

Scouring meson decays for true muonium

Yao Ji*

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, Regensburg 93040, Germany

Henry Lamm†

Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

(Dated: October 2, 2018)

Rare meson decay experiments promise to measure branching ratios as small as 10^{-13} . This presents an opportunity to discover the $\mu^+\mu^-$ bound state true muonium. We consider a set of possible channels, all with branching ratios above $\sim 10^{-11}$. For the electromagnetic decays $\eta/\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma$, theoretical and phenomenological form factors $F_{\eta/\eta'\gamma\gamma^*}(Q^2)$ allow predictions of $\mathcal{BR}(\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma) \sim 4.8 \times 10^{-10}$ and $\mathcal{BR}(\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma) \sim 3.7 \times 10^{-11}$ at the 5% level. Discussion of experimental prospects and potential backgrounds are made.

Within the Standard Model, only the Higgs interaction breaks *lepton universality*, but the discovery of neutrino masses implies that at least one beyond-Standard Model modification is required. Many precision physics searches have been undertaken in the charged lepton sector to detect additional lepton universality violations. Measurements of $(g-2)_e$ [1], charge radii [2, 3], and B meson decays [4–14] have each shown hints of discrepancy. The bound state of $(\mu^+\mu^-)$, *true muonium*, or TM for short, presents another avenue for investigating lepton universality [15, 16]. To facilitate these studies, efforts are ongoing to improve theoretical predictions [17–23]. Alas, true muonium remains undetected today.

There are two categories of $(\mu^+\mu^-)$ production methods discussed within the literature: particle collisions (fixed-target and collider) [24–31], or through rare decays of mesons [32–38]. Both are challenging due to the low production rates. Currently, the HPS [39] experiment is searching for true muonium [40] via $e^-Z \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)X$. Another fixed-target experiment, DIRAC [41] could look for $(\mu^+\mu^-)$ in an upgraded run [42]. The existing KOTO experiment [43] and proposed NA62-KLEVER [44] hope to achieve sensitivities to K_L decays with $\mathcal{BR} \sim 10^{-13}$, which would also present an opportunity to detect true muonium [37].

In this work, we present predictions for $\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma)$ where true muonium is accompanied by a monochromatic photon (which in the η/η' rest frame are 233.2 MeV and 455.6 MeV respectively) including $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ radiative corrections. These calculations improve upon previous constituent quark model calculations which estimated $\mathcal{BR}(\eta \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma) \approx 10^{-9}$ [32, 34]. Numerous studies of $F_{\eta/\eta'\gamma\gamma^*}(Q^2)$ are available to estimate potential systematics for this process. Other discovery channels involving hadronic final states with $\mathcal{BR} \geq 10^{-12}$ are discussed and comments on backgrounds are made.

The order of magnitude of $\mathcal{BR}(X \rightarrow Y(\ell^+\ell^-))$ can be estimated by multiplying $\mathcal{BR}(X \rightarrow Y\gamma)$ by α^4 , which

TABLE I. Meson decay branching ratios involving photons considered in this work. The first two are electromagnetic decays, while the others are strong decays. Branching ratios to true muonium can be estimated by multiplying by $\alpha^4 \approx 2.8 \times 10^{-9}$

Channel	\mathcal{BR}
$\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$	4.0×10^{-1}
$\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$	2.2×10^{-2}
$\eta' \rightarrow \rho\gamma$	2.9×10^{-1}
$\omega \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$	8.2×10^{-2}
$\eta' \rightarrow \omega\gamma$	2.8×10^{-2}
$J/\psi \rightarrow \eta'\gamma$	5.2×10^{-3}
$J/\psi \rightarrow X_h\gamma$	6×10^{-2}

arises from $|\mathcal{M}(\gamma^* \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-)\mathcal{M}(\ell^+\ell^- \rightarrow (\ell^+\ell^-))|^2 \propto \alpha|\psi(0)|^2$. This implies that $\mathcal{BR}(X \rightarrow Y(\mu^+\mu^-)) \lesssim 10^{-9}$. In Table I, we have included a list of channels which led to branching ratios to true muonium of $\gtrsim 10^{-12}$. There are two processes with $\mathcal{BR} > 10\%$: $\eta' \rightarrow \rho\gamma$ and the electromagnetic $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, the latter along side the percent level $\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ we will discuss in more detail. The large number of J/ψ events being collected in the near future also presents the possibility of subpercent channels like $J/\psi \rightarrow \eta'\gamma$, as well as the percent-level but more complicated inclusive $J/\psi \rightarrow X_h\gamma$ [45]. Predictions of $X_h + (\mu^+\mu^-)$ decays require knowledge of hadronic transition form factors, and are more limited in precision compared to processes like $\eta/\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma$ where the better studied electromagnetic form factors are available. These electromagnetic decays are the main focus of the rest of the paper.

While K_L experiments are reaching sensitivities of 10^{-13} , the sensitivity of J/ψ and η/η' searches is worse. At present, the BESIII experiments has the largest J/ψ and η/η' data sets. From the 1.3×10^9 J/ψ events collected and using the two largest branching ratios, $\gamma\eta/\eta'$ and $\phi\eta/\eta'$, one anticipates 2.0×10^6 η events and 7.7×10^6 η' events with a factor to 10 increase expected in the

* yao.ji@physik.uni-regensburg.de

† hlamm@umd.edu




FIG. 1. One of the Feynman diagrams of $\eta/\eta' \rightarrow \gamma^*\gamma^* \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma$ which contribute to the branching ratio at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^5)$ and is proportional to $F_{\gamma^*\gamma^*}(z_1, z_2)$

next decade [46]. This 10^{10} J/ψ is right at the edge of what is necessary for an inclusive search. Another similar sized data set exists from A2 where η is produced through $\gamma p \rightarrow \eta p$, and have 6.2×10^6 η events. The recently approved JLab Eta Factory experiment anticipates collecting 1.3×10^8 η and 9.8×10^7 η' events with 200 days of beam time [47], and beyond that can be run in parallel with the GlueX experiment if the later is extended beyond 2023 [47]. Further into the future, proposals like REDTOP at FermiLab discussed methods to accrue 10^{13} η and 10^{11} η' events [48].

Following previous calculations for the electromagnetic decay of mesons to atoms [32–37], the branching ratios are

$$\frac{\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma)}{\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)} = \frac{\alpha^4 \zeta(3)}{2} (1 - z_{TM})^3 \left[1 + C_{\eta/\eta'} \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \right] |f_{\eta/\eta'}(z_{TM})|^2, \quad (1)$$

where $\zeta(3) = \sum_n 1/n^3$ arising from the sum over all allowed $(\mu^+\mu^-)$ states, $C_\eta = -0.35(6)$ and $C_{\eta'} = 0.35(3)$, $z_{TM} = M_{TM}^2/M_{\eta/\eta'}^2 \approx 4M_\mu^2/M_{\eta/\eta'}^2$, and $f(z) = F_{\eta/\eta'\gamma\gamma^*}(z)/F_{\eta/\eta'\gamma\gamma^*}(0)$.

In [37], the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ radiative corrections to the analogous process $K_L \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma$ including the leptonic and hadronic vacuum polarization [21], and an improved calculation of the double virtual photon contribution $h \rightarrow \gamma^*(k) + \gamma^*(P_h - k) \rightarrow \gamma + TM$ were presented, where P_h is the four-momentum of the initial hadron, and k is the four-momentum of one of the virtual photons. This final term is dependent upon the initial state and has been recomputed for the η/η' processes.

For this contribution, one should take the convolution of the QED amplitude with double-virtual-photon form factor $F_{\eta/\eta'\gamma^*\gamma^*}(k^2/M_{\eta/\eta'}^2, (P_{\eta/\eta'} - k)^2/M_{\eta/\eta'}^2)$. Taking the form factor to be a constant equal to $F_{\gamma\gamma^*}(0, z_{TM})$

and factoring it out from the integral is a sufficient approximation as shown in [49]. This approximation is expected to receive process-dependent corrections but all comparable processes have errors less than 10% [50, 51] with 4% being a reasonable estimate for our particular process based on various models for the form factors. With this, we find that the total next to leading order correction is

$$C_{\eta/\eta'} = [C_{eVP} + C_{\mu VP} + C_{\tau VP} + C_{hVP} + C_{ver}] + C_{\gamma^*\gamma^*} = \begin{cases} \left[\frac{8.526(4)}{9} \right] - \frac{11.7(5)}{9} & \text{for } \eta \\ \left[\frac{8.526(4)}{9} \right] - \frac{5.4(3)}{9} & \text{for } \eta' \end{cases}, \quad (2)$$

where the bracketed terms are independent of the initial meson, the C_{iVP} indicate vacuum polarization contributions from $i = e, \mu$, and hadrons, C_{ver} is the vertex correction term of [33], while $C_{\gamma^*\gamma^*}$ is the contribution from diagram in Fig. 1 and alike. A similar calculation for positronium, where other lepton flavors and hadronic loop corrections are negligible, finds the $\frac{\alpha}{\pi}$ coefficient to be $C_0 = C_{VP} + C_{ver} = -52/9$ [33]. C_{iVP} are found by computing

$$C_{iVP} = 4m_\mu^2 \int_{4m_i^2}^{\infty} dt \frac{\text{Im } \Pi(t)}{t(4m_\mu^2 - t)} \quad (3)$$

from the spectral functions $\text{Im } \Pi(t)$. This function is known to leading order analytically for the leptons, and is derived from experiment for the hadronic distribution.

$F_{\eta/\eta'\gamma\gamma^*}(0)$ are fixed to the experimental values [52]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{BR}(\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) &= 39.41(20)\%, \\ \mathcal{BR}(\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) &= 2.22(8)\%. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Evaluating Eq. (1), we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{BR}(\eta \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma) &= 4.14(3) \times 10^{-10} |f(z_{TM})|^2, \\ \mathcal{BR}(\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma) &= 3.26(12) \times 10^{-11} |f(z_{TM})|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where the dominant error is from $\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$, preventing the measurement of these radiative corrections from this ratio. An improved value of $\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$ or constructing a different ratio, as we do below, can allow sensitivity to these corrections.

Results for the form factors $F_{\eta/\eta'\gamma^*\gamma^*}(Q^2)$ can be broadly classified into three groups: theoretical predictions [53–56], experimental extractions [57–59, 61–63], and dispersion analyses [64–67]. The standard parameterization for $f(z)$ is a series expansion in z

$$f(z) = 1 + b_{\eta/\eta'} z + c_{\eta/\eta'} z^2 + d_{\eta/\eta'} z^3 + \dots \quad (6)$$

which for all but the dispersion analyses of [66, 67] truncate at first order. The theoretical predictions make vastly different assumptions about the coupling between η/η' and the photon, as well as different modeling of the

TABLE II. Form factor coefficients and $\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-\gamma))$.

	η Coefficients		$\mathcal{BR}(\eta \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-\gamma)) \times 10^{10}$	η' Coefficients		$\mathcal{BR}(\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-\gamma)) \times 10^{11}$	Ref.
χ PT	b_η	0.51	4.79(3)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.47	3.74(14)	[53]
VMD	b_η	0.53	4.82(3)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.33	3.70(14)	[53]
CQ Loops	b_η	0.51	4.79(3)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.30	3.69(14)	[53]
BL Interp.	b_η	0.36	4.59(3)	$b_{\eta'}$	2.11	3.96(15)	[54]
R χ T - 1 Octet	b_η	0.546(9)	4.84(3)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.384(3)	3.71(14)	[55]
R χ T - 2 Octets	b_η	0.521(2)	4.81(3)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.384(3)	3.71(14)	[55]
Anomaly SR	b_η	0.51	4.79(3)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.06	3.61(13)	[56]
Anomaly SR	b_η	0.54	4.83(3)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.16	3.64(14)	[56]
CELLO	b_η	0.428(89)	4.68(12)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.46(23)	3.74(16)	[57]
CLEO	b_η	0.501(38)	4.78(6)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.24(8)	3.67(14)	[58]
Lepton-G	b_η	0.57(12)	4.87(17)	$b_{\eta'}$	1.6(4)	3.79(20)	[59, 60]
NA60	b_η	0.585(51)	4.89(8)	–	–	–	[61]
WASA	b_η	0.68(26)	5.0(4)	–	–	–	[62]
A2	b_η	0.59(5)	4.90(8)	–	–	–	[63]
DA	b_η	$0.62^{+0.07}_{-0.03}$	4.94(10)	$b_{\eta'}$	$1.45^{+0.17}_{-0.12}$	3.74(15)	[64]
DA	b_η	$0.57^{+0.06}_{-0.03}$	4.87(9)	–	–	–	[65]
RA	b_η	$0.576(11)_{\text{st}(4)_{\text{sy}}}$		$b_{\eta'}$	$1.31(4)_{\text{st}(1)_{\text{sy}}}$		
	c_η	$0.339(15)_{\text{st}(5)_{\text{sy}}}$		$c_{\eta'}$	$1.74(9)_{\text{st}(3)_{\text{sy}}}$		
	d_η	$0.200(14)_{\text{st}(18)_{\text{sy}}}$	$4.953(30)_{\text{st}(6)_{\text{sy}}}$	$d_{\eta'}$	$2.30(19)_{\text{st}(21)_{\text{sy}}}$	$3.720(140)_{\text{st}(4)_{\text{sy}}}$	[66, 67]

mixing between the two mesons. The experimental results rely upon integrating the functional form of Eq. (6) in Q^2 bins, and then non-linearly fitting $b_{\eta/\eta'}$. The dispersive analyses rely upon connecting experimental data for multiple processes to the virtual photon form factors through analyticity and crossing symmetry. We have tabulated all of the form factors considered in this work in Table II. With the exception of the Brodsky-Lepage interpolation predictions of η [54], the branching ratios predicted for true muonium agree within the uncertainties.

While improving $\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$ is certainly desirable, one could consider other branching ratios that remove this uncertainty. One potentially interesting ratio that would also test lepton universality is the ratio of true muonium to positronium (e^+e^-):

$$\begin{aligned}
R &= \frac{\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-\gamma))}{\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow (e^+e^-\gamma))} \\
&= \frac{(1 - z_{TM})^3 \left(1 + C_{\eta/\eta'} \frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right) |f(z_{TM})|^2}{(1 - z_{Ps})^3 \left(1 - \frac{52}{9} \frac{\alpha}{\pi}\right) |f(z_{Ps})|^2} \\
&= K_{\eta/\eta'} \left| \frac{f(z_{TM})}{f(z_{Ps})} \right|^2, \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

which is independent of the $\mathcal{BR}(\eta/\eta' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$ uncertainty and $K_\eta = 0.62469(8)$ and $K_{\eta'} = 0.87340(5)$. This ratio has the added feature that it directly measures lepton universality, and due to the small range of Q^2 of leptonic atom production, this ratio has reduced Q^2 dependence arising from form factor uncertainties.

Compared to this theoretical precision, the current and near-future experimental outlooks are less optimistic. Clearly the present 10^6 η/η' BESIII and A2 data are insufficient for observing true muonium. From these, one would expect to place an upper limit on the branching ratios $\mathcal{BR} \lesssim 10^{-5}$ which is $10^4 - 10^5$ times larger than the predicted rates. This should be compared with the situation for $K_L \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-\gamma)$ where upper bounds of $\mathcal{BR} \lesssim 10^{-9}$ are possible at KTeV [68, 69] which are superior limits but still 10^3 times as large as predicted [37]. In the next decade, BESIII's larger data set is still inadequate for even single-event detection through the η/η' processes, although the inclusive J/ψ channel is potentially viable. The JLab Eta Factory experiment would be competitive with the possible bounds from KTeV based on the Standard Model predictions. What is required is a proposal like REDTOP at FermiLab which would be sufficient for a discovery of true muonium through the decay of η with 100s of events, and potentially an observation of the η' decay.

The most promising signal channel for discovering true muonium in mesonic decays is e^+e^- , with a large background from the free decays $\eta/\eta' \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-\gamma$. This background can be computed by integrating the differential cross section in an invariant mass bin, M_{bin} , centered around the $(\mu^+\mu^-)$ peak defined as $[2m_\mu - M_{bin}/2, 2m_\mu + M_{bin}/2]$. For bin sizes similar to BESIII (20 MeV), the values are $\mathcal{BR}(\eta \rightarrow e^+e^-\gamma)_{bin} = 4 \times 10^{-6} M_{bin}$, and $\mathcal{BR}(\eta' \rightarrow e^+e^-\gamma)_{bin} = 3 \times 10^{-7} M_{bin}$ where M_{bin} is in MeV. This large raw background ($\sim 10^4 \times$ the signal)

must be reduced, by its distinct features compared to true muonium decays can plausible do this.

The two two-body decay topology suggests cuts on momenta and angular distribution would be powerful in background suppression, but exact values of the suppression will be highly detector efficiency dependent. As an example, for radiative Dalitz decay the angle θ_e between the e^+e^- can be arbitrary, but from the true muonium decay $\theta_e \sim m_{TM}/E_{TM} \sim 50^\circ \times \frac{\text{GeV}}{E_{\eta/\eta'}}$. In BESIII, where the typically η/η' is produced from the decay of J/Ψ , one finds $\theta_e \sim 30^\circ$. This correlation can be more precisely measured than the invariant mass, and can yield a factor of 10 in background suppression. Full reconstruction of the η/η' allows for cuts on the γ energy, where the bin resolution is $\mathcal{O}(M_{bin})$ together with the anti-parallel

correlation between the γ and the true muonium yields at least factor of 3 further background suppression. If the vertex resolution is better than 0.5 mm, cuts can be made using the proper lifetime of true muonium ground state $c\tau = 0.5$ mm. Otherwise nearly all the e^+e^- will be insufficiently separated from the primary $\eta/\eta' \rightarrow (\mu^+\mu^-)\gamma$ vertex to distinguish.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

HL is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-FG02-93ER-40762. YJ acknowledges the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for support under grant BR 2021/7-1.

-
- [1] G. Bennett *et al.* (Muon G-2 Collaboration), *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 072003 (2006), arXiv:hep-ex/0602035 [hep-ex].
- [2] A. Antognini *et al.*, *Science* **339**, 417 (2013).
- [3] R. Pohl *et al.* (CREMA), *Science* **353**, 669 (2016).
- [4] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb collaboration), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 151601 (2014), arXiv:1406.6482 [hep-ex].
- [5] J. P. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 101802 (2012), arXiv:1205.5442 [hep-ex].
- [6] J. P. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 072012 (2013), arXiv:1303.0571 [hep-ex].
- [7] M. Huschle *et al.* (Belle), *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 072014 (2015), arXiv:1507.03233 [hep-ex].
- [8] Y. Sato *et al.* (Belle), *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 072007 (2016), arXiv:1607.07923 [hep-ex].
- [9] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 111803 (2015), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, no.15, 159901 (2015)], arXiv:1506.08614 [hep-ex].
- [10] S. Hirose *et al.* (Belle), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 211801 (2017), arXiv:1612.00529 [hep-ex].
- [11] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 171802 (2018), arXiv:1708.08856 [hep-ex].
- [12] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 072013 (2018), arXiv:1711.02505 [hep-ex].
- [13] S. Hirose *et al.* (Belle), *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 012004 (2018), arXiv:1709.00129 [hep-ex].
- [14] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), (2017), arXiv:1711.05623 [hep-ex].
- [15] D. Tucker-Smith and I. Yavin, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 101702 (2011), arXiv:1011.4922 [hep-ph].
- [16] H. Lamm, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 115007 (2016), arXiv:1609.07520 [hep-ph].
- [17] U. Jentschura, G. Soff, V. Ivanov, and S. G. Karshenboim, *Phys. Rev. A* **56**, 4483 (1997), arXiv:physics/9706026 [physics].
- [18] U. Jentschura, G. Soff, V. Ivanov, and S. G. Karshenboim, (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9706401 [hep-ph].
- [19] H. Lamm, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 073008 (2015).
- [20] H. Lamm, *Phys. Rev. A* **95**, 012505 (2017), arXiv:1611.04258 [physics.atom-ph].
- [21] Y. Ji and H. Lamm, *Phys. Rev. A* **94**, 032507 (2016).
- [22] Y. Ji and H. Lamm, (2017), arXiv:1701.04362 [physics.atom-ph].
- [23] H. Lamm and Y. Ji, *Proceedings, 6th International Conference on Exotic Atoms and Related Topics (EXA2017): Vienna, Austria, September 11-15, 2017*, EPJ Web Conf. **181**, 01016 (2018), arXiv:1712.03429 [hep-ph].
- [24] S. M. Bilenky, V. H. Nguyen, L. L. Nemenov, and F. G. Tkebuchava, *Yad. Fiz.* **10**, 812 (1969).
- [25] V. Hughes and B. Maglic, *Bull. Am. Phys. Soc.* **16**, 65 (1971).
- [26] J. Moffat, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **35**, 1605 (1975).
- [27] E. Holvik and H. A. Olsen, *Phys. Rev. D* **35**, 2124 (1987).
- [28] I. Ginzburg, U. Jentschura, S. G. Karshenboim, F. Krauss, V. Serbo, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. C* **58**, 3565 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9805375 [hep-ph].
- [29] N. Arteaga-Romero, C. Carimalo, and V. Serbo, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 032501 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/0001278 [hep-ph].
- [30] S. J. Brodsky and R. F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 213401 (2009), arXiv:0904.2225 [hep-ph].
- [31] Y. Chen and P. Zhuang, (2012), arXiv:1204.4389 [hep-ph].
- [32] L. Nemenov, *Yad. Fiz.* **15**, 1047 (1972).
- [33] M. I. Vysotsky, *Yad. Fiz.* **29**, 845 (1979).
- [34] G. Kozlov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **48**, 167 (1988).
- [35] J. Malenfant, *Phys. Rev. D* **36**, 863 (1987).
- [36] A. P. Martynenko and R. N. Faustov, *Moscow Univ. Phys. Bull.* **53N5**, 6 (1998), [Vestn. Mosk. Univ. Fiz. Astron. **53N5**, 10(1998)].
- [37] Y. Ji and H. Lamm, (2017), arXiv:1706.04986 [hep-ph].
- [38] M. Fael and T. Mannel, *Nucl. Phys. B* **932**, 370 (2018), arXiv:1803.08880 [hep-ph].
- [39] A. Celentano (HPS), *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **556**, 012064 (2014).
- [40] A. Banburski and P. Schuster, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 093007 (2012), arXiv:1206.3961 [hep-ph].
- [41] A. Benelli (DIRAC Collaboration), EPJ Web Conf. **37**, 01011 (2012).
- [42] P. Chliapnikov, DIRAC-NOTE-2014-05 (2014).
- [43] J. K. Ahn *et al.*, *PTEP* **2017**, 021C01 (2017), arXiv:1609.03637 [hep-ex].
- [44] M. Moulson (NA62-KLEVER Project), *Proceedings, International Conference on Kaon Physics (KAON 2016): Birmingham, United Kingdom, September 14-17, 2016*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **800**, 012037 (2017), arXiv:1611.04864 [hep-ex].
- [45] D. Besson *et al.* (CLEO), *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 032012 (2008),

- arXiv:0806.0315 [hep-ex].
- [46] S.-s. Fang, A. Kupsc, and D.-h. Wei, *Chin. Phys.* **C42**, 042002 (2018), arXiv:1710.05173 [hep-ex].
- [47] L. Gan *et al.*, “Jlab proposal Eta Decays with Emphasis on Rare Neutral Modes: The JLab Eta Factory (JEF) Experiment, PR12-14-004.”
- [48] C. Gatto, B. Fabela Enriquez, and M. I. Pedraza Morales (REDTOP), *Proceedings, 38th International Conference on High Energy Physics (ICHEP 2016): Chicago, IL, USA, August 3-10, 2016*, PoS **ICHEP2016**, 812 (2016).
- [49] K. Kampf, M. Knecht, and J. Novotny, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C46**, 191 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0510021 [hep-ph].
- [50] Kampf, Karol and Novotný, Jiří and Sanchez-Puertas, Pablo, *Phys. Rev.* **D97**, 056010 (2018), arXiv:1801.06067 [hep-ph].
- [51] T. Husek and S. Leupold, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C75**, 586 (2015), arXiv:1507.00478 [hep-ph].
- [52] M. Tanabashi *et al.* (ParticleDataGroup), *Phys. Rev.* **D98**, 030001 (2018).
- [53] L. Ametller, J. Bijnens, A. Bramon, and F. Cornet, *Phys. Rev.* **D45**, 986 (1992).
- [54] S. J. Brodsky and G. P. Lepage, *Conference on Nuclear Structure and Particle Physics Oxford, England, April 6-8, 1981*, *Phys. Rev.* **D24**, 1808 (1981).
- [55] H. Czyz, S. Ivashyn, A. Korchin, and O. Shekhovtsova, *Phys. Rev.* **D85**, 094010 (2012), arXiv:1202.1171 [hep-ph].
- [56] Y. Klopot, A. Oganesian, and O. Teryaev, *JETP Lett.* **99**, 679 (2014), arXiv:1312.1226 [hep-ph].
- [57] H. J. Behrend *et al.* (CELLO), *Z. Phys.* **C49**, 401 (1991).
- [58] J. Gronberg *et al.* (CLEO), *Phys. Rev.* **D57**, 33 (1998), arXiv:hep-ex/9707031 [hep-ex].
- [59] R. I. Dzhelyadin *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **94B**, 548 (1980), [Yad. Fiz.32,998(1980)].
- [60] L. G. Landsberg, *Phys. Rept.* **128**, 301 (1985).
- [61] R. Araldi *et al.* (NA60), *Phys. Lett.* **B677**, 260 (2009), arXiv:0902.2547 [hep-ph].
- [62] M. Hodana and P. Moskal (WASA-at-COSY), *Proceedings, 12th International Workshop on Production, properties and interaction of mesons (MESON 2012): Cracow, Poland, May 31-June 5, 2012*, *EPJ Web Conf.* **37**, 09017 (2012), arXiv:1210.3156 [nucl-ex].
- [63] P. Aguar-Bartolome *et al.* (A2), *Phys. Rev.* **C89**, 044608 (2014), arXiv:1309.5648 [hep-ex].
- [64] C. Hanhart, A. Kupsc, U. G. Meissner, F. Stollenwerk, and A. Wirzba, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C73**, 2668 (2013), [Erratum: *Eur. Phys. J.* C75,no.6,242(2015)], arXiv:1307.5654 [hep-ph].
- [65] B. Kubis and J. Plenter, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C75**, 283 (2015), arXiv:1504.02588 [hep-ph].
- [66] R. Escribano, P. Masjuan, and P. Sanchez-Puertas, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C75**, 414 (2015), arXiv:1504.07742 [hep-ph].
- [67] R. Escribano, S. Gonzalez-Solis, P. Masjuan, and P. Sanchez-Puertas, *Phys. Rev.* **D94**, 054033 (2016), arXiv:1512.07520 [hep-ph].
- [68] A. Alavi-Harati *et al.* (KTeV), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 071801 (2001).
- [69] E. Abouzaid *et al.* (KTeV), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 051804 (2007), arXiv:hep-ex/0702039 [hep-ex].