Strong and weak CP tests in sequential decays of polarized Σ^0 hyperons

W. L. Xu⁶⁷, X. P. Xu⁵⁵, Y. Xu⁴⁰, Y. C. Xu⁷⁸, Z. S. Xu⁶⁴, F. Yan^{12,g}, L. Yan^{12,g}, W. B. Yan^{72,58}, W. C. Yan⁸¹, X. Q. Yan^{1,64}, H. J. Yang^{51,f}, H. L. Yang³⁴, H. X. Yang¹, T. Yang¹, Y. Yang^{12,g}, Y. F. Yang^{1,64}, Y. F. Yang⁴³,
Y. X. Yang^{1,64}, Z. W. Yang^{38,k,l}, Z. P. Yao⁵⁰, M. Ye^{1,58}, M. H. Ye⁸, J. H. Yin¹, Junhao Yin⁴³, Z. Y. You⁵⁹, B. X. Yu^{1,58,64}, C. X. Yu⁴³, G. Yu^{1,64}, J. S. Yu^{25,i}, M. C. Yu⁴⁰, T. Yu⁷³, X. D. Yu^{46,h}, Y. C. Yu⁸¹, C. Z. Yuan^{1,64}, J. Yuan³⁴, J. Yuan⁴⁵,
L. Yuan², S. C. Yuan^{1,64}, Y. Yuan^{1,64}, Z. Y. Yuan⁵⁹, C. X. Yue³⁹, A. A. Zafar⁷⁴, F. R. Zeng⁵⁰, S. H. Zeng^{63,A;63,B;63,C;63,D}, X. Zeng^{12,g}, Y. Zeng^{5,i}, Y. J. Zeng⁵⁹, Y. J. Zeng^{1,64}, X. Y. Zhaig³¹, H. Zhang⁵¹, H. Zhang^{1,64}, B. X. Zhang¹, D. H. Zhang⁴³, G. Y. Zhang^{1,64}, H. Zhang⁵¹, H. Zhang⁵¹, H. Zhang⁵¹, H. Zhang^{51,4}, H. R. Zhang^{72,58}, H. Y. Zhang^{1,58}, J. Zhang^{51,4}, H. R. Zhang^{72,58}, H. Z. Zhang^{1,58,64}, J. L. Zhang²⁰, J. Q. Zhang^{11,58,64}, H. R. Zhang^{72,58}, H. Y. Zhang^{38,k,l}, J. Y. Zhang^{1,64}, Shulei Zhang^{52,i}, X. D. Zhang^{1,64}, Q. Y. Zhang^{1,58,64}, J. X. Zhang^{38,k,l}, S. H. Zhang^{1,64}, Shulei Zhang^{52,i}, X. D. Zhang⁶⁴,
L. M. Zhang⁶¹, Lei Zhang⁴², P. Zhang^{1,64}, Q. Y. Zhang³⁴, R. Y. Zhang^{38,k,l}, S. H. Zhang^{1,64}, Shulei Zhang^{25,i}, X. D. Zhang⁶⁵, Y. Zhang^{1,58,64}, J. X. Zhang³⁴, Y. T. Zhang⁸¹, Y. H. Zhang^{1,58}, Y. M. Zhang³⁹, Yan Zhang^{72,58}, Z. D. Zhang^{1,54}, L. Zhang⁵⁰, Y. Zhang³⁴, Z. Y. Zhang³⁴, Y. H. Zhang^{1,58}, Y. M. Zhang³⁹, Yan Zhang^{72,58}, K. Zhuo^{1,58}, A. Zhang^{1,58}, J. Zhang⁴⁵, G. Zhao^{1,58}, Y. X. Zhao^{1,64}, J. Z. Zhao^{1,58}, A. Zhenchugov^{36,5}, B. Zheng⁷³, B. M. Zheng³⁴, J. P. Zheng^{1,58}, Y. M. Zhang³⁹, Yan Zhang^{72,58}, Z. D. Zhang¹, Z. H. Zhao^{1,58}, M. G. Zhao^{72,58}, M. G. Zhao⁷³, B. M. Zheng³⁴, J. P. Zheng^{1,58}, W. J. Zheng^{1,58}, Y. M. Zhang³⁹, Y. X. Zhao^{1,64}, J. Z. Chao^{1,58}, A. Zhenchugov^{36,5}, B. Zhe

(BESIII Collaboration)

¹ Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100049, People's Republic of China

² Beihang University, Beijing 100191, People's Republic of China

³ Bochum Ruhr-University, D-44780 Bochum, Germany

⁴ Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics SB RAS (BINP), Novosibirsk 630090, Russia

⁵ Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213, USA

⁶ Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, People's Republic of China

⁷ Central South University, Changsha 410083, People's Republic of China

⁸ China Center of Advanced Science and Technology, Beijing 100190, People's Republic of China

⁹ China University of Geosciences, Wuhan 430074, People's Republic of China

¹⁰ Chung-Ang University, Seoul, 06974, Republic of Korea

¹¹ COMSATS University Islamabad, Lahore Campus, Defence Road, Off Raiwind Road, 54000 Lahore, Pakistan

¹² Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, People's Republic of China

¹³ GSI Helmholtzcentre for Heavy Ion Research GmbH, D-64291 Darmstadt, Germany

Guangxi Normal University, Guilin 541004, People's Republic of China

¹⁵ Guangxi University, Nanning 530004, People's Republic of China

¹⁶ Hangzhou Normal University, Hangzhou 310036, People's Republic of China

¹⁷ Hebei University, Baoding 071002, People's Republic of China

¹⁸ Helmholtz Institute Mainz, Staudinger Weg 18, D-55099 Mainz, Germany 19

Henan Normal University, Xinxiang 453007, People's Republic of China

²⁰ Henan University, Kaifeng 475004, People's Republic of China

²¹ Henan University of Science and Technology, Luoyang 471003, People's Republic of China

²² Henan University of Technology, Zhengzhou 450001, People's Republic of China

²³ Huangshan College, Huangshan 245000, People's Republic of China

²⁴ Hunan Normal University, Changsha 410081, People's Republic of China

²⁵ Hunan University, Changsha 410082, People's Republic of China

²⁶ Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai 600036, India

²⁷ Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA

²⁸ INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, (A)INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, I-00044, Frascati, Italy;

(B)INFN Sezione di Perugia, I-06100, Perugia, Italy; (C)University of Perugia, I-06100, Perugia, Italy

²⁹ INFN Sezione di Ferrara, (A)INFN Sezione di Ferrara, I-44122,

Ferrara, Italy; (B)University of Ferrara, I-44122, Ferrara, Italy

³⁰ Inner Mongolia University, Hohhot 010021, People's Republic of China

³¹ Institute of Modern Physics, Lanzhou 730000, People's Republic of China

³² Institute of Physics and Technology, Peace Avenue 54B, Ulaanbaatar 13330, Mongolia

³³ Instituto de Alta Investigación, Universidad de Tarapacá, Casilla 7D, Arica 1000000, Chile

³⁴ Jilin University, Changchun 130012, People's Republic of China

Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz, Johann-Joachim-Becher-Weg 45, D-55099 Mainz, Germany

³⁶ Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Moscow region, Russia

³⁷ Justus-Liebig-Universitaet Giessen, II. Physikalisches Institut, Heinrich-Buff-Ring 16, D-35392 Giessen, Germany ³⁸ Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, People's Republic of China

Liaoning Normal University, Dalian 116029, People's Republic of China

⁴⁰ Liaoning University, Shenyang 110036, People's Republic of China ⁴¹ Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210023, People's Republic of China

⁴² Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, People's Republic of China

⁴³ Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, People's Republic of China

⁴⁴ National Centre for Nuclear Research, Warsaw 02-093, Poland

⁴⁵ North China Electric Power University, Beijing 102206, People's Republic of China

⁴⁶ Peking University, Beijing 100871, People's Republic of China

⁴⁷ Qufu Normal University, Qufu 273165, People's Republic of China

⁴⁸ Renmin University of China, Beijing 100872, People's Republic of China

Shandong Normal University, Jinan 250014, People's Republic of China

⁵⁰ Shandong University, Jinan 250100, People's Republic of China

⁵¹ Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, People's Republic of China

Shanxi Normal University, Linfen 041004, People's Republic of China

⁵³ Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, People's Republic of China

⁵⁴ Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, People's Republic of China

⁵⁵ Soochow University, Suzhou 215006, People's Republic of China

⁵⁶ South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510006, People's Republic of China

57 Southeast University, Nanjing 211100, People's Republic of China

⁵⁸ State Key Laboratory of Particle Detection and Electronics, Beijing 100049, Hefei 230026, People's Republic of China ⁵⁹ Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou 510275, People's Republic of China

⁶⁰ Suranaree University of Technology, University Avenue 111, Nakhon Ratchasima 30000, Thailand

⁶¹ Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, People's Republic of China

⁶² Turkish Accelerator Center Particle Factory Group, (A)Istinye University, 34010, Istanbul,

Turkey; (B)Near East University, Nicosia, North Cyprus, 99138, Mersin 10, Turkey

⁶³ University of Bristol, (A)H H Wills Physics Laboratory; (B)Tyndall Avenue; (C)Bristol; (D)BS8 1TL

⁶⁴ University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, People's Republic of China

⁶⁵ University of Groningen, NL-9747 AA Groningen, The Netherlands

⁶⁶ University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, USA

⁶⁷ University of Jinan, Jinan 250022, People's Republic of China

⁶⁸ University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom

University of Muenster, Wilhelm-Klemm-Strasse 9, 48149 Muenster, Germany

⁷⁰ University of Oxford, Keble Road, Oxford OX13RH, United Kingdom

⁷¹ University of Science and Technology Liaoning, Anshan 114051, People's Republic of China

⁷² University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, People's Republic of China

⁷³ University of South China, Hengyang 421001, People's Republic of China

⁴ University of the Punjab, Lahore-54590, Pakistan

⁷⁵ University of Turin and INFN, (A)University of Turin, I-10125, Turin, Italy; (B)University

of Eastern Piedmont, I-15121, Alessandria, Italu; (C)INFN, I-10125, Turin, Italu

⁷⁶ Uppsala University, Box 516, SE-75120 Uppsala, Sweden

77 Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, People's Republic of China

⁷⁸ Yantai University, Yantai 264005, People's Republic of China

⁷⁹ Yunnan University, Kunming 650500, People's Republic of China

⁸⁰ Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, People's Republic of China

⁸¹ Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou 450001, People's Republic of China

^a Deceased

^b Also at the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow 141700, Russia

^c Also at the Novosibirsk State University, Novosibirsk, 630090, Russia

^d Also at the NRC "Kurchatov Institute", PNPI, 188300, Gatchina, Russia

^e Also at Goethe University Frankfurt, 60323 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

^f Also at Key Laboratory for Particle Physics, Astrophysics and Cosmology, Ministry of Education; Shanghai Key Laboratory

for Particle Physics and Cosmology; Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics, Shanghai 200240, People's Republic of China

^g Also at Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Ion-beam Application (MOE) and Institute

of Modern Physics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200443, People's Republic of China

^j Also at Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Nuclear Science, Institute of

^k Also at MOE Frontiers Science Center for Rare Isotopes, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, People's Republic of China

Also at Lanzhou Center for Theoretical Physics, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, People's Republic of China

^m Also at the Department of Mathematical Sciences, IBA, Karachi 75270, Pakistan

ⁿ Also at Ecole Polytechnique Federale de Lausanne (EPFL), CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

° Also at Helmholtz Institute Mainz, Staudinger Weg 18, D-55099 Mainz, Germany

Also at School of Physics, Beihang University, Beijing 100191, China

The $J/\psi, \psi(3686) \to \Sigma^0 \overline{\Sigma}^0$ processes and subsequent decays are studied using the world's largest

^h Also at State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology,

Peking University, Beijing 100871, People's Republic of China

ⁱ Also at School of Physics and Electronics, Hunan University, Changsha 410082, China

Quantum Matter, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510006, China

 J/ψ and $\psi(3686)$ data samples collected with the BESIII detector. The parity-violating decay parameters of the decays $\Sigma^0 \to \Lambda \gamma$ and $\bar{\Sigma}^0 \to \bar{\Lambda} \gamma$, $\alpha_{\Sigma^0} = -0.0017 \pm 0.0021 \pm 0.0018$ and $\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0} =$ $0.0021 \pm 0.0020 \pm 0.0022$, are measured for the first time. The strong-CP symmetry is tested in the decays of the Σ^0 hyperons for the first time by measuring the asymmetry $A_{CP}^{\Sigma} = \alpha_{\Sigma^0} + \bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0} =$ $(0.4 \pm 2.9 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-3}$. The weak-CP test is performed in the subsequent decays of their daughter particles Λ and $\bar{\Lambda}$. Also for the first time, the transverse polarizations of the Σ^0 hyperons in J/ψ and $\psi(3686)$ decays are observed with opposite directions, and the ratios between the S-wave and D-wave contributions of the $J/\psi, \psi(3686) \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$ decays are obtained. These results are crucial to understand the decay dynamics of the charmonium states and the production mechanism of the $\Sigma^0 - \bar{\Sigma}^0$ pairs.

The question of why our universe consists of matter, but almost no antimatter, has puzzled the scientific community for more than half a century and is to this day subjected to intensive research [1-6]. One of the longstanding explanations is baryogenesis [7], i.e. that the matter abundance is generated dynamically. Among the necessary criteria for this to be possible is the existence of processes that violate charge-conjugation and parity (CP) conservation. The Standard Model (SM) of particle physics allows for tiny signals of CP violation (CPV)in weak interactions, in line with experimental observations in meson decays [8–11]. The SM should in principle also allow for CP violating strong processes, which would be manifest in e.g. a non-zero neutron electric dipole moment (EDM) [12–14]. However, the extremely tiny experimental upper limit of the neutron EDM [15] suggests that CPV in strong interactions is unnaturally small. The SM itself does not provide an answer to the smallness of strong CPV, which calls for further investigations. The radiative decay $\Sigma^0 \to \Lambda \gamma$ could in principle offer an opportunity to study the interference between a parity-conserving (from the magnetic transition moment) and a parity-violating amplitude (from the electric dipole transition moment, EDTM). The EDTM of this decay is related to the neutron EDM via SU(3) flavor symmetry [16, 17]. This can be explored by measuring the parity-violating decay parameters α_{Σ^0} , and $\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0}$ for the charge conjugate decay. In the SM, α_{Σ^0} and $\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0}$ are predicted to be very small [17], nonzero measurements of these parameters at current or near-future experimental sensitivity levels would be indications of parity violation beyond the standard model. Based on the values of these parameters, the strong-CP symmetry can be tested by measuring the asymmetry $A_{CP}^{\Sigma} = \alpha_{\Sigma^0} + \bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0}$, finding a non-vanishing A_{CP}^{Σ} would point to signals of CPV beyond the SM [17].

The large yield of quantum entangled $\Sigma^0 \overline{\Sigma}^0$ pairs at BESIII [18] enables a pioneering test of strong-*CP* symmetry in the Σ^0 hyperon decays. In addition, the subsequent decays of the daughter particles Λ and $\overline{\Lambda}$ provide an independent measurement of the $\Lambda/\overline{\Lambda}$ decay parameter $\alpha_{\Lambda}/\overline{\alpha}_{\Lambda}$, which have undergone much scrutiny in recent years due to the large discrepancy observed between old and new data [1–3, 19–23], and allow a test of weak-*CP* symmetry. Finally, the data collected with different vector charmonia will help elucidate their decay dynamics.

The decay of a charmonium (ψ) into a hyperon-

antihyperon pair can be completely described by two parameters, α_{ψ} and $\Delta \Phi_{\psi}$ [24]. The former describes the angular distribution of the hyperon-antihyperon pair, while the latter is related to the hyperon polarization,

$$P_y(\cos\theta_Y) = \frac{\sqrt{1 - \alpha_\psi^2} \sin\Delta\Phi_\psi \cos\theta_Y \sin\theta_Y}{1 + \alpha_\psi \cos^2\theta_Y}, \quad (1)$$

where θ_Y is the angle between the momenta of e^+ and the hyperon in the e^+e^- center-of-mass (C.M.) system. The hyperon polarization would manifest itself by a non-zero $\Delta \Phi_{\psi}$.

In recent years, the BESIII collaboration has published a series of studies [1–3, 19, 25–29] about hyperon polarization. An intriguing result was reported in Ref. [25], where the directions of the $\Sigma^+/\bar{\Sigma}^-$ polarizations were observed to be opposite in J/ψ and $\psi(3686)$ decays; this phenomenon, however, is not observed in $J/\psi \rightarrow \Xi^-\bar{\Xi}^+/\Xi^0\bar{\Xi}^0$ and $\psi(3686) \rightarrow \Xi^-\bar{\Xi}^+/\Xi^0\bar{\Xi}^0$ decays [1, 3, 27, 28]. Until now, there is no interpretation of these results, therefore, more experimental measurements of the hyperon polarization are highly desirable.

The analysis presented in this Letter is based on samples of $(10087 \pm 44) \times 10^6 J/\psi$ and $(2712 \pm 14) \times 10^6$ $\psi(3686)$ events [30, 31] collected with the BESIII detector at the BEPCII collider. Details about BEPCII and BESIII can be found in Refs. [32–38]. Simulated data samples produced with GEANT4-based [39] Monte Carlo (MC) software, which includes the geometric description of the BESIII detector and the detector response, are used to determine detection efficiencies and estimate backgrounds. The simulations model the beam energy spread and initial state radiation (ISR) in the e^+e^- annihilations with the generator KKMC [40]. Inclusive MC samples of J/ψ and $\psi(3686)$ resonances are produced, in which the known decay modes are modeled with EVT-GEN [41], and the remaining unknown decays are modeled with LUNDCHARM [42]. For the signal process, $e^+e^- \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0, \Sigma^0 \rightarrow \Lambda(\rightarrow p\pi^-)\gamma, \bar{\Sigma}^0 \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda}(\rightarrow \bar{p}\pi^+)\gamma$, two different MC samples are used. One is generated, with the uniform distribution of the kinematic momenta of the final states, to obtain the efficiency correction used in the fit to determine the parameters, and the other is generated according to the joint angular distribution for the signal process with the parameters obtained by this analysis (signal MC).

The Λ and $\overline{\Lambda}$ hyperons are reconstructed from their dominant decay modes, $\Lambda \rightarrow p\pi^-$ and $\bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow \bar{p}\pi^+$. Charged tracks detected in the multilaver drift chamber (MDC) are required to be within a polar angle (θ) range of $|\cos\theta| < 0.93$, where θ is defined with respect to the z-axis, which is the symmetry axis of the MDC. Events with at least four charged tracks are retained. Tracks with momentum larger than 0.45 GeV/c for the J/ψ dataset and 0.55 GeV/c for the $\psi(3686)$ dataset are considered as proton candidates, otherwise as pion candidates. There is no further particle identification requirement. Secondary vertex fits [43] are performed for all combinations with oppositely-charged proton and pion candidates, and the combinations passing the vertex fit successfully and with invariant masses within a range of [1.111, 1.120] GeV/ c^2 are regarded as the Λ and $\bar{\Lambda}$ candidates.

Photon candidates are identified using showers in the electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC). The deposited energy of each shower must be more than 25 MeV in the barrel region($|\cos \theta| < 0.80$) and more than 50 MeV in the end-cap region ($0.86 < |\cos \theta| < 0.92$). To suppress electronic noise and showers unrelated to the event, the difference between the EMC time of the photon candidate and the event start time is required to be within [0, 700] ns.

Events with at least one Λ candidate, one $\bar{\Lambda}$ candidate, and two photons are considered for further analysis. A four-constraint (4C) kinematic fit is performed under the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}\gamma\gamma$ hypothesis by constraining their total reconstructed four-momentum to that of the initial ψ . If there is more than one $\Lambda \bar{\Lambda} \gamma \gamma$ combination, the one with the smallest χ^2 of the 4C fit (χ^2_{4C}) is selected, and $\chi^2_{\rm 4C} < 100$ is required. Since there are two γ candidates (γ_1, γ_2) per event, there will be two combinations of $\Lambda(\bar{\Lambda})$ and γ . Therefore, a six-constraint (6C) kinematic fit is performed under the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}\gamma\gamma$ hypothesis by additionally constraining the invariant masses of $\Lambda \gamma_1$ ($m_{\Lambda \gamma_1}$) and $\Lambda \gamma_2$ $(m_{\bar{\Lambda}\gamma_2})$ to the known masses [44] of Σ^0 and $\bar{\Sigma}^{0,1}$. The combination which minimizes χ^2 of the 6C fit (χ^2_{6C}) is kept, and there is no further requirement on the χ^2_{6C} . Finally, the $m_{\Lambda\gamma_1}$ and $m_{\bar{\Lambda}\gamma_2}$ masses from the 4C fit are required to be within [1.178, 1.206] GeV/ c^2 . After applying all the event selection criteria, the final event samples in the signal region contain 1083676 events for the J/ψ decay and 51837 events for the $\psi(3686)$ decay.

The backgrounds in this analysis are divided into three categories: background channels which have a $\Sigma^0 \overline{\Sigma}^0$ pair (type 1), channels that have one Σ^0 or one $\overline{\Sigma}^0$ (type 2), and ones containing no Σ^0 or $\overline{\Sigma}^0$ (type 3). Inclusive MC samples of 10 billion J/ψ events and 2.7 billion $\psi(3686)$ events are used for studying background type 1. After applying the same selection criteria as for data, the only peaking background channel is found to be $J/\psi \to \gamma \eta_c, \eta_c \to \Sigma^0 \overline{\Sigma}^0$. An exclusive MC simulation of this process is carried out, and the corresponding number of events from this channel in data is estimated to

be 391 ± 145 , which is only about 0.036% of the total selected candidates in the J/ψ data sample and can thus be neglected. The later two types of backgrounds are estimated with the two-dimensional sideband regions of the distribution of $m_{\bar{\Lambda}\gamma_2}$ versus $m_{\Lambda\gamma_1}$ using the same method as in Ref. [25]. The lower and upper sideband regions are defined as $m_{\Lambda\gamma_1/\bar{\Lambda}\gamma_2} \in (1.138, 1.166) \text{ GeV}/c^2$ and $m_{\Lambda\gamma_1/\bar{\Lambda}\gamma_2} \in (1.218, 1.246) \text{ GeV}/c^2$, respectively. The background levels are found to be 0.7% for $J/\psi \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$ and 1.5% for $\psi(3686) \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$.

Following the formulation in Refs. [17, 45–49], the joint angular distribution of the full decay chain $e^+e^- \rightarrow \psi \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0, \Sigma^0 \rightarrow \Lambda(\rightarrow p\pi^-)\gamma, \bar{\Sigma}^0 \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda}(\rightarrow \bar{p}\pi^+)\gamma$ is obtained,

$$\mathcal{W}(\bar{\zeta}, \vec{\omega}) \propto (1 - \alpha_{\Lambda} \alpha_{\Sigma^{0}} \cos \theta_{p})(1 - \bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda} \bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^{0}} \cos \theta_{\bar{p}}) \times \{1 + \alpha_{\psi} \cos^{2} \theta_{\Sigma} + \sqrt{1 - \alpha_{\psi}^{2}} \sin \theta_{\Sigma} \cos \theta_{\Sigma} \cdot [\beta_{\gamma} \bar{\beta}_{\gamma} F_{1} - (\beta_{\gamma} F_{2} - \bar{\beta}_{\gamma} F_{3})] + \beta_{\gamma} \bar{\beta}_{\gamma} [\alpha_{\psi} F_{4} + F_{5} - (\alpha_{\psi} + \cos^{2} \theta_{\Sigma}) \cos \theta_{\Lambda} \cos \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}}] \}.$$
(2)

Here, $\vec{\omega}$ represents the six parameters of interest, α_{ψ} , $\Delta \Phi_{\psi}$, α_{Σ^0} , $\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0}$, α_{Λ} , $\bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda}$; $\vec{\zeta}$ stands for seven helicity angles, θ_{Σ} , θ_{Λ} , φ_{Λ} , $\theta_{\bar{\Lambda}}$, $\varphi_{\bar{\Lambda}}$, θ_p , and $\theta_{\bar{p}}$. For simplicity, the symbols $\beta_{\gamma} \equiv \frac{\alpha_{\Sigma^0} - \alpha_{\Lambda} \cos \theta_p}{1 - \alpha_{\Lambda} \alpha_{\Sigma^0} \cos \theta_p}$ and $\bar{\beta}_{\gamma} \equiv \frac{\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0} - \bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda} \cos \theta_{\bar{p}}}{1 - \bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda} \bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0} \cos \theta_{\bar{p}}}$ are introduced, and $F_1 - F_5$ are defined below,

$$F_{1} = \cos \Delta \Phi_{\psi} (\sin \theta_{\Lambda} \cos \varphi_{\Lambda} \cos \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}} - \sin \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}} \cos \varphi_{\bar{\Lambda}} \cos \theta_{\Lambda}),$$

$$F_{2} = \sin \Delta \Phi_{\psi} \sin \theta_{\Lambda} \sin \varphi_{\Lambda},$$

$$F_{3} = \sin \Delta \Phi_{\psi} \sin \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}} \sin \varphi_{\bar{\Lambda}},$$

$$F_{4} = \sin^{2} \theta_{\Sigma} \sin \theta_{\Lambda} \sin \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}} \sin \varphi_{\Lambda} \sin \varphi_{\bar{\Lambda}},$$

$$F_{5} = \sin^{2} \theta_{\Sigma} \sin \theta_{\Lambda} \sin \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}} \cos \varphi_{\Lambda} \cos \varphi_{\bar{\Lambda}}.$$
 (3)

The helicity angles are constructed as illustrated in Fig. 1, and the corresponding angles of the anti-particle decay sequence are obtained analogously. To validate the formula, a check is made by setting the parameters α_{Σ^0} and $\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0}$ in $\mathcal{W}(\vec{\zeta}, \vec{\omega})$ to zero, and then the formalism is found to be equivalent to the covariant formalism given in Ref. [50].

An unbinned maximum likelihood fit is performed in the seven angular dimensions $\vec{\zeta}$ by simultaneously fitting both the $J/\psi \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$ and $\psi(3686) \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$ datasets to determine the parameters $\vec{\omega}$. During the fitting process, the background events estimated from the data sidebands are included, and their log-likelihood is subtracted from the data based on the normalized weights. The numerical results are summarized in Table II, together with the CPasymmetries A_{CP}^{Σ} and $A_{CP}^{\Lambda} = (\alpha_{\Lambda} + \bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda})/(\alpha_{\Lambda} - \bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda})$. The correlation coefficient matrix of the fitted parameters is shown in Tab. I.

The transverse polarizations (parallel or anti-parallel to \hat{y}_{Σ^0}) of the Σ^0 hyperon in the J/ψ and $\psi(3686)$ decays are observed for the first time and are found to have opposite directions. The corresponding parameters are

TABLE I. Full correlation coefficient matrix of the fitted parameters.

Coefficients	$lpha_{J/\psi}$	$\Delta \Phi_{J/\psi}$	$\alpha_{\psi(3686)}$	$\Delta \Phi_{\psi(3686)}$	$lpha_{\Sigma^0}$	$\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0}$	$lpha_{\Lambda}$	\bar{lpha}_{Λ}
$\alpha_{J/\psi}$	1.000	-0.016	-0.012	0.012	-0.002	-0.002	0.018	-0.013
$\Delta \Phi_{J/\psi}$	-0.016	1.000	0.006	-0.007	0.004	0.000	0.011	0.027
$lpha_{\psi(3686)}$	-0.012	0.006	1.000	-0.451	0.007	-0.007	-0.011	0.004
$\Delta \Phi_{\psi(3686)}$	0.012	-0.007	-0.451	1.000	-0.001	-0.001	-0.051	-0.067
$lpha_{\Sigma^0}$	-0.002	0.004	0.007	-0.001	1.000	-0.009	-0.083	-0.083
$ar{lpha}_{\Sigma^0}$	-0.002	0.000	-0.007	-0.001	-0.009	1.000	0.032	0.033
$lpha_{\Lambda}$	0.018	0.011	-0.011	-0.051	-0.083	0.032	1.000	0.980
\bar{lpha}_{Λ}	-0.013	0.027	0.004	-0.067	-0.083	0.033	0.980	1.000



FIG. 1. The definitions of the helicity angles. The polar angle θ_{Σ} is the angle between the Σ^0 momentum and the e^+ beam direction in the e^+e^- C.M., where the \hat{z} axis is defined along the e^+ momentum. θ_{Λ} and φ_{Λ} are the polar and azimuthal angles of the Λ momentum direction in the Σ^0 rest frame, where \hat{z}_{Σ^0} is defined along the Σ^0 momentum direction in the e^+e^- C.M., and \hat{y}_{Σ^0} is defined by $\hat{z} \times \hat{z}_{\Sigma^0}$. The angles θ_p and φ_p are the polar and azimuthal angles of the proton momentum direction in the Λ rest frame, where \hat{z}_{Λ} is defined along the Λ momentum in the Σ^0 rest frame, and \hat{y}_{Λ} is along $\hat{z}_{\Sigma^0} \times \hat{z}_{\Lambda}$.

determined to be $\Delta \Phi_{J/\psi} = -0.0828 \pm 0.0068 \pm 0.0033$ rad and $\Delta \Phi_{\psi(3686)} = 0.512 \pm 0.085 \pm 0.035$ rad for the $J/\psi \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \overline{\Sigma}^0$ and $\psi(3686) \rightarrow \Sigma^0 \overline{\Sigma}^0$ decays, respectively, which differ from zero with a significance of 12.2σ for the J/ψ dataset and 7.4 σ for the $\psi(3686)$ dataset. The Σ^0 polarizations can be illustrated through the moment μ , as defined:

$$\mu^{k}(\cos\theta_{\Sigma}) = \frac{1}{N_{\text{total}}} \sum_{i}^{N^{k}} (\sin\theta_{\Lambda}^{i}\sin\varphi_{\Lambda}^{i}\cos\theta_{p}^{i} + \sin\theta_{\overline{\Lambda}}^{i}\sin\varphi_{\overline{\Lambda}}^{i}\cos\theta_{\overline{p}}^{i}),$$

$$(4)$$

where N_{total} is the total number of events in the dataset,

TABLE II. Values and uncertainties of the fit parameters and the *CP* asymmetries A_{CP}^{Σ} and A_{CP}^{Λ} , along with the previous measurements. The first and second uncertainties in this work are statistical and systematic, respectively, and those for the previous results are the total uncertainties. In the previous results, only the values reported in Ref. [51] are cited for $\alpha_{J/\psi}$ and $\alpha_{\psi(3686)}$, as it gives the most precise measurement for $\alpha_{J/\psi}$ and the only measurement for $\alpha_{\psi(3686)}$.

Parameter	This work	Previous results
$\alpha_{J/\psi}$	$-0.4133 \pm 0.0035 \pm 0.0077$	-0.449 ± 0.022 [51]
$\Delta \Phi_{J/\psi}(\text{rad})$	$-0.0828 \pm 0.0068 \pm 0.0033$	
$\alpha_{\psi(3686)}$	$0.814 \pm 0.028 \pm 0.028$	0.71 ± 0.12 [51]
$\Delta \Phi_{\psi(3686)}(\mathrm{rad})$	$0.512 \pm 0.085 \pm 0.034$	
$lpha_{\Sigma^0}$	$-0.0017 \pm 0.0021 \pm 0.0018$	
$\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0}$	$0.0021 \pm 0.0020 \pm 0.0022$	
α_{Λ}	$0.730 \pm 0.051 \pm 0.011$	$0.748 \pm 0.007 \ [44]$
$\bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda}$	$-0.776\pm0.054\pm0.010$	$-0.757 \pm 0.004 \ [\textbf{44}]$
A_{CP}^{Σ}	$(0.4 \pm 2.9 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-3}$	
A_{CP}^{Λ}	$(-3.0 \pm 6.9 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-2}$	$(-2.5 \pm 4.8) \times 10^{-3}$ [2]

 N^k is the number of events in the k-th $\cos \theta_{\Sigma}$ bin, and *i* is the *i*-th event in that bin. The expected angular dependence of the moment for the acceptance-corrected data is $(\alpha_{\Lambda} - \bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda})(1 + \alpha_{\psi} \cos^2 \theta_{\Sigma})P_y(\cos \theta_{\Sigma})/(18 + 6\alpha_{\psi})$. Comparing the data to the PHSP MC sample, as shown in Fig. 2, the polarizations of the Σ^0 are observed clearly.

To compare the fit results with the distributions in data, four more moments, T1 - T4, are defined from



FIG. 2. Distributions of the moments μ versus $\cos \theta_{\Sigma}$ for $J/\psi \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$ and $\psi(3686) \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$. The points with error bars are data, the red solid lines are the signal MC samples with input parameters fixed to the fit results, and the blue dashed lines represent the distributions without polarization from the PHSP MC samples.

Eq. (2):

$$T1^{k} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{total}}} \sum_{i}^{N^{k}} \left(\cos^{2} \theta_{\Sigma} n_{1,z}^{i} n_{2,z}^{i} - \sin^{2} \theta_{\Sigma} n_{1,x}^{i} n_{2,x}^{i} \right),$$

$$T2^{k} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{total}}} \sum_{i}^{N^{k}} \cos \theta_{\Sigma} \sin \theta_{\Sigma} \left(n_{1,z}^{i} n_{2,x}^{i} - n_{1,x}^{i} n_{2,z}^{i} \right),$$

$$T3^{k} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{total}}} \sum_{i}^{N^{k}} \cos \theta_{\Sigma} \sin \theta_{\Sigma} \left(n_{1,y}^{i} + n_{2,y}^{i} \right),$$

$$T4^{k} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{total}}} \sum_{i}^{N^{k}} \left(n_{1,z}^{i} n_{2,z}^{i} - \sin^{2} \theta_{\Sigma} n_{1,y}^{i} n_{2,y}^{i} \right),$$
(5)

where $n_{1,x} = \cos \theta_p \sin \theta_\Lambda \cos \varphi_\Lambda$, $n_{1,y} = \cos \theta_p \sin \theta_\Lambda \sin \varphi_\Lambda$, $n_{1,z} = \cos \theta_p \cos \theta_\Lambda$, $n_{2,x} = \cos \theta_{\bar{p}} \sin \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}} \cos \varphi_{\bar{\Lambda}}$, $n_{2,y} = \cos \theta_{\bar{p}} \sin \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}} \sin \varphi_{\bar{\Lambda}}$, $n_{2,z} = \cos \theta_{\bar{p}} \cos \theta_{\bar{\Lambda}}$. Figure 3 shows the distributions of these moments versus $\cos \theta_{\Sigma}$ for the J/ψ dataset, the ones for the $\psi(3686)$ dataset are shown in Ref. 4. The fit results are consistent with those distributions in data.

The sources of the systematic uncertainties are summarized in Table III. The total systematic uncertainties of various parameters are obtained by summing the individual contributions in quadrature. The details are described as follows.

The control samples $J/\psi \to p\bar{p}\pi^+\pi^-$, $e^+e^- \to \gamma\mu^+\mu^-$, and $J/\psi \to pK^-\bar{\Lambda} + c.c.$ are used to estimate the uncer-



FIG. 3. Distributions of the moments T1 - T4 versus $\cos \theta_{\Sigma}$ for the J/ψ dataset. The dots with error bars represent the data, and the red solid lines are the signal MC samples with the input parameters fixed to the fit results.



FIG. 4. Distributions of the moments T1 - T4 versus $\cos \theta_{\Sigma}$ for the $\psi(3686)$ dataset. The dots with error bars represent the data, and the red solid lines are the signal MC samples with the input parameters fixed to the fit results.

tainties from the p, π tracking, γ reconstruction, and $\Lambda/\bar{\Lambda}$ reconstruction [52], respectively. The efficiency differences between data and MC simulation for the control samples are used to re-weight the PHSP MC sample. The differences between the fit results with corrections and the nominal fit are taken as the systematic uncertainties.

For the 4C kinematic fit, some discrepancies are observed in the χ^2_{4C} distributions between data and the signal MC sample. Similar to Refs. [53, 54], a data-driven method is used to estimate these effects on the final results. The PHSP MC samples are weighted according to the χ^2_{4C} distributions in data, and the differences between the fit results after weighting and the nominal results are taken as the systematic uncertainties of the 4C kinematic fit.

Source (10^{-3})	$\alpha_{J/\psi}$	$\Delta \Phi_{J/\psi}$ (rad)	$\alpha_{\psi(3686)}$	$\Delta \Phi_{\psi(3686)}$	(rad)	α_{Σ^0}	$\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0}$	α_{Λ}	$\bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda}$	A_{CP}^{Σ}	A^{Λ}_{CP}
Tracking	0.0	0.2	10	13		0.9	1.5	1	1	0.6	0
γ reconstruction	0.5	0.5	1	0		0.2	0.1	2	3	0.0	3
$\Lambda/\bar{\Lambda}$ reconstruction	6.2	0.2	24	30		0.7	0.4	6	3	0.2	8
4C kinematic fit	1.5	0.1	5	6		1.0	1.5	2	3	0.6	3
$\Sigma^0/\bar{\Sigma}^0$ mass window	0.2	3.2	2	7		0.8	0.2	7	6	0.8	8
Background estimation	4.3	0.4	10	6		0.6	0.1	6	6	0.6	9
Total	7.7	3.3	28	34		1.8	2.2	11	10	1.3	15

TABLE III. Absolute systematic uncertainties $(\times 10^{-3})$ for the measured parameters.

The mass window of $\Sigma^0/\bar{\Sigma}^0$ is $\pm 3\sigma$ wide around the known Σ^0 mass [44], where $\sigma = 4.5 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ is the mass resolution of the reconstructed $\Sigma^0/\bar{\Sigma}^0$. We change the mass window to $\pm 2\sigma$ or $\pm 4\sigma$ to study the systematic uncertainties from the $\Sigma^0/\bar{\Sigma}^0$ mass requirement. The largest deviations from the nominal values are taken as the systematic uncertainties.

The systematic uncertainties from the background estimation are studied by including the background in the fit or not. In the nominal solution, the events in the data sideband region are used to subtract the background events. Here, an alternative solution is performed by regarding all the selected events in the data sample as signal events. The differences between the alternative and nominal fit results are taken as the systematic uncertainties.

In summary, this Letter presents the first measurements of the parity-violating decay parameters for the decays $\Sigma^0 \to \Lambda \gamma$ and $\bar{\Sigma}^0 \to \bar{\Lambda} \gamma$, $\alpha_{\Sigma^0} = -0.0017 \pm 0.0021 \pm$ 0.0018 and $\bar{\alpha}_{\Sigma^0} = 0.0021 \pm 0.0020 \pm 0.0022$, respectively. The extracted values of decay parameters allow for the strong-CP test, $A_{CP}^{\Sigma} = (0.4 \pm 2.9 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{-3}$. These results are consistent with P and CP conservation, and will provide crucial constraints for new physics models. The decay parameters α_{Λ} and $\bar{\alpha}_{\Lambda}$, which are listed in Table II, are measured independently, and the weak-CPtest is performed in the sub-decays of Λ and $\bar{\Lambda}$. These results are in good agreement with the values obtained from the $J/\psi \to \Lambda \bar{\Lambda}$ and $J/\psi \to \Xi^{-(0)}\bar{\Xi}^{+(0)}$ analyses of BESIII [1-3].

Furthermore, the spin polarizations of the Σ^0 hyperons with opposite directions in the J/ψ and $\psi(3686)$ decays are observed for the first time. This phenomenon is also observed in the case of the $\psi \to \Sigma^+ \bar{\Sigma}^-$ decays [25], but not in the $\Xi^{-(0)}$ [1, 3, 27, 28] hyperon pairs. Following Ref. [55] with the measured parameters α_{ψ} and $\Delta \Phi_{\psi}$, the ratio of the D-wave and S-wave coupling constants g_D/g_S , the relative phase δ between the S-wave and D-wave, the percentage of the S-wave contribution $\Gamma_S/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$, and the effective radius r_{eff} of the $\psi \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$ decay (where $\bar{L} = r_{\text{eff}} \times p$, \bar{L} and p are the average orbital angular momentum and the relative momentum of the Σ^0 and $\bar{\Sigma}^0$ in ψ C.M. system) are obtained for the first time, as shown in Table IV together with the parameters for $\psi \to \Sigma^+ \bar{\Sigma}^-$ calculated in Ref. [55]. What is particularly intriguing is that, as speculated in Ref. [55], the δ difference between $J/\psi \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$ and $\psi(3686) \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$ is about the same as the value between $J/\psi \to \Sigma^+ \bar{\Sigma}^-$ and $\psi(3686) \to \Sigma^+ \bar{\Sigma}^-$ decays [55], and both are equal to approximately π . If this is not a coincidence, the underlying mechanism should be investigated in the future. These results are crucial to understand the decay dynamics of the charmonium states and the production mechanism of the $\Sigma^0 - \bar{\Sigma}^0$ pairs and provide useful information for hunting down excited nucleon resonances [55].

Acknowledgement

The BESIII Collaboration thanks the staff of BEPCII and the IHEP computing center for their strong support. The authors would like to extend thanks to Prof. Jusak Tandean, Dr. Shu-Ming Wu and Dr. Jia-Jun Wu for useful discussion and helpful advice. This work is supported in part by National Key R&D Program of China under Contracts Nos. 2023YFA1606000, 2020YFA0406300, 2020YFA0406400: National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Contracts Nos. 11635010. 11735014, 11935015, 11935016, 11935018, 12025502, 12035009, 12035013, 12061131003, 12165022, 12192260, 12192261, 12192262, 12192263, 12192264, 12192265, 12221005, 12225509, 12235017, 12342502, 12361141819; the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) Large-Scale Scientific Facility Program; the CAS Center for Excellence in Particle Physics (CCEPP); Joint Large-Scale Scientific Facility Funds of the NSFC and CAS under Contract No. U1832207; 100 Talents Program of CAS; The Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPAC) and Shanghai Key Laboratory for Particle Physics and Cosmology; Yunnan Fundamental Research Project under Contract No. 202301AT070162; German Research Foundation DFG under Contracts Nos. 455635585, FOR5327, GRK 2149; Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Italy; Ministry of Development of Turkey under Contract No. DPT2006K-120470; National Research Foundation of Korea under Contract No. NRF-2022R1A2C1092335; National Science and Technology fund of Mongolia; National Science Research and Innovation Fund (NSRF) via the Program Management Unit for Human Resources & Institutional Development, Research and Innovation of Thailand under Contract

TABLE IV. The parameters of the $\psi \to \Sigma^0 \overline{\Sigma}^0$ (this work) and $\psi \to \Sigma^+ \overline{\Sigma}^-$ (from Ref. [55]) processes, including the ratio between the coupling constants of D-wave and S-wave (g_D/g_S) , the relative phase between S-wave and D-wave (δ) , the ratio between partial width of S-wave and total width $(\Gamma_S/\Gamma_{\text{total}})$, and the effective radius (r_{eff}) . The first and second uncertainties in this work are statistical and systematic, respectively, and the ones for $\psi \to \Sigma^+ \overline{\Sigma}^-$ are the total uncertainties.

Mode	$g_D/g_S~({ m GeV}^{-2})$	δ (rad)	$\Gamma_S/\Gamma_{\rm total}$ (%)	$r_{\rm eff}~({\rm fm})$
$J/\psi \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$	$0.1217 \pm 0.0015 \pm 0.0028$	$2.947 \pm 0.017 \pm 0.012$	$95.23 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.21$	$0.0191 \pm 0.0005 \pm 0.0008$
$\psi(3686) \to \Sigma^0 \bar{\Sigma}^0$	$0.123 \pm 0.008 \pm 0.006$	$-0.28 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.04$	$82.7\pm1.9\pm1.4$	$0.049 \pm 0.005 \pm 0.004$
$J/\psi \to \Sigma^+ \bar{\Sigma}^-$ [55]	0.171 ± 0.006	2.67 ± 0.04	90.9 ± 0.6	0.0362 ± 0.0024
$\psi(3686) \rightarrow \Sigma^+ \bar{\Sigma}^-$ [55]	0.097 ± 0.009	-0.33 ± 0.10	88.3 ± 2.0	0.033 ± 0.006

No. B16F640076; Polish National Science Centre under Contract No. 2019/35/O/ST2/02907; The Swedish Research Council; The Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, Sweden; The Swedish Foundation for International Cooperation in Research and Higher Education (STINT); U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-FG02-05ER41374.

- M. Ablikim et al. (BESIII Collaboration), Nature 606, 64 (2022).
- [2] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 131801 (2022).
- [3] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 108, L031106 (2023).
- [4] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 132, 021801 (2024).
- [5] Y. Guan *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), arXiv:2401.04646 [hep-ex].
- [6] R. Aaij et al. (LHCb Collaboration), arXiv:2310.19397 [hep-ex].
- [7] A. D. Sakharov, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 5, 32 (1967).
- [8] J. H. Christenson, J. W. Cronin, V. L. Fitch, and R. Turlay, Phys. Rev. Lett. 13, 138 (1964).
- [9] B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 091801 (2001).
- [10] K. Abe *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 091802 (2001).
- [11] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 122, 211803 (2019).
- [12] N. f. Ramsey, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 32, 211 (1982).
- [13] N. Fortson, P. Sandars, and S. Barr, Phys. Today 56N6, 33 (2003).
- [14] G. Luders, Annals Phys. 2, 1 (1957).
- [15] C. Abel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 081803 (2020).
- [16] M. Gell-Mann, The Eightfold Way: A Theory of strong interaction symmetry, (1961), 10.2172/4008239.
- [17] S. S. Nair, E. Perotti, and S. Leupold, Phys. Lett. B 788, 535 (2019).
- [18] H. B. Li, Front. Phys. (Beijing) 12, 121301 (2017),
 [Erratum: Front. Phys. (Beijing) 14, 64001 (2019)].
- [19] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Nature Phys. 15, 631 (2019).
- [20] P. Astbury et al., Nucl. Phys. B 99, 30 (1975).
- [21] W. E. Cleland, G. Conforto, G. H. Eaton, H. J. Gerber, M. Reinharz, A. Gautschi, E. Heer, C. Revillard, and G. Von Dardel, Nucl. Phys. B 40, 221 (1972).
- [22] O. E. Overseth and R. F. Roth, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 391 (1967).
- [23] P. M. Dauber, J. P. Berge, J. R. Hubbard, D. W. Merrill,

and R. A. Muller, Phys. Rev. 179, 1262 (1969).

- [24] G. Fäldt and A. Kupsc, Phys. Lett. B 772, 16 (2017).
- [25] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 052004 (2020).
- [26] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 092002 (2021).
- [27] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 106, L091101 (2022).
- [28] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 108, L011101 (2023).
- [29] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), JHEP **10**, 081 (2023), [Erratum: JHEP 12, 080 (2023)].
- [30] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Chin. Phys. C 46, 074001 (2022).
- [31] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), arXiv:2403.06766 [hep-ex].
- [32] M. Ablikim *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **614**, 345 (2010).
- [33] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Chin. Phys. C 44, 040001 (2020).
- [34] C. Yu et al., in 7th International Particle Accelerator Conference (2016) p. TUYA01.
- [35] K. X. Huang, Z. J. Li, Z. Qian, J. Zhu, H. Y. Li, Y. M. Zhang, S. S. Sun, and Z. Y. You, Nucl. Sci. Tech. 33, 142 (2022).
- [36] X. Li *et al.*, Radiat. Detect. Technol. Methods 1, 13 (2017).
- [37] Y. X. Guo *et al.*, Radiat. Detect. Technol. Methods 1, 15 (2017).
- [38] P. Cao et al., Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A 953, 163053 (2020).
- [39] S. Agostinelli *et al.* (GEANT4 Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A 506, 250 (2003).
- [40] S. Jadach, B. F. L. Ward, and Z. Was, Phys. Rev. D 63, 113009 (2001).
- [41] D. J. Lange, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A 462, 152 (2001);
 R. G. Ping, Chin. Phys. C 32, 599 (2008).
- [42] J. C. Chen, G. S. Huang, X. R. Qi, D. H. Zhang, and Y. S. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D 62, 034003 (2000); R. L. Yang, R. G. Ping, and H. Chen, Chin. Phys. Lett. 31, 061301 (2014).
- [43] M. Xu et al., Chin. Phys. C 33, 428 (2009).

- [44] R. L. Workman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), PTEP 2022, 083C01 (2022).
- [45] A. Z. Dubnickova, S. Dubnicka, and M. P. Rekalo, Nuovo Cim. A 109, 241 (1996).
- [46] G. I. Gakh and E. Tomasi-Gustafsson, Nucl. Phys. A 771, 169 (2006).
- [47] H. Czyz, A. Grzelinska, and J. H. Kuhn, Phys. Rev. D 75, 074026 (2007).
- [48] E. D. Commins and P. H. Bucksbaum, Weak Interactions of Leptons and Quarks (1983).
- [49] H. B. Li and X. X. Ma, Phys. Rev. D 100, 076007 (2019).
- [50] G. Fäldt and K. Schönning, Phys. Rev. D 101, 033002

(2020).

- [51] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 95, 052003 (2017).
- [52] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 107, 092004 (2023).
- [53] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 108, L091101 (2023).
- [54] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), JHEP **04**, 013 (2024).
- [55] S. M. Wu, J. J. Wu, and B. S. Zou, Phys. Rev. D 104, 054018 (2021).