^0; |\cos \theta| \leq 0.8) = \sigma = \sigma_0 + \sigma_2, \\
\sigma_2 = \int_0^{4\pi} \left| M_{\pi^+\pi^-} \right|^2 d\cos \theta, \\
\sigma_2 = \int_0^{4\pi} \left| M_{\rho^0\rho^0} \right|^2 d\cos \theta.
\]
In what follows, $\sigma_{\lambda\lambda}$ and $\sigma_{2\lambda}$ denote the corresponding partial cross sections.

Before fitting the data with the use of the above model, it may be useful to consider in brief a somewhat simplified framework of their description.

Figure 15a borrowed from paper [106] displays theoretical curves for the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ cross section $\sigma = \sigma_0 + \sigma_2^{\text{Born}}$ and its components $\sigma_0$ and $\sigma_2^{\text{Born}}$, corresponding to the simplest variant of the above model in which only the S-wave Born amplitudes of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^-$ events accompanied by $\pi$ and $K$ exchanges are taken into account in $\sigma_0$; they are modified by strong final-state interactions of charged pions and kaons, whereas all higher partial waves of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ with $\lambda = 0$ and 2 are taken in the Born approximation [105, 106]. This modification results in appearing the $f_0(980)$-resonance signal in $\sigma_0$, the magnitude and the shape of which agree fairly well with the Belle data (Fig. 15a). It follows from comparison of the respective curves in Figs 8a and 15a that the S-wave contribution to $\sigma(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$; $|\cos \theta| \leq 0.6$) is small for $\sqrt{s} > 0.5$ GeV. It is clear that the contribution of $f_2(1270)$ resonance is the main missing element needed to describe the Belle data on $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ over the entire $\sqrt{s}$ range from 0.8 to 1.5 GeV. If the description is restricted to the data gathered in the vicinity of $f_0(980)$ resonance, the large incoherent background under it, caused by the $\sigma_2$ contribution, can be purely phenomenologically approximated by a polynomial in $\sqrt{s}$. The result of such a fit is shown in Fig. 15c, d [106].

Naturally, taking account of the final-state interactions in the S-wave Born amplitudes of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^-$ reactions eventually leads to the prediction of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ reaction for the S-wave amplitude [9, 105–107]. Figure 15b compares the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ cross section estimated as described above with the Crystal Ball and Belle data. (Note that the step of $\sqrt{s}$ for the Crystal Ball and Belle data is 50 and 20 MeV, respectively.) The agreement with the data for $\sqrt{s} \leq 0.8$ GeV, i.e., in the $(\sigma(600))$-resonance region, should be regarded as quite good since no fitting parameters were used to construct $\sigma_0$. Also, it is clear that the $f_2(1270)$-resonance responsibility region begins for $\sqrt{s} > 0.8$ GeV in both $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ channels.

Thus, two things become apparent even at this stage of data description: first, if the direct coupling constants of $\sigma(600)$ and $f_0(980)$ with $\gamma\gamma$ are included in the fittings, their role will be negligible in agreement with the prediction made in Refs [85, 86]; second, the $\sigma(600) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $f_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays are actually described in accordance with formulas (10) and (12) by the triangle loop rescattering diagrams, $\text{resonance} \rightarrow (\pi^+\pi^-, K^+K^-) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$; this means that they represent four-quark transitions [9, 105–107].
An interesting and important feature of the $f_0(980)$ signal in $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ is its complicated 'internal' structure evidenced in Fig. 16. The $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ rescattering amplitude undoubtedly plays the defining role in the formation of this signal since it specifies the natural scale of $f_0(980)$-production cross section in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions [105].\footnote{Due to this amplitude, the $f_0(980)$ peak is transferred from $T_{K^+K^-\rightarrow\pi^+\pi^-}(s)$ to the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ amplitude. In the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ rescattering contribution, the $f_0(980)$ resonance is manifested as a dip. The resulting shape of the $f_0(980)$ signal strongly depends on the interference of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ resonance amplitude with the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ amplitude (Fig. 16a),\footnote{The solid curve depicts $|I_{K^+K^-}(s)|^2$ as a function of $\sqrt{s}$ (see Fig. 17); evidently, it sharply decreases just under the $K^+K^-$ threshold, i.e., directly in the $f_0(980)$-resonance region.\footnote{Such a behavior of the $f_0(980)$ two-photon production amplitude strongly suppresses the left wing of the $f_0(980)$ peak determined by the resonance amplitude $T_{K^+K^-\rightarrow\pi^+\pi^-}(s)$, making impossible approximation of the $f_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width by a constant even in the $m_0 - \Gamma_0/2 \leq \sqrt{s} \leq m_0 + \Gamma_0/2$ region [105].}\footnote{The maximum of $\sigma(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-)$ is controlled by the product of the ratios of squares of coupling constants $R_{\gamma K} \approx g_{\gamma K}^2/m_{\gamma K}^2 \times g_{\gamma K}^2/m_{\gamma K}^2$ and the quantity $|I_{K^+K^-}(s)|^2$. The estimation gives
\[
\sigma(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow f_0(980) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-) \approx 0.6 \times 0.6 \times R_{\gamma K}/m_0^2 \approx 8 \text{ nb} \times R_{\gamma K},
\]
where $\pi = 1/137$, and $m_0$ is the $f_0(980)$ mass.}\footnote{Note that the relative sign of these amplitudes, determining the character of interference, is inferred reliably [105, 106].}\footnote{Function $|I_{K^+K^-}(s)|^2$ decreases with respect to its maximum at $\sqrt{s} = 2m_{K^-} \approx 0.9873$ GeV by 1.66, 2.23, 2.75, 3.27, and 6.33 times at $\sqrt{s} = 0.98, 0.97, 0.96, 0.95, \text{ and } 0.9$ GeV, respectively.}\footnote{The following should be emphasized in connection with the aforesaid. The real situation is such that virtually any simplified form of the approximation of the $f_0(980)$ signal observed in $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ cross sections will provide only conventional information on the two-photon production mechanism of the $f_0(980)$-state and its parameters.}\footnote{It is noteworthy that even current knowledge of dynamics of strong interaction amplitudes $T_{\pi\pi-\pi\pi}(s)$ for $T_0^0(s)$ and $T_2^2(s)$ and $T_{K^+K^-\rightarrow\pi\pi}(s)$ allows us to advance the understanding of the properties of light scalar mesons emerging from the data on the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ reactions. In fitting these data, we utilize the model for $T_0^0(s)$ and $T_{K^+K^-\rightarrow\pi\pi}(s)$ amplitudes formulated in Ref. [171] and applied to the combined analysis of the data on the $n^0K^0$ mass spectrum in the $\phi \rightarrow n^0K^0\gamma$ decay, $\pi\pi$ scattering for $2m_\pi < \sqrt{s} < 1.6$ GeV, and the $\pi\pi \rightarrow K\bar{K}$ reaction [171, 172]. Parametrization used in this model for $T_0^0(s)$ takes into account the contributions from mixing $\sigma(600)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances, and from the background (containing a large negative phase due to chiral}}}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig16}
\caption{The structure of the $f_0(980)$ signal in $\sigma_0$. (a) Dashed, dotted and solid curves show the contributions from $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ rescatterings, and their sum, respectively. (b) The dashed and solid lines in (a) are identical; the dotted and dashed-dot lines show the $\sigma_0^{\text{Born}}$ and $\sigma_0^{\text{Born}}$ cross sections, respectively ($\sigma_0^{\text{Born}} < \sigma_0^{\text{Born}}$ because of destructive interference between the $S$-wave and higher partial waves); the resulting $f_0(980)$ signal in $\sigma_0$ is plotted as the solid line.}
\end{figure}
symmetry) which shields (hides) the $\sigma(600)$ resonance (see in addition Refs [6, 9, 45, 46]). Formulas (10) and (12) transfer the chiral shielding effect of the $\sigma(600)$ resonance from the $\pi\pi$ scattering to the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi$ amplitudes. This effect is illustrated in Fig. 18a by the example of $\pi\pi$ scattering phases $\delta_{\pi\pi}(s)$, $\delta_{\pi\pi}^{\pi}(s)$, and $\delta_{\pi\pi}^{\pi}(s)$ [see formulas (20)–(22) and (24)], and in Figs 18b and 18c with the corresponding cross sections of $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ reactions. As mentioned above and seen from Fig. 18c, the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ cross section near the threshold in the absence of such shielding would be approximately 100 nb, not 5–10 nb, due to the $\pi^+\pi^-\rho^0$ loop mechanism of $\sigma(600) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay [9]. The decay width corresponding to this mechanism, $\Gamma_{\sigma(600)\rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s)$, is shown in Fig. 18d [see also formula (64) in Appendix A.1].

Let us write down following Ref. [171] the expressions for scattering amplitudes:

$$T_{\sigma}^{\pi\pi}(s) = T_{\sigma\pi\pi}(s) + \exp\left(2i\delta_{\sigma\pi\pi}(s)\right) T_{\sigma\pi\pi}(s),$$  \hspace{1cm} (20)

$$T_{B}^{\pi\pi}(s) = \exp\left(2i\delta_{B\pi\pi}(s)\right) - 1,$$  \hspace{1cm} (21)

$$T_{\pi\pi}(s) = \frac{n_{B\pi\pi}(s) \exp\left(2i\delta_{\pi\pi}(s)\right) - 1}{2\rho_{\pi\pi}(s)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (22)

$$T_{\pi\pi}(s) = \exp\left[i\left(\delta_{B\pi\pi}(s) + \delta_{B\pi\pi}^{\pi}(s)\right)\right] T_{\pi\pi}^{\pi\pi}(s),$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)

where $\delta_{B\pi\pi}^{\pi}(s)$ and $\delta_{B\pi\pi}^{\pi}(s)$ are the phases of the elastic S-wave background in $\pi\pi$ and $KK$ channels with $I = 0$, and the $\pi\pi$ scattering phase is given by

$$\delta_{B\pi\pi}^{\pi}(s) = \delta_{B\pi\pi}^{\pi}(s) + \delta_{\pi\pi}(s).$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)

The amplitudes of the $\sigma(600) - f_0(980)$ resonance complex in formulas (10), (12), (20), (22), and (23) have the form [171]

$$T_{\pi\pi}^{\pi\pi}(s) = \begin{vmatrix} g_{\sigma\pi\pi} A_\sigma(s) + g_{F_0\pi\pi} A_{F_0}(s) \\ 32\pi [D_\sigma(s) D_{F_0}(s) - \Pi_{F_0}(s)] \end{vmatrix},$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)

$$T_{\pi\pi}^{\pi\pi}(s) = \begin{vmatrix} g_{KK\pi^0} A_{KK}(s) + g_{F_0\pi^0} A_{F_0}(s) \\ 16\pi [D_{KK}(s) D_{F_0}(s) - \Pi_{F_0}(s)] \end{vmatrix},$$  \hspace{1cm} (26)

$$M_{\pi^0}^{\pi\pi}(s) = s \exp\left[i\delta_{B\pi\pi}(s)\right] \frac{g_{\sigma\pi\pi}^{(0)} A_\sigma(s) + g_{F_0\pi\pi}^{(0)} A_{F_0}(s)}{D_\sigma(s) D_{F_0}(s) - \Pi_{F_0}(s)},$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

where $A_\sigma(s) = D_\sigma(s) g_{\sigma\pi\pi} + \Pi_\sigma(s) g_{F_0\pi\pi} - \Pi_{F_0}(s) g_{\sigma\pi\pi}$, $A_{F_0}(s) = D_{F_0}(s) g_{F_0\pi\pi} + \Pi_{F_0}(s) g_{\sigma\pi\pi} - \Pi_\sigma(s) g_{F_0\pi\pi}$, and $g_{\sigma\pi\pi}^{(0)}$ and $g_{F_0\pi\pi}^{(0)}$ are the direct coupling constants of $\sigma$- and $f_0$-resonances with photons, respectively. Here, we use the expressions from paper [171] (see also Appendices A.1–A.3)
for the $\delta^{\pi^+}_{B}(s)$ and $\delta^{K^+K^-}_{B}(s)$ phases, the propagators of $\sigma(600)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances, $1/D_{a}(s)$ and $1/D_{b}(s)$, and the polarization operator matrix element $H_{\text{pol}}(s)$. Mass $m_0$ is a free parameter; the values of other parameters in the strong amplitudes ($m_0$, masses, $g_{\pi \pi \pi \pi}$ and $g_{K^+K^-}$ coupling constants, etc.) correspond to variant 1 from Table 1 in the same paper.\textsuperscript{11} In the $\pi^-$ scattering amplitude with $J = 0$ and $I = 2$, we assume $\eta_2^{\pi^+}(s) = 1$ at all $\sqrt{s}$ values being considered and take $\delta_0^{\pi^+}(s)$ from Ref. [274].

The amplitudes of the $f_2(1270)$-resonance production in formulas (11) and (13) have the following form:

$$M_{f_2(1270)\to \pi^+\pi^-}(s) = M_{f_2(1270)\to \pi^+\pi^-}(s)$$

$$= \sqrt{s} G_2(s) \sqrt{\left(2/3\right) G_2(\pi^+\pi^-)(s)/\rho_\pi^+(s)} \frac{m_{f_2}^2 - s - i\sqrt{s} G_{f_2}(s)}{m_{f_2}^2 - s}.$$  

The main contribution to $\Gamma_0^{\pi^+\pi^-}(s) = \Gamma_0^{\pi^+\pi^-}(s) + \Gamma_0^{K^+K^-}(s)$ comes from the partial $f_2(1270) \to \pi^+\pi^-$ decay width

$$\Gamma_{f_2(1270)\to \pi^+\pi^-}(s) = \Gamma_0^{\pi^+\pi^-}(m_{f_2}^2) B_{f_2(1270)\to \pi^+\pi^-} \times \frac{m_{f_2}^2}{s} \frac{q_{\pi^+}(s)}{q_{\pi^-}(s)} D_2(q_{\pi^+}(m_{f_2}^2) r_{f_2}) D_2(q_{\pi^-}(s) r_{f_2})$$

where $B_{f_2(1270)\to \pi^+\pi^-} = 0.848$ [10]. $q_{\pi^+}(s) = \sqrt{s} \rho_{\pi^+}(s)/2$, $D_2(s) = 9 + 3x^2 + x^4$, and $r_{f_2}$ is the interaction radius. The small contributions from $\Gamma_0^{K^+K^-}(s)$ and $\Gamma_0^{\pi^+\pi^-}(s)$ are the same as controlling the shape of the $f_2(1270)$-resonance wings is important for fitting data with small errors.

The amplitude $G_2(s)$ in Eqn (28) describes the coupling of $f_2(1270)$ resonance with photons:

$$G_2(s) = \sqrt{\Gamma_0^{\pi^+\pi^-}(s) + i \frac{M_{\text{Born}}(s)}{16\pi} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \rho_\pi^+(s) \Gamma_{f_2(1270)\to \pi^+\pi^-}(s)}.$$  

\textsuperscript{11} Removing the misprint in the sign of constant $C \equiv C_{\text{Born}}$ [171], we use $C_{\text{Born}} = -0.047$ GeV$^4$. Note that our principal conclusions [the insignificance of the direct transition $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and the predominant role of the four-quark transition $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-K^+K^-$] are independent of a concrete fitting variant presented in papers [171, 172].

The explicit form of the $M_{\text{Born}}(s)$ amplitude is presented in Appendix A.1 [see formula (53)]. By definition, the $f_2(1270) \to \gamma\gamma$ decay width is given by

$$\Gamma_{f_2(1270)\to \gamma\gamma}(s) = |G_2(s)|^2,$$  

and

$$\Gamma_{0}^{\gamma\gamma}(s) = \frac{m_{f_2}^2}{\sqrt{s} \Gamma_{f_2(1270)\to \pi^+\pi^-}(m_{f_2}^2)} \frac{s^2}{m_{f_2}^4} \left( \frac{1}{m_{f_2}^2} - \frac{1}{s} \right).$$

[factor $s^2$ here and factor $s$ in Eqn (27) arise from the requirement of gauge invariance]. The second term in $G_2(s)$ relates to the transition $f_2(1270) \to \pi^+\pi^- \to \gamma\gamma$ with real pions in the intermediate state, i.e., it corresponds to the imaginary part of the $f_2(1270) \to \pi^+\pi^- \to \gamma\gamma$ decay amplitude and ensures the fulfillment of the Watson theorem requirement for the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ amplitude with $J = 2$ and $I = 0$ in the region below the first inelastic threshold. This term makes a significant contribution of less than 6% to $\Gamma_{f_2(1270)\to \gamma\gamma}(s)$. (According to different estimations, the absolute value of the real part of the $f_2(1270) \to \pi^+\pi^- \to \gamma\gamma$ amplitude is significantly smaller than that of the direct transition amplitude.) The simplest approximation (32) for $f_{\text{Born}}^{(0)}(\gamma\gamma)(s)$ [the main contribution to the $f_2(1270) \to \gamma\gamma$ decay width] is consistent with the current state of the theory and phenomenological description of the data. The effective parameter $f_{\text{Born}}^{(0)}(\gamma\gamma)(m_{f_2}^2) = (1/5)g_{\gamma\gamma}^2(m_{f_2}^2)/(16\pi)m_{f_2}^2$ in formula (32) reflects the lack of knowledge of absolute values of the amplitudes responsible for $f_2(1270) \to \gamma\gamma$ decay. For the above reasons (see Section 3), it is generally accepted that the $f_2(1270) \to \gamma\gamma$ decay is dominated by the direct quark–antiquark transition $q\bar{q} \to \gamma\gamma$ and its amplitude is characterized by constant $g_{\gamma\gamma}$. As demonstrated in Refs [9, 102, 105–110] and as it gradually emerges here, the situation in the case of light scalar mesons is totally the opposite.

Now, we are prepared to discuss the general procedure of fitting the Belle experiment data on $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ cross sections, which was described in Refs [106, 107].

Let us first consider fitting the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ reaction cross section (Fig. 19b), which has smaller background contributions beneath $f_0(980)$ and $f_2(1270)$ resonances than the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ cross section, as follows from the comparison of
Clearly, in this situation the values of $G^\text{Born}(x_1)$ are 'grasped' in data fitting due to the interference of the $M^\text{Born}(s, t)$ amplitude (see formulas (10), (12), and (27)) with the contributions of the dominant rescattering mechanisms. Clearly, in this situation the values of $G^\text{Born}(x_1)$ and $G^\text{Born}(x_2)$ are not as important as the fact of their relative smallness, implying that direct $\Gamma_{m_t \rightarrow m_t}(t^0)$ and $\Gamma_{k \rightarrow k}(t^0)$ decay widths $< 0.1$ keV.

Due to the high statistical accuracy of the Belle data, the formally calculated errors for the principal parameters of the model are negligibly small. In such situations, the model dependence of adjustable parameter values is the main source of their uncertainty.

This, in turn, emphasizes the dominance of $\pi^+\pi^-$ and $K^+K^-$ loop coupling mechanisms of $\sigma(600)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances with photons. Indeed, the $\sigma(600) \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width due to the $\pi^+\pi^-$ loop mechanism is estimated at $\approx (1 - 1.75) \text{ keV}$ over the range of $0.4 < \sqrt{s} < 0.5$ GeV [9] (Fig. 18d), whereas the resonance mass distribution average of the $f_0(980) \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width due to the $K^+K^-$ loop mechanism is $\approx (0.15 - 0.2)$ keV [105].

However, such a possibility of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0$ cross section coming into conflict with the data on $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction (see the solid curve for $\sigma = \sigma_0 + \sigma_2$ in Fig. 19a) due to the large Born contribution to $\sigma_2$ and its strong constructive (destructive) interference with the $f_1(1270)$-resonance contribution for $\sqrt{s} < m_t$ ($\sqrt{s} > m_t$), absent in $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$. The difficulty of the combined description of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ cross sections after the publication of new Belle data was highlighted in paper [106] where a method to obviate it was proposed. The situation can be significantly improved by multiplying the Born $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ amplitudes corresponding to elementary one-pion exchange by the common suppressing form factor $G_K(t, u)$ (where $t$ and $u$ are the Mandelstam variables for the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction). To show this, we use as an example the expression for $G_K(t, u)$ suggested in paper [191]:

$$G_K(t, u) = \left[ \frac{1}{3} - \frac{m_T^2 - t}{(u - m_T^2)/x_1^2} \right] + \left[ \frac{1}{3} - \frac{m_T^2 - u}{(u - m_T^2)/x_1^2} \right].$$

where $x_1$ is the free parameter. Such an ansatz is quite acceptable in the physical region of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction. Note that the introduction of the form factor by replacing the amplitudes $M^\text{Born}(s, t)$ of elementary one-pion exchange by $M^\text{Born}(s, t; x_1) = G_K(t, u)M^\text{Born}(s, t)$ does not break the gauge invariance of the tree approximation [191]. The substitution $m_T \rightarrow m_T - x_1, x_1 \rightarrow x_1$ in formula (33) also yields the form factor $G_K(t, u)$ for the Born amplitudes of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^-$. The solid curves for the cross sections $\sigma = \sigma_0 + \sigma_2$ and $\sigma = \sigma_0 + \sigma_2$ in Figs 20a and 20b demonstrate combined fitting of the data on the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ cross section in the $0.85 < \sqrt{s} < 1.5$ GeV region, and the data on the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ cross section in the $2m_T < \sqrt{s} < 1.5$ GeV region, taking account of the form factors modifying the point-like Born contributions. The description thus obtained is more than satisfactory provided all, i.e., both statistical and systematic, errors of the Belle data shown in Fig. 20 by shaded bands are taken into consideration. We believe such fitting to

Such a modification of point-like Born contributions is quite absolutely natural; in due time it was discussed in the literature in connection with the data on the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction [95, 97, 191, 193, 194] and the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0$ reactions near the threshold [103, 104]. However, it is the problem of the combined description of the new Belle data on $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ reactions that unambiguously points to the necessity of modification of the Born sector in the model for $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$.
to be totally justified, the statistical errors of both Belle measurements being so small that it is practically impossible to obtain a formally acceptable value of $\chi^2$ in the combined fitting of the $\pi^+\pi^-$ and $\eta\eta'$ data in a wide $s$ region without taking the systematic errors into consideration.\textsuperscript{21} The curves in Fig. 20 correspond to the following values of the parameters: \(m_1 = 1.272\) GeV, \(F_{K^0}^{\text{res}}(m_1^2) = 0.196\) GeV, \(r_2^s = 8.2\) GeV\(^{-1}\), \(\Gamma_{K^0}^{\text{res}}(m_1) = 3.83\) keV \([F_{K^0}^{\text{res}}(m_1) = 3.76\) keV\], \(m_0 = 0.969\) GeV, \(g_{\gamma\gamma} = -0.049\) GeV\(^{-1}\) \([F_{K^0}^{\text{res}}(m_1) \text{ is insignificantly small}\], \(g_{\eta\gamma}^{\text{res}} = 0.718\) GeV\(^{-1}\) \([F_{K^0}^{\text{res}}(m_1) \approx 0.01\) keV\], \(x_1 = 0.3\) GeV, and \(x_2 = 1.75\) GeV. It is clear from a comparison of Figs 19b and 20b that the influence of the form factors on the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ cross section is weak in contrast to its effect on $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ (cf. Figs 19a and 20a), which most notably modifies the $\sigma_2$ contribution. It should be emphasized that all our conclusions about the mechanisms of the two-photon decays (productions) of the $\sigma(600)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances remain in force.\textsuperscript{22}

Thus, the physics of two-photon decays of light scalar mesons can be more clearly delineated. The mechanism of their decays into $\gamma\gamma$ differs from the decay mechanism of the classical tensor qq-meson, i.e., direct qq $\to \gamma\gamma$ annihilation. The decays of light scalar mesons into $\gamma\gamma$, suppressed in comparison with those of tensor mesons, are mediated through the rescattering mechanisms, i.e., four-quark transitions $\sigma(600) \to \pi^+\pi^- \to \gamma\gamma$, $f_0(980) \to K^+K^- \to \gamma\gamma$, $a_0(980) \to K^0\bar{K}^0 \to \gamma\gamma$, etc. Such a picture is consistent with available data and confirms the q$^2$q$^2$-nature of light scalar mesons. Importantly, it is impossible for a number of reasons to comprehensively characterize the coupling between scalar mesons and photons (by analogy with tensor mesons) by the values of the $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{res}}(m_0^2)$ constants.

Above all, it is clear that when we deal with resonances accompanied by an appreciable background, and when their two-photon decay widths change sharply over the resonance peak width due to the proximity of inelastic channel thresholds, there is no point in discussing the two-photon width at the resonance point.

In this context, it is interesting to consider the S-wave cross section of the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction determined by resonance contributions alone, namely

\[
\sigma^{\text{res}}(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-;s) = \int_{\text{res}}^{s} \frac{I_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{res}}(s)}{32\pi} \exp\left(2\rho(s)\right) T_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{res}}(s) + I_{K^+K^-}^{\text{res}}(s) T_{K^+K^-}(s) + M_{\gamma\gamma}^{\text{direct}}(s)^2 \, ds \tag{34}
\]

\textsuperscript{21} The presence of large systematic errors, the sources of which are described at length in publications by the Belle Collaboration [90–92], do not diminish the role of high-statistics data that enabled the researchers to resolve small local effects associated with manifestations of the $f_0(980)$ resonance.

\textsuperscript{22} Notice the absence of experimental evidences of elementary o and $a_2(1320)$ exchanges in the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$ amplitudes, respectively, which make contributions (mostly S-wave contributions) to the cross sections that rapidly increase with energy and become comparable with the $f_1(1270)$-resonance contribution in the respective energy range. This observation was explained in Ref. [103] through the example of the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ reaction (see Section 5 for details). The proper Reggeization of point-like exchanges with high spins significantly reduces the dangerous contributions. In addition, partial cancellations take place in amplitudes with $\lambda = 0$ between elementary o and $f_0(1170)$ exchanges in $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ reaction and between $a_2(1320)$ and $a_1(1280)$ exchanges in $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$. The contribution of the $\rho$ exchange to $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ is small (because $g_{\pi\pi}^\rho \approx g_{\pi\pi}^{\text{direct}}/9$) and is additionally cancelled by the $b_1(1235)$-exchange contribution.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure21.png}
\caption{The integrand in formula (35) corresponding to the combined fit (see Fig. 20) of the data on $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\pi^0$ reactions is shown by the solid curve. The dotted and dashed curves display the contributions from resonant elastic $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and inelastic $\gamma\gamma \to K^+K^- \to \pi^+\pi^-$ rescatterings, respectively.}
\end{figure}

\[\langle\Gamma_{f_0(980)}\rangle = \int_{0.1\,\text{GeV}}^{1.1\,\text{GeV}} \frac{d\gamma_{\gamma\gamma}}{8\sqrt{s}} \frac{3\gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^2}{8\pi^2} \sigma_{\gamma\gamma}(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-;s) \, d\sqrt{s}. \tag{35}\]

This quantity is an adequate working characteristic of the coupling between $f_0(980)$ and $\gamma\gamma$. For the presented combined fit, \(\langle\Gamma_{f_0(980)}\rangle \approx 0.19\) keV\([107]\). Taking into account that the $2\gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^\prime < \sqrt{s} < 0.8$ GeV region is dominated by the wide $\sigma(600)$ resonance, we obtain \(\langle\Gamma_{\sigma(600)}\rangle \approx 0.45\) keV by analogy with formula (35)\([107]\). Note that the cusp near the $\pi\pi$ threshold in the expression \(\frac{3\gamma_{\gamma\gamma}^2}{8\pi^2} \sigma_{\gamma\gamma}(\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-;s)\) (see Fig. 21) is a manifestation of the corrections for the finite width in the propagator of scalar resonance. A simple explanation of this phenomenon is presented in Appendix A.1. Such a threshold enhancement is absent in the total S-wave amplitude of the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ event due to the shielding of the resonance contribution to the $T^{\omega}_{\gamma\gamma}(s)$ amplitude by the chiral background (see, for example, Fig. 20b).

The above examples clearly demonstrate the nontriviality of obtaining information about two-photon decays of $\sigma(600)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances. For example, it is impossible to determine $I_{\gamma\gamma}(m_0^2)$ directly from the data, because the cross section in the $\pi$ region is formed by both the resonance and the compensating background. A concrete dynamic model of the total amplitude is needed to separate them, the simple Breit–Wigner formula being insufficient here.

As for the $f_0(980)$ resonance, experimentalists have begun to take into consideration already two of the three important circumstances [90–92] (see also Refs [10, 11]) that we pointed out in paper [105]. One is that account is taken of the
corrections for the finite width due to the coupling of \( f_0(980) \) resonance with the KK channel in the \( f_0(980) \)-resonance propagator, which essentially influence the shape of the \( f_0(980) \) peak in the \( \pi \pi \) channel. The other is that interference of the \( f_0(980) \) resonance with the background is taken into consideration even if in the simplest form. But no model was constructed for the \( f_0(980) \to \gamma \gamma \) decay amplitude itself, which was simply assumed to be constant [90–92]. Fitting data in this way, the Belle Collaboration extracted the values for \( \Gamma_{f_0(980)\to\gamma\gamma}(m^2_{\gamma\gamma}) \) presented in Table 4. However, they should not be perceived literally. To begin with, they cannot be used to determine the coupling constant \( g_{\pi G} \) in the effective interaction Lagrangian, i.e., the constant of the direct mechanism in the two-photon production of the \( a_0(980) \) resonance with the \( K \bar{K} \) factors. In order to analyze the data, we further developed the model discussed earlier in papers [102, 103, 108]. This model is not be perceived literally. To begin with, they cannot be used as coupling constants in a Hermitian effective Lagrangian.

Naturally, these residues are 'dressed' by the background because they relate to the total amplitudes. Our analysis in the framework of the SU(2)_L × SU(2)_R-linear \( \sigma \) model [9] indicated that the background essentially influences the values and phases of the residues. Thus, the focus on quantities like \( \Gamma_{R-\gamma\gamma}(pole) \) obtained in the dispersion approach does not help to elucidate the mechanism governing the two-photon decays of scalar mesons and does not shed light on the nature of light scalars.

5. Production of \( a_0(980) \) resonance in the \( \gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta \) reaction

Our conclusions about the important role of the \( K^+K^- \) loop mechanism in the two-photon production of the \( a_0(980) \) resonance and its putative four-quark nature, made in the late 1980s and the early 1990s [48, 102, 103], were based on an analysis of the results of the first Crystal Ball [189] (see Fig. 5) and JADE [96] experiments on the \( \gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta \) reaction. Unfortunately, large statistical errors in these data and a rather rough step in the invariant mass of the \( \pi^0\eta \) system (40 MeV and 60 MeV in the Crystal Ball and JADE experiments, respectively) left many uncertainties.

As mentioned in Section 3.1, the Belle Collaboration obtained new data on the \( \gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta \) reaction at the KEK B-factory in 2009 [93] with statistics three orders of magnitude higher than those in the previous Crystal Ball and JADE experiments (336 and 291 events, respectively).

The experiments revealed a sizable \( \gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta \) cross section in the region between \( a_0(980) \) and \( a_2(1320) \) resonances

\[ \text{(Fig. 22)} \]

23 The above considerations also hold for the case of \( \sigma(600) \) resonance.

24 The JADE [96] data for \( \gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta \) are not normalized and are therefore omitted in Fig. 22.


\[ M_2^{\text{Born}}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta; s, \theta) = 2g_{\text{Born}}g_{\text{Born}} \frac{s}{4} \left[ \frac{G_m(s, t)}{t - m_m^2} + \frac{uG_m(s, u)}{u - m_u^2} \right], \tag{39} \]

where

\[ g_{\text{Born}} = \frac{1}{3} g_{\text{Born}} \sin(\theta_1 - \theta_p), \]

\[ g_{\text{Born}}^2 = 12\pi \Gamma_{\gamma\gamma - \gamma\gamma} \frac{m_{\gamma\gamma}^2 - m_{\pi^0 \eta}^2}{2m_{\gamma\gamma}^2} \approx 0.519 \text{ GeV}^{-2} \tag{10, 11}, \]

\[ \theta_1 = 35.3^\circ \] is the ‘ideal’ mixing angle, \( \theta_p \) is the mixing angle in the pseudoscalar nonet, \( t \) and \( u \) are the Mandelstam variables for the \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta \) reaction, and \( G_m(s, t) \) and \( G_m(s, u) \) are \( t \)- and \( u \)-channel form factors; for elementary \( \rho \) and \( \omega \) exchanges \( G_m(s, t) = G_m(s, u) = 1 \). In the corresponding Born amplitudes for \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta' \), one finds \( g_{\text{Born}} \approx (1/3)g_{\text{Born}} \cos(\theta_1 - \theta_p) \), and for \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \text{KK} \) with the \( K^* \) exchange, \[ g_{\text{KK}^* \gamma} \approx 0.064 \text{ GeV}^{-2} \text{ and } g_{\text{KK}^* \gamma} \approx 0.151 \text{ GeV}^{-2} \tag{10, 11}. \]

Note that information on the start-up Born sources of the quantum numbers of \( p- \) and \( o-\)mesons [also \( b_1(1235)- \) and \( h_1(1170)-\)mesons] is very scarce in the nonasymptotic energy range of interest. What is clear is that there are no experimental observations of elementary \( \rho \) and \( \omega \) exchanges whose contributions to the \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta^* \) reaction even in the energy range from 1 to 1.5 GeV. Therefore, we employ the Regge type form factors \[ G_m(s, t) = \exp \left[ \left( t - m_m^2 \right) b_0(s) \right], \]

\[ G_m(s, u) = \exp \left[ \left( u - m_u^2 \right) b_0(s) \right], \]

where \( b_0(s) = b_0^0 + \frac{p_f}{4} \ln \left[ 1 + \left( \frac{s}{s_0} \right)^4 \right] \).

\[ b_0^0 = 0, \quad p_f = 0.8 \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \quad \text{and } s_0 = 1 \text{ GeV}^2 \text{ (and, by analogy, for the } K^* \text{ exchange).} \]

As regards \( b_1(1235) \) and \( h_1(1170) \) exchanges, their amplitudes have shapes analogous to those defined by formulas (38) and (39), except for the common sign in the helicity \( 0 \) amplitude. Proper estimation suggests that the axial-vector exchanges amplitudes are at least five times smaller than the corresponding vector exchange amplitudes; for this reason, their contributions are neglected.\(^{26} \)

The terms in formula (36) proportional to S-wave hadron amplitudes \( T_{\pi^0 \eta \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta}(s) \), \( T_{\pi^0 \eta \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta}(s) \), and \( T_{K^* K \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta}(s) \) are attributed to the rescattering mechanisms. In these amplitudes, we take into account the contribution from the mixed \( a_0(980) \) resonance and heavy \( a_0(980) \) resonance (denoted for brevity as \( a_0 \) and \( a_0' \), respectively), as well as the background

\(^{25} \) These contributions are weakly sensitive to the usually discussed magnitudes of \( \theta_p \) \[11]. The reference curves in Fig. 22 correspond to \( \theta_p = -22^\circ \).

\(^{26} \) The high-spin exchanges in the \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta^* \) reaction are the correction against the background of the K-exchange contribution. This correction is needed to describe the data on the said reaction (see below). As far as \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi \pi \) reactions are concerned, the corrections from the high-spin exchanges prove to be less significant against the background of the summarized contribution from \( \rho \) and \( K \) exchanges, and it is impossible to take them into account at the current level of knowledge.
where $\Re$ in formula (36) describes the integral of $\Im$ for the $a_0$ resonance (and, by analogy, for $a$ resonances with photons; factor $\hat{I}$ is defined by the singly residual dispersion $K^0$(s) or $K^0$ channels with isospin $I = 1$, respectively (see Appendix A.2).

The amplitudes of the $\pi^0 - a_0^-$-resonance complex in Eqs (40)-(42) have a form analogous to that described by formulas (25), (26) [109, 110, 171, 275]:

$$T_{\pi^0 - \pi^-}(|s|) = \frac{g_{a_0ab}A_{a_0ab}(s) + g_{a_0ab}A_{a_0ab}(s)}{16\pi |D_{a_0}| D_{a_0} - \Pi^2_{a_0a_0}(s)},$$

where

$$A_{a_0}(s) = D_{a_0}(s)g_{a_0a_0}s + \Pi_{a_0a_0}(s)g_{a_0a_0}s,$$

$$A_{a_0}(s) = D_{a_0}(s)g_{a_0a_0}s + \Pi_{a_0a_0}(s)g_{a_0a_0}s,$$

$g_{a_0ab}$ and $g_{a_0ab}$ are the coupling constants, and the propagator for the $a_0$ resonance (and, by analogy, for $a_0^-$) is given by

$$D_{a_0} = \frac{1}{m_{a_0}^2 - s + \sum_{ab} \Re \Pi_{a_0}^{ab}(m_{a_0}^2) - \Pi_{a_0}^{ab}(s)},$$

where $\Re \Pi_{a_0}^{ab}(s)$ is defined by the singly residual dispersion integral of $\Im \Pi_{a_0}^{ab}(s) = \sqrt{s} \Gamma_{a_0,ab}(s) = g_{a_0ab}^2 \rho_{ab}(s)/(16\pi)$, with

$$\Pi_{a_0a_0}(s) = C_{a_0a_0} + \sum_{ab} \frac{g_{a_0ab}g_{a_0ab}}{D_{a_0}},$$

and $C_{a_0a_0}$ being the resonance mixing parameter (see Appendix A.2 for the explicit form of polarization operators $\Pi_{a_0}^{ab}(s)$ [108, 132, 169, 170]). The amplitude

$$M_{\pi^0 - \pi^-}^{\text{Direct}}(s) = s \left( g_{a_0a_0}A_{a_0a_0} + g_{a_0a_0}A_{a_0a_0} \right) \frac{\exp(i\delta_{a})}{D_{a_0}D_{a_0} - \Pi_{a_0a_0}(s)} (44)$$

in formula (36) describes the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ transition caused by direct coupling constants $g_{a_0}^{(0)}$ and $g_{a_0}^{(0)}$ of $a_0$- and $a_0^-$ resonances with photons; factor $s$ appears due to gauge invariance.

Expression (36) implies that the $T_{ab - \pi^0\eta}(s)$ amplitudes in the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow ab - \pi^0\eta$ scattering loops (see Fig. 23) lie on the mass shell. Functions $\exp(i\delta_{a})$, $\exp(i\delta_{a})$, and the previously introduced $K^{-}\bar{K}^{-}(s, x_2)$ are the amplitudes of the triangle loop diagrams describing transitions $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow ab - \pi^0\eta$ (scalar state with a mass equaling $\sqrt{s}$) in which the meson pairs $\pi^0\eta$, $\pi^0\eta$, and $K^0 \bar{K}^0$ are produced by electromagnetic Born sources (see Fig. 24) (the corresponding formulas are presented in Appendices A.2 and A.3). The constructed amplitude $M_0(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta; s, x_0)$ satisfies the Watson theorem in the elastic region.

For the $a_0(1320)$-resonance production amplitude in formula (37), we use parametrization analogous to Eqs (28) and (29):

$$M_{\gamma\gamma \rightarrow a_0(1320) - \pi^0\eta}(s) = \sqrt{s} \Gamma_{a_2 - \gamma\gamma}(s) G_{a_2}(s) B(a_2 \rightarrow \pi\eta)/\rho_{a_2}(s),$$

where

$$\Gamma_{a_2}^{\text{tot}}(s) = G_{a_2}(s) \frac{m_{a_2}^2}{s} q_{a_2}(s) D_2(q_{a_2}(s) m_{a_2}^2) r_{a_2},$$

$q_{a_2}(s) = \sqrt{s} \rho_{a_2}(s)/2$, $D_2(s) = 9 + 3s^2 + s^4$, $x_2$ is the interaction radius, and $\Gamma_{a_2 - \gamma\gamma}(s) = (\sqrt{s}/m_{a_2}) \Gamma_{a_2 - a_2}$. To recall, the $f_2(1270) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $a_2(1320) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay widths are in excellent agreement with the relation $\Gamma_{f_2 - \gamma\gamma}/\Gamma_{a_2 - \gamma\gamma} = 25/9$ [10, 11, 17] that is valid in the naive $q\bar{q}$ model, for direct $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ transitions.

The results of our fitting the Belle data on the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ reaction cross section are demonstrated in Figs 25 and 26. The corresponding values of model parameters are presented in Appendix A.2. The excellent agreement with the experimental results (see Fig. 25) allows for definitive conclusions about the main dynamic components of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ reaction mechanism, whose contributions are illustrated in detail by Fig. 26a-b.

Let us start from the contribution of inelastic $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0 - \pi^0\eta$ scattering in which the intermediate $K^0\bar{K}^0$...
pair is produced as a result of a charged one-kaon exchange (Fig. 24b). Similar to the case of $a_0(980)$ production in $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$ reactions [106, 107], this mechanism specifies the natural scale for the $a_0(980)$-production cross section in the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ reaction and also leads to the narrowing of the $a_0(980)$-peak in this channel [102, 108]. The maximum of the cross section $\sigma(\gamma\gamma \to K^+K^- \to a_0(980) \to \pi^0\eta; |\cos \theta| < 0.8)$ is controlled by the product of the ratio of the number of coupling constants $R_{a_0} = \frac{g_{a_0K^+K^-}/g^2_{a_0\pi\pi}}{g_{a_0\pi\pi}^2}$ and the quantity $[\hat{I}^K_{K^+K^-} (4m^2_{a_0} ; x_2)]^2$. The estimation of this cross section (neglecting the effect of the heavy $a_0^\prime(1400)$ resonance) gives $\sigma(\gamma\gamma \to K^+K^- \to a_0(980) \to \pi^0\eta; |\cos \theta| < 0.8) \approx 0.8 \times 1.42^2 R_{a_0}/m^2_{a_0} \approx 24 \text{ [nb]} \times R_{a_0}$. The narrowing of the $a_0(980)$-peak in the $\sigma(\gamma\gamma \to K^+K^- \to a_0(980) \to Z^0_{\pi\pi})$ cross section results from the sharp reduction of function $|\hat{I}^K_{K^+K^-} (s; x_2)|^2$ below the $K^+K^-$ threshold [102, 108]. The $\gamma\gamma \to K^+K^- \to \pi^0\eta$ rescattering contribution to the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ cross section is shown by solid curve 3 in Fig. 26a. The $K^+$ exchange further narrows slightly the $a_0(980)$-peak (see the dashed curve under curve 3 in Fig. 26a).

Evidently, the $\gamma\gamma \to KK \to \pi^0\eta$ rescattering mechanism alone is not enough to describe the data in the $a_0(980)$-resonance region. The addition of the Born contribution from $\rho$ and $\sigma$ exchanges, modified by S-wave $\gamma\gamma \to (\pi^0\eta \to \pi^0\eta)$ rescattering, and the $M_{\text{dir}}^{\pi^0\eta}(s)$ amplitude, which is due to direct transitions of $a_0$ and $a_0^\prime$ into photons, makes it possible to obtain the observed cross section value. The contributions of these two mechanisms themselves are rather small in the region of $a_0(980)$ resonance (see solid curve 4 in Fig. 26a for the former, and the dashed-dot curve in Fig. 26b for the latter), but their coherent sum with the contribution from inelastic $\gamma\gamma \to KK \to \pi^0\eta$ rescattering (see diagrams for the amplitude with $\lambda = 0$ in Fig. 23) results in significant enhancement of the $a_0(980)$ resonance (solid curve 2 in Fig. 26a). To recall, all S-wave contributions to the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ amplitude have the same phase up to the $K^+K^-$ threshold, in agreement with the Watson theorem.

It should be noted that we deduced from the fit of the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ data (as a by-product) preliminary information on the S-wave amplitude of the $\pi^0\eta \to \pi^0\eta$ reaction, which is important for pseudoscalar meson physics. All characteristics of this amplitude are presented in Fig. 27. The important role of the background $\pi^0\eta$ elastic rescattering amplitude, $T^{\pi^0\eta}_{\text{bg}}(s)$, should be noted here [see formula (40)]. First, the choice of the negative background phase $\delta^{\pi^0\eta}_{\text{bg}}(s)$ (Fig. 27b) in $T^{\pi^0\eta}_{\text{bg}}(s)$ makes it possible to correlate the $\pi\eta$ scattering length in the model being considered with the estimates based on the current algebra [276, 277] and chiral perturbation theory [278, 279], according to which $a_0^\prime \approx 0.005 \approx 0.1$ (in units of $m^3_{\pi}$). The resonance contribution to $a_0^\prime (\approx 0.3)$ is compensated for by the background contribution. Second, the large negative value of $\delta^{\pi^0\eta}_{\text{bg}}(s)$ in an energy range around 1 GeV accounts for the resonance-like behavior of the reaction cross section shown by solid curve 4 in Fig. 26a.

Let us turn to Fig. 26b and discuss the contribution from the supposedly existing heavy $a_0^\prime(1400)$ resonance [11] with the mass $m_{a_0^\prime} \approx 1.4 \text{ GeV}$. The cross section corresponding to the $M_{\text{dir}}^{\pi^0\eta}(s)$ (amplitude-dashed-dot curve) exhibits a marked enhancement in the energy range around 1.4 GeV. This enhancement transforms into a shoulder in the cross section corresponding to the total resonance contribution (dotted curve), i.e., to the joint contribution from the $M_{\text{dir}}^{\pi^0\eta}(s)$ amplitude and rescattering amplitudes proportional to the amplitudes of resonance transitions $ab \to \pi^0\eta$ ($ab = \pi\eta$, $K^+K^-$, $K^0\eta$, $\eta\eta$). Finally, there are no signs of resonance near 1.4 GeV in the total cross section $\sigma_0$ (solid curve 2) which additionally includes the Born $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ contribution and the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta \to \pi^0\eta$ rescattering caused by the background $\pi^0\eta \to \pi^0\eta$ elastic amplitude. Thus, we are dealing with strong destructive interference between different contributions, masking the $a_0^\prime$ resonance in the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^0\eta$ cross section. Nevertheless, it is owing to $a_0^\prime$ that one can simulate a significant smooth S-wave background beneath $a_0^\prime(1320)$ resonance and between $a_0(980)$- and $a_0^\prime(1320)$-resonances, as required by the Belle data [93]. Also, a wide range of energies,
1.28–1.42 GeV, is admissible for the mass of $a_0^0$ due to the resulting cancellations (see Ref. [109] for details).

Let us now consider the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ reaction cross section determined by resonance contributions alone and find, by analogy with formula (35), the $a_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width averaged over the resonance mass distribution in the $\pi\eta$ channel [102, 108]:

$$
\langle \Gamma_{a_0^0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} / \tau \rangle_{\pi\eta} = \frac{1.1 \text{ GeV}}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{1.1 \text{ GeV}} \sigma_{\text{res}}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta; s) d\sqrt{s},
$$

(47)

where the integral is calculated over the region of the $a_0(980)$-resonance responsibility. Taking into account the contribution from all rescatterings and direct transitions to $\gamma\gamma$ in $\sigma_{\text{res}}$ gives

$$
\langle \Gamma_{a_0^0(980) \rightarrow (K^0 K^0 + \pi^0\eta + \pi^0\eta)} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma / \tau \rangle_{\pi\eta} \approx 0.4 \text{ keV}.
$$

Taking into account only the rescatterings leads to

$$
\langle \Gamma_{a_0^0(980) \rightarrow (K^0 K^0 + \pi^0\eta + \pi^0\eta)} \rightarrow \gamma\gamma / \tau \rangle_{\pi\eta} \approx 0.23 \text{ keV},
$$

while account of the direct transitions alone yields

$$
\langle \Gamma_{\text{direct}} / \tau \rangle_{\pi\eta} \approx 0.028 \text{ keV}.
$$

This analysis points to the dominant role of $a_0(980) \rightarrow (K^0 K^0 + \pi^0\eta + \pi^0\eta) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ rescattering mechanisms, i.e., four-quark transitions, in the $a_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay. Such a picture suggests the $q^2\bar{q}^2$-nature of $a_0(980)$ resonance and is consistent with the properties of its partners — $\sigma_0(600)$- and $f_0(980)$-resonances. As concerns the prediction of the ideal $q\bar{q}$ model for the two-photon decay widths of $f_0(980)$- and $a_0(980)$-mesons, $\Gamma_{f_0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} / \Gamma_{a_0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma} = 25/9$, it is excluded by experiment.\(^{28}\)

### 6. Preliminary results

The results of a theoretical analysis of experimental attainments in the region of relatively low (up to 1 GeV) energies can be formulated as follows.

1. Naive consideration of the mass spectrum of the light scalar mesons $\sigma(600)$, $\kappa(800)$, $a_0(980)$, and $f_0(980)$ reveals their four-quark, $q^2\bar{q}^2$, structure.

2. Both intensities and mechanisms of $a_0(980)$- and $f_0(980)$-resonance production in $\phi(1020)$-meson radiative decays, the four-quark transitions $\phi(1020) \rightarrow K^0 K^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma(a_0(980)/f_0(980))$, suggest the $q^2\bar{q}^2$-nature of light scalars.

3. (The) intensities and mechanisms of two-photon production of light scalars, four-quark transitions $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \rightarrow \sigma(600)$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta \rightarrow a_0(980)$, and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^0 K^0 \rightarrow f_0(980)/a_0(980)$, also suggest their $q^2\bar{q}^2$-nature.

4. (Moreover, the absence of $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma f_0(980)$, $\rho_0(980)$, $\omega_0(980)$ decays in the presence of intense $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma f_2(1270)$, $\gamma f_2^\prime(1525)$, $\rho_2(1320)$, $\omega_2(1270)$ decays is at variance with the $P$-wave two-quark, $q\bar{q}$, structure of $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances.

5. Note also that $a_0(980)$- and $f_0(980)$-mesons look like ‘outliers’ among the well-established $b_1(1235)$, $h_1(1170)$, $a_1(1260)$, $f_1(1285)$, $a_2(1320)$, and $f_2(1270)$ states belonging to the lowest $P$-wave $q\bar{q}$-multiplet cannot be realized in a naive manner. Anyway, the question remains open and awaits further experimental and theoretical studies to be resolved.

\(^{27}\) To recall, we did not need to introduce a heavy isoscalar resonance for the theoretical description of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ processes in Section 4, nor had the Belle group to do the same for the phenomenological treatment of their experimental data [91, 92]. In principle, $f_0(1370)$ might be such a resonance [11]. Generally speaking, the situation with heavy scalar resonances with mass $\geq 1.3$ GeV has long been confusing. Suffice it to say that the authors of Ref. [75] question the very existence of such a state as $f_0(1370)$ (see also Refs [280, 281]). It appears that the wish to see scalar resonances with masses $1.3–1.4$ GeV as the partners of the well-established $b_1(1235)$, $h_1(1170)$, $a_1(1260)$, $f_1(1285)$, $a_2(1320)$, and $f_2(1270)$ states belonging to the lowest $P$-wave $q\bar{q}$-multiplet cannot be realized in a naive manner. Anyway, the question remains open and awaits further experimental and theoretical studies to be resolved.

\(^{28}\) As mentioned in paper [108], there are no grounds for a model of nonrelativistic KK molecules due to the large momenta in the kaon loops describing $\phi \rightarrow K^+ K^- \rightarrow \gamma f_0/a_0$ and $f_0/a_0 \rightarrow K^+ K^- \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decays [45, 214, 215]. Our analysis provides an additional argument against the molecular model. The fact is that the $a_0(980)$ resonance is strongly coupled to the $K K$ and $\pi\pi$ channels that are equivalent, in accordance with the $q^2\bar{q}^2$ model. We find it impossible to construct a weakly bound $K K + \pi\pi$ molecule. Moreover, the widths of the two-photon decays of scalar resonances are calculated in the molecular model at the resonance point [282, 283], which is insufficient to describe the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$, and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ reactions. No attempts to describe the data on these processes in the framework of the molecular model have been reported thus far; therefore, the results obtained are only of academic interest.
7. Future research

7.1 $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ resonances near $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^0 K^0$ reaction thresholds

The Belle Collaboration studied the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$, and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ reactions at a high-statistics level.29 In July 2010, it also published the data on the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta\eta$ reaction [285]. The $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta\eta$ cross section for $\sqrt{s} > 1.2$ GeV is dominated by the contributions from tensor $f_2(1270)$, $a_2(1320)$, and $f_2'(1525)$ resonances. But an appreciable S-wave contribution of $\approx (1.5 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.7) \text{ nb}$ near the threshold, $2m_\eta = 1.0957 \text{ GeV} < \sqrt{s} < 1.2 \text{ GeV}$, points to the presence of a subthreshold resonance strongly coupled to the $\eta\eta$ channel. Such resonance in the $q^2\tilde{q}^2$ model is $f_0(980)$. Unfortunately, $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta\eta$ is not the best reaction for its investigation because it allows only the end of the tail of this resonance to be seen.

Moreover, high-statistics information is still lacking for the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^0 K^0$ processes in the energy range around 1 GeV. It is believed that $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances exhibit their four-quark structure in these processes in a very peculiar way [103, 104].

Experiments reported in Refs [100, 190, 269, 286–291] have demonstrated that the cross sections of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^0 K^0$ reactions in an energy range of $1 < \sqrt{s} < 1.7$ GeV are actually saturated with the contributions from classical tensor $f_2(1270)$, $a_2(1320)$, and $f_2'(1525)$ resonances (Fig. 28) produced in helicity states with $\lambda = 2$. The qq model [292] predicts constructive and destructive interference between $f_2(1270)$- and $a_2(1320)$-resonance contributions in $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^0 K^0$ reactions.

29 Worthy of note are the plans to measure with a high degree of accuracy the cross section of the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction in the near-threshold region of $\sqrt{s}$ from 0.28 to 0.45 GeV at the renovated Frascati DAΦNE $\phi$-factory using the KLOE-2 detector [175, 284]. Thus far, only very inaccurate MARK II data for this reaction are available [95] (Fig. 6a). It also planned to measure the integral and differential cross sections of $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ reactions in the $\sqrt{s}$ range from 0.45 to 1.1 GeV [175, 284] and thereby replenish prior experimental information on the production of $a_0(600)$ and $\eta(980)$. One of the objectives is to reduce statistical errors in the $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ cross section in the vicinity of $\sigma(600)$ resonance to 2% (Fig. 6b).
$2m_{K^0} < \sqrt{s} < 1.1$ GeV. As regards the $\gamma\gamma \to K^0\bar{K}^0$ reaction, its amplitude does not contain the Born contribution, while the $a_0(980)$-resonance contribution has the sign opposite to that in the $\gamma\gamma \to K^0\bar{K}^0$ channel. As a result, the contributions of $S$-wave rescattering amplitudes with isospin $I = 0$ and $I = 1$ in the $\gamma\gamma \to K^0\bar{K}^0$ reaction practically cancel each other and the corresponding cross section should be at the level of $\lesssim 1$ nb.

7.2 $\sigma(600), f_0(980),$ and $a_0(980)$ resonances in $\gamma\gamma^* \to \pi\pi$ collisions

Studies of light scalars produced in $\gamma\gamma^*(Q^2)$ collisions have good prospects. Given that $\sigma(600)$, $f_0(980)$, and $a_0(980)$ resonances are the four-quark states, their contributions to the $\gamma\gamma^*(Q^2) \to \pi^0\pi^0$ and $\gamma\gamma^*(Q^2) \to \pi^0\eta$ reaction cross sections must decrease with increasing $Q^2$ faster than the contributions from classical tensor qq-mesons $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$. Such a behavior of the contribution from the resonance exotic $q^2\bar{q}^2$-state with $J^P(J^{PC}) = 2^+(2^{++})$ [48, 85, 86] to the $\gamma\gamma^* \to \rho^0\rho^0$ and $\gamma\gamma^* \to \rho^+\rho^-$ cross sections have recently been observed by the L3 Collaboration [293–296].

7.3 The search for $J/\psi \to \phi f_0(980)$ and $J/\psi \to \phi a_0(980)$ decays

These decays are important for the elucidation of the nature of $f_0(980)$ and $a_0(980)$ resonances [36, 38, 41]. The $J/\psi \to \phi a_0(980)$ decay remains to be demonstrated, while $B(J/\psi \to \phi a_0(980)) < 4.4 \times 10^{-4}$ [36]. Information concerning $B(J/\psi \to \phi f_0(980)) = (1.4 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-4}$ [11] needs to be substituted by the appropriate upper limit [38, 41].

7.4 Inelasticity of $\pi\pi$ scattering and $f_0(980)\to a_0(980)$ mixing

Considerable progress has been achieved in experimental studies of various reactions with the participation of $f_0(980)$- and $a_0(980)$-mesons. Nevertheless, it turns out that an equally good description of the available data can be obtained for substantially different sets of interaction constants $g_{6\pi K K}$, $g_{6\pi \pi K}$, etc. (see, e.g., Refs [34, 132, 136, 171, 172]). Certainly, it would be highly desirable to fix their values. As far as $g_{6\pi K K}$- and $g_{6\pi \pi K}$-constants are concerned, this issue could be addressed using precise data on the inelasticity of $\pi\pi$ scattering near the KK threshold, which have not been updated since 1975 [112–115]. In all probability, the VES Collaboration that conducted experiments on the $\pi^+\pi^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\eta$ reaction at the Institute of High-Energy Physics (Protvino) may have possession of such unprocessed data. Moreover, the product of $g_{6\pi K K}$- $g_{6\pi \pi K}$- constants can be fixed from the data on $f_0(980)\to a_0(980)$ mixing expected from the BES III experiments [131].

Exclusive information on $g_{6\pi K K}$- $g_{6\pi \pi K}$- could be obtained from studies on the spin asymmetry jump due to $f_0(980)\to a_0(980)$ mixing in the $\pi^+\pi^- \to \pi^+\pi^-\eta$ reaction [124].

The present work was supported in part by RFBR grant No. 10-02-00016.

8. Appendices

A.1 $\gamma\gamma \to \pi\pi$

This Appendix comprises explicit expressions for the Born helicity amplitudes corresponding to the charged one-pion exchange mechanism and for the triangle loop integrals $I_{\pi^+\pi^-}^{\pi^+\pi^-}(s; x_1)$ and $I_{\pi^+\pi^-}^{\pi^+\pi^-}(s; x_1)$ used in Section 4. In addition, a few useful auxiliary formulas for the solitary scalar resonance are presented.

The Born helicity amplitudes for an elementary one-pion exchange in the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-$ reaction have the form

$$M_0^{\text{Born}}(s, \theta) = \frac{4m_{\pi}^2}{s} \cdot \frac{8\pi \alpha}{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}^2(s) \cos^2 \theta},$$

$$M_2^{\text{Born}}(s, \theta) = \frac{8\pi \alpha \rho_{\pi^+}^2(s) \sin^2 \theta}{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}^2(s) \cos^2 \theta},$$

where $\rho_{\pi^+}(s) = (1 - 4m_{\pi}^2/s)^{1/2}$. Their partial-wave expansions are as follows:

$$M_\pm^{\text{Born}}(s, \theta) = \sum_{j \geq 4} (2j + 1) M_{2j}^{\text{Born}}(s) d_{2j}(\theta),$$

where $d_{2j}(\theta)$ are usual d-functions (see, e.g., Refs [10, 11]). The three lowest partial waves take the form

$$M_{20}^{\text{Born}}(s) = 4\pi \alpha \left( \frac{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}^2(s)}{\rho_{\pi^+}^2(s)} \ln \frac{1 + \rho_{\pi^+}(s)}{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}(s)} \right),$$

$$M_{22}^{\text{Born}}(s) = 4\pi \alpha \left( \frac{3 - \rho_{\pi^+}^2(s)}{2\rho_{\pi^+}^2(s)} \ln \frac{1 + \rho_{\pi^+}(s)}{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}(s)} - 1 \right),$$

$$M_{22}^{\text{Born}}(s) = 4\pi \alpha \left( \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \left[ \frac{(1 - \rho_{\pi^+}^2(s))^2}{2\rho_{\pi^+}^2(s)} \ln \frac{1 + \rho_{\pi^+}(s)}{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}(s)} - 1 \right] \right).$$

The amplitude of the triangle loop diagram describing the $\gamma\gamma \to \pi^+\pi^-\to\phi f_0(980)$ (scalar state with a mass equaling $\sqrt{s}$) transition is given by

$$I_{\pi^+\pi^-}^{\phi f_0}(s) = \frac{s}{\pi} \int_{4m_{\pi}^2}^{s} \rho_{\pi^+}(s') M_{20}^{\text{Born}}(s') \frac{ds'}{s'(s' - s - u)}.$$

The fact that $I_{\pi^+\pi^-}^{\phi f_0}(s) \propto s$ as $s \to 0$ is a consequence of gauge invariance. For $0 < s < 4m_{\pi^+}^2$, one has

$$I_{\pi^+\pi^-}^{\phi f_0}(s) = 8\pi \left( \frac{m_{\pi}^2}{s} \left[ \pi + i \ln \frac{1 + \rho_{\pi^+}(s)}{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}(s)} \right] - 1 \right).$$

and for $s \geq 4m_{\pi^+}^2$, the desired amplitude is

$$I_{\pi^+\pi^-}^{\phi f_0}(s) = 8\pi \left( \frac{m_{\pi}^2}{s} \left[ \pi + i \ln \frac{1 + \rho_{\pi^+}(s)}{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}(s)} \right] - 1 \right).$$

The form factor introduced in formula (33), viz.

$$G_{\pi^+}(t, u) = \frac{1}{s} \left[ \frac{m_{\pi^+}^2 - t}{1 - (u - m_{\pi^+}^2)/x_1^2} + \frac{m_{\pi^+}^2 - u}{1 - (t - m_{\pi^+}^2)/x_1^2} \right],$$

(here, Mandelstam variables $t = m_{\pi^+}^2 - s[1 - \rho_{\pi^+}(s) \cos \theta]/2$ and $u = m_{\pi^+}^2 - s[1 + \rho_{\pi^+}(s) \cos \theta]/2$, modifies the Born partial amplitudes. Let us introduce the notations

$$M_{2j}^{\text{Born}}(s) = \frac{1 - \rho_{\pi^+}^2(s)}{\rho_{\pi^+}^2(s)} F_{2j}^{\text{Born}}(\rho(p_+; s)),$$

$$M_{2j}^{\text{Born}}(s) = \rho_{\pi^+}(s) F_{2j}^{\text{Born}}(\rho(p_+; s)).$$
In this case, numerical integration is needed.

to the contribution of the Function

where

Then, the corresponding amplitudes taking account of the form factor can be represented in the form

\[ M_{0j}^{\text{Born}}(x, x_1) = \frac{1 - \rho_{\pi^0}(s)}{\rho_{\pi^+}(s)} \times \left[ F_{0j}^{\text{Born}}(\rho_{\pi^+}(s)) - F_{0j}^{\text{Born}}(\rho_{\pi^-}(s, x_1)) \right], \]

\[ M_{2j}^{\text{Born}}(x, x_1) = \rho_{\pi^+}(s) \times \left[ F_{2j}^{\text{Born}}(\rho_{\pi^+}(s)) - F_{2j}^{\text{Born}}(\rho_{\pi^-}(s, x_1)) \right], \]

where

\[ \rho_{\pi^+}(s, x_1) = \frac{\rho_{\pi^+}(s)}{1 + 2s^2/s}. \]

Function \( I_{\pi^+}^g(s) \) [see formulas (54)–(56)] is replaced, taking into account the form factor, by the following expression

\[ I_{\pi^+}^g(s) = \frac{s}{\pi} \int_{4m_{\pi^+}^2}^{\infty} \frac{\rho_{\pi^+}(s') M_{0j}^{\text{Born}}(s', x_1)}{s'(s' - s - 4m_{\pi^+}^2)} \, ds'. \]  

In this case, numerical integration is needed.

To facilitate understanding the structure and normalization of the rather complicated expressions used in data fitting, we will present here formulas for the production cross section of \( \sigma \) resonance and its two-photon decay width due to the \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \rightarrow \sigma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \) rescattering mechanism in the imaginary case of a solitary \( \sigma \) resonance coupled only to the \( \pi\pi \) channel.

The corresponding resonance cross section has the familiar form

\[ \sigma_{\text{res}}(\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-; s) = \frac{8\pi}{s} \sqrt{s} \Gamma_{\sigma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \gamma}(s) \sqrt{s} \Gamma_{\sigma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-}(s) / [D_{\sigma}(s)]^2, \]

where

\[ \Gamma_{\sigma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-}(s) = \frac{1}{16\pi} \left| M_{\sigma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-}(s) \right|^2, \]

\[ \Gamma_{\sigma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s) = \frac{1}{16\pi} \left| M_{\sigma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s) \right|^2, \]

\[ M_{\sigma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s) = M_{\sigma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^- \gamma}(s) + sg_{\sigma\gamma\gamma}^{(0)}. \]

The propagator of the \( \sigma \) resonance with the mass \( m_\sigma \) in formula (63) should be replaced by

\[ \Gamma_{\sigma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s) = \frac{1}{16\pi} \left| M_{\sigma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s) \right|^2, \]

\[ M_{\sigma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s) = m_\sigma \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta \]

Polarization operators \( \Pi_{\sigma}^{\pi^0}(s) \) of \( \eta \) resonance introduced in Section 5 [see the paragraph with formulas (43) and (44)] have the following form for

\[ I_{\sigma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \text{Im} \Pi_{\sigma}^{\pi^0}(s) = \frac{3}{2} \frac{g_{\sigma\gamma\gamma}^{(0)}}{16\pi} \rho_{\pi^+}(s)/\sqrt{s}. \]

The quantity \( \text{Re} [\Pi_{\sigma}^{\pi^0}(m_\sigma^2) - \Pi_{\sigma}^{\pi^0}(s)] \) in the denominator of the right-hand side of Eqn (67) is the correction for the finite width of a resonance decay. In Fig. 29, the solid and dashed curves depict the real and imaginary parts of the inverse propagator \( D_{\sigma}(s) \) (taken with the minus sign) for the case of resonance with the mass \( m_\sigma = 0.6 \text{ GeV} \) and the width \( \Gamma_\sigma = \Gamma_{\sigma \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(m_\sigma^2) = 0.45 \text{ GeV} \). It is evidenced that \( \text{Re} [D_{\sigma}(s)] \) can be close to zero at \( s = 4m_{\pi^+}^2 \), due to the correction for the large finite width (coupling constant). As a result, a threshold cusp appears in the amplitudes proportional to \( |1/D_{\sigma}(s)| \) 30 For comparison, dotted and dashed-dot curves in Fig. 29 show for the same values of \( m_\sigma \) and \( \Gamma_\sigma \) the real and imaginary parts of the inverse propagator \( D_{\sigma}(s) = m_\sigma^2 - s - \text{Im} \sigma_\Gamma(s - 4m_{\pi^+}^2)/(m_\sigma^2 - 4m_{\pi^+}^2) \) 1/2 (taken with the minus sign) in which the correction for the finite width is absent [118].

A.2 \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta \)

References to the papers in which corrections for the finite widths and analytic properties of the propagators for the real \( f_i(980), a_0(980) \), and \( n(900) \) resonances were investigated are presented in Section 2. In connection with the \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta \) and \( \gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi \pi \) reactions, these corrections were discussed also in Refs [102, 105].
\[ s \geq m_{ab}^{(s)} + m_{ab}^{(t)} \text{ (where } m_{ab}^{(s)} = m_b + m_a, m_{ab}^{(t)} = m_a) \]

\[
\Pi_{ab}^{(s)}(s) = \frac{g_{ab}^{(s)}}{16\pi} \left[ \frac{m_{ab}^{(s)} - m_a}{m_b} \ln \frac{m_b}{m_a} \right. \\
+ \left. \rho_{ab}(s) \left( i - \frac{1}{\pi} \ln \frac{s - m_{ab}^{(s)} - m_a}{s - m_{ab}^{(s)} - m_b} \right) \right],
\]

(71)

where

\[ \rho_{ab}(s) = \sqrt{\frac{s - m_{ab}^{(s)} - m_a}{s - m_{ab}^{(s)} - m_b}} \]

for \( m_{ab}^{(s)} < s < m_{ab}^{(t)} \):

\[
\Pi_{ab}^{(t)}(s) = \frac{g_{ab}^{(t)}}{16\pi} \left[ \frac{m_{ab}^{(t)} - m_a}{m_b} \ln \frac{m_b}{m_a} \right. \\
- \left. \rho_{ab}(s) \left( 1 - \frac{2}{\pi} \arctan \frac{m_{ab}^{(t)} - s}{\sqrt{s - m_{ab}^{(t)} - m_a}} \right) \right],
\]

(72)

where

\[ \rho_{ab}(s) = \sqrt{\frac{m_{ab}^{(t)} - s}{s - m_{ab}^{(t)} - m_a}} \]

and for \( s \leq m_{ab}^{(t)} \):

\[
\Pi_{ab}^{(t)}(s) = \frac{g_{ab}^{(t)}}{16\pi} \left[ \frac{m_{ab}^{(t)} - m_a}{m_b} \ln \frac{m_b}{m_a} \right. \\
- \left. \rho_{ab}(s) \frac{1}{\pi} \ln \frac{m_{ab}^{(t)} - s + \sqrt{s - m_{ab}^{(t)} - m_a}}{m_{ab}^{(t)} - s - \sqrt{s - m_{ab}^{(t)} - m_a}} \right],
\]

(73)

where

\[ \rho_{ab}(s) = \sqrt{\frac{m_{ab}^{(t)} - s}{s - m_{ab}^{(t)} - m_a}} + \sqrt{\frac{m_{ab}^{(s)} - s}{s - m_{ab}^{(s)} - m_b}} \]

The triangle loop integral in formula (36) takes the form

\[
I_{\pi}^{S}(s) = \frac{s}{\pi} \int_{m_{l} + m_{l'}} \rho_{\pi}^{I}(s') M_{00}^{\pi}(\pi \rightarrow \pi^{0} \eta ; s') ds',
\]

(74)

the Born S-wave amplitude

\[
M_{00}^{\pi}(\pi \rightarrow \pi^{0} \eta ; s) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ M_{00}^{\pi}(\pi \rightarrow \pi^{0} \eta ; s, \theta \cos \theta) d \cos \theta ,
\]

(75)

and \( M_{00}^{\pi}(\pi \rightarrow \pi^{0} \eta ; s, \theta) \) is defined in formula (38). Functions \( I_{\pi}^{S}(s) \) and \( I_{I}^{K}(s) \) entering formula (36) are calculated in a similar way, while function \( I_{K}^{K}(s; x_{2}) \) is found from formula (92) in Appendix A.3.

For the background phase shifts, we utilized the simplest parametrizations quite satisfactorily in the physical region of the \( \gamma \gamma \rightarrow \pi^{0} \eta \) reaction:

\[
\exp(i S_{ab}^{(b)}(s)) = \left( 1 + i F_{ab}(s) \right)^{1/2},
\]

(76)

\[
F_{\pi}(s) = \sqrt{1 - m_{\pi}^{(s)}} / \left[ c_{0} + c_{1} (s - m_{\pi}^{(s)})^{2} \right] ,
\]

(77)

\[
F_{K}(s) = \frac{f_{KK} \sqrt{s} (p_{K-K}(s) + p_{K}^{*} k^{*}(s))}{2} ,
\]

(78)

\[
F_{\pi}(s) = f_{\pi} \sqrt{s - m_{\pi}^{(s)}} / \left[ s - m_{\pi}^{(s)} \right] ,
\]

(79)

The curves in Figs 25–27 correspond to the following model parameters:

\[
(m_{ab}^{(s)}, \alpha_{0}^{s}, \alpha_{0}^{s} \otimes K \otimes \alpha_{0}^{s} \otimes K) = (0.9845, 4.23, 3.79, -2.13) \text{ GeV};
\]

\[
(m_{ab}^{(t)}, \alpha_{0}^{t}, \alpha_{0}^{t} \otimes K \otimes \alpha_{0}^{t} \otimes K) = (1.4, 3.3, 0.28, 2.91) \text{ GeV};
\]

\[
(g_{0}\gamma_{0}, g_{0}\gamma_{0}) = (1.77, -11.5) \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^{-1};
\]

\[
C_{a_{0}a_{0}}^{4} = 0.06 \text{ GeV}^{2}, \ c_{0} = -0.603 ,
\]

\[
c_{1} = -6.48 \text{ GeV}^{-2}, \ c_{2} = 0.121 \text{ GeV}^{-4};
\]

\[
(f_{KK}, F_{\pi}) = (-0.37, 0.28) \text{ GeV}^{-1};
\]

\[
(m_{ab}, f_{ab}^{0}) = (1.322, 0.116) \text{ GeV};
\]

\[
F_{ab}^{0}(0) = 1.053 \text{ keV} , \ r_{ab} = 1.9 \text{ GeV}^{-1}, \ \theta_{ab} = -24^{\circ}
\]

(see paper [109] for details).

A.3 \( \gamma \gamma \rightarrow KK \)

Born amplitudes of the \( \gamma \gamma \rightarrow K^{+}K^{-} \) reaction, determined by an elementary K exchange, \( M_{B}^{\text{Born} K}(s, \theta) \), and \( M_{B}^{\text{Born} K}(s, \theta) \), result from the corresponding Born \( \gamma \gamma \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \) amplitudes \( M_{B}^{\text{Born} \pi}(s, \theta) \) and \( M_{B}^{\text{Born} \pi}(s, \theta) \) by the substitutions \( m_{\pi} \rightarrow m_{K} \), and \( p_{\pi}(s) \rightarrow p_{K}(s) = (1 - 4m_{K}^{2} / s) / (2m_{K}^{2}) \) in formulas (48), (49), and (51)–(53); they have the following form

\[
M_{B}^{\text{Born} K}(s, \theta) = \frac{4m_{K}^{2}}{s} \frac{8\pi z}{1 - p_{K}^{*}(s) \cos^{2} \theta} ,
\]

(80)

\[
M_{B}^{\text{Born} K}(s, \theta) = \frac{8\pi z p_{K}^{*}(s) \sin^{2} \theta}{1 - p_{K}^{*}(s) \cos^{2} \theta} ,
\]

(81)

\[
M_{B}^{\text{Born} K}(s, \theta) = 4\pi z \frac{1 - \rho_{K}^{*}(s)}{p_{K}^{*}(s) \ln 1 + \rho_{K}^{*}(s)} ,
\]

(82)

\[
M_{B}^{\text{Born} K}(s, \theta) = 4\pi z \frac{1 - \rho_{K}^{*}(s)}{p_{K}^{*}(s) \ln 1 + \rho_{K}^{*}(s)} \ln 1 + \rho_{K}^{*}(s) - 3 ,
\]

(83)

\[
M_{B}^{\text{Born} K}(s, \theta) = 4\pi z \frac{1 - \rho_{K}^{*}(s)}{p_{K}^{*}(s) \ln 1 + \rho_{K}^{*}(s)} \ln 1 + \rho_{K}^{*}(s) - 3 ,
\]

(84)

Function \( I_{K_{K}}^{K}(s) \) is obtained from \( I_{K_{K}}^{K}(s) \) by the substitutions \( m_{\pi} \rightarrow m_{K} \), and \( p_{\pi}(s) \rightarrow p_{K}(s) \) in expressions (55) and (56); therefore, for \( 0 < s < 4m_{K}^{2} \), one finds

\[
I_{K_{K}}^{K}(s) = 8\pi z \frac{m_{K}^{2}}{s} \left[ \pi - 2 \arctan \left| p_{K}^{*}(s) \right| \right]^{2} - 1 ,
\]

(85)

and for \( s \geq 4m_{K}^{2} \), the desired function is

\[
I_{K_{K}}^{K}(s) = 8\pi z \frac{m_{K}^{2}}{s} \left[ \pi + \ln \frac{1 + \rho_{K}^{*}(s)}{1 - \rho_{K}^{*}(s)} \right]^{2} - 1 .
\]

(86)
The corresponding cross sections are as follows:

\[ \sigma_{00}(\gamma \gamma \rightarrow K^+ K^-) = \frac{\rho_{K^+}(s)}{32 \pi s} |M_{00}(\gamma \gamma \rightarrow K^+ K^-; s)|^2, \]  
\[ \sigma_{00}(\gamma \gamma \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0) = \frac{\rho_{K^0}(s)}{64 \pi s} |M_{00}(\gamma \gamma \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0; s)|^2. \]  

The amplitudes of \( \pi\pi \rightarrow KK \) reactions, \( T_{\pi\pi \rightarrow KK} = \frac{1}{4} |\mathcal{M}_{\pi\pi \rightarrow KK}(s)|^2 \), are defined by formulas (23), (26). The amplitudes of \( K^+ K^- \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0 \) reactions take the form

\[ T_{K^+ K^- \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0}(s) = \frac{t_0^2(s) + t_1^2(s)}{2}, \]  
\[ T_{K^+ K^- \rightarrow K^0\bar{K}^0}(s) = \frac{t_0^2(s) - t_1^2(s)}{2}, \]  

where \( t_0^2(s) \) are the S-wave amplitudes of \( KK \rightarrow KK \) reactions with isospin \( I = 0 \) and 1:

\[ t_0^2(s) = \exp \left( 2i\theta_{KK}^0(s) \right) - 1 + \exp \left( 2i\theta_{KK}^0(s) \right) T_{KK}(s) , \]  
\[ t_1^2(s) = \exp \left( 2i\theta_{KK}^1(s) \right) - 1 + \exp \left( 2i\theta_{KK}^1(s) \right) T_{KK}(s) , \]  

where \( \theta_{KK}^0(s) \) and \( \theta_{KK}^1(s) \) are the phases in the channels with \( I = 0 \) and 1, respectively, and

\[ T_{KK}(s) = \frac{g_{KK}^0 - g_{KK}^1}{2i\Re\theta_{KK}^0(s)} + \frac{g_{KK}^1}{2i\Re\theta_{KK}^1(s)} , \]  
\[ T_{KK}(s) = \frac{g_{KK}^0 - g_{KK}^1}{2i\Re\theta_{KK}^0(s)} - \frac{g_{KK}^1}{2i\Re\theta_{KK}^1(s)} , \]  

where

\[ \theta_{KK}^0(s) = \vartheta_{KK}^0(s) + \Pi_{00}(s) \]  
\[ \theta_{KK}^1(s) = \vartheta_{KK}^1(s) + \Pi_{00}(s) \]  
\[ \theta_{KK}^0(s) = \vartheta_{KK}^0(s) + \Pi_{00}(s) \]  
\[ \theta_{KK}^1(s) = \vartheta_{KK}^1(s) + \Pi_{00}(s) \]  

The amplitudes of direct resonance–photon transitions assume the form

\[ M_{\text{res}}^\text{direct}(s) = s \exp \left( i\theta_{KK}^0(s) \right) \frac{1}{2} [\rho_{KK}^0(s) + \rho_{KK}^1(s)] D_0(s) D_0(s) - \Pi_{00}(s) , \]  
\[ M_{\text{res}}^\text{direct}(s) = s \exp \left( i\theta_{KK}^0(s) \right) \frac{1}{2} [\rho_{KK}^0(s) - \rho_{KK}^1(s)] D_0(s) D_0(s) - \Pi_{00}(s) , \]  
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