

Two-photon width of η_b , η'_b and η''_b from Heavy-Quark Spin Symmetry

J.P. Lansberg^{a,b} and T.N. Pham^a

^aCentre de Physique Théorique, École polytechnique, CNRS,
91128 Palaiseau, France

^bPhysique Théorique Fondamentale, Université de Liège,
17 Allée du 6 Août, Bât. B5, B-4000 Liège-1, Belgium

We predict the two-photon width of the pseudoscalar bottomonia, $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b)$, $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta'_b)$ and $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta''_b)$ within a Heavy-Quark Spin-Symmetry setting following the same line as our recent work for the corresponding decays for charmonia. Binding-energy effects are included for excited states and are shown to shift up the η'_b and η''_b widths by 10 %. We point out that the essentially model independent ratio $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b)/\Gamma_{\ell\bar{\ell}}(\Upsilon)$ and the branching ratio $BR(\eta_b \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)$ obtained could be used to extract the coupling constant α_s .

PACS numbers: 13.20.Gd 13.25.Gv 11.10.St 12.39.Hg

I. INTRODUCTION

In this brief report, we calculate the two-photon width of the pseudoscalar bottomonia, $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b(nS))$ using the same straightforward approach as in [1] which employs an effective Lagrangian satisfying heavy-quark spin symmetry [2, 3, 4]. Since the b -quark mass is significantly higher than the c -quark mass, we expect the approximations in our approach to hold better.

For the time being, only a single candidate for the ground state (η_b) has been found by the Aleph collaboration [5], its mass was evaluated to be 9300 ± 28 MeV [5, 6]. The Potentiality for its observation at the Tevatron was also analysed in [7].

On the contrary, all the corresponding vector states below the $B\bar{B}$ threshold have been observed and their leptonic-decay width measured. Indeed, the $\Upsilon(1S)$ mass is 9460.30 ± 0.26 MeV and its leptonic width $\Gamma_{\ell\bar{\ell}}$ is 1.340 ± 0.018 keV, $M_{\Upsilon(2S)}$ is 10.02326 ± 0.00031 GeV, $\Gamma_{\ell\bar{\ell}}(\Upsilon(2S))$ is 0.612 ± 0.011 keV, $M_{\Upsilon(3S)}$ is 10.3552 ± 0.0005 GeV and finally $\Gamma_{\ell\bar{\ell}}(\Upsilon(3S))$ is 0.443 ± 0.008 keV [6]. For recent reviews on new mesons, see [8, 9, 10].

From these widths, we can extract $f_{\Upsilon(nS)}$. With $f_{\eta_b(nS)} \approx f_{\Upsilon(nS)}$ –following Heavy-Quark Spin Symmetry (HQSS)– we can predict the corresponding two-photon decay rates of the $\eta_b(nS)$. For the $2S$ and $3S$ states, we are also able to refine the procedure by including binding-energy effects as a function of the to-be measured η'_b and η''_b masses. Moreover these decay constants could also be computed via sum rules [11] or lattice simulations [12].

As in [1], the effective Lagrangians, which we use for the coupling of the $b\bar{b}$ pair to two photons and to a dilepton pair $\ell\bar{\ell}$, are:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{\gamma\gamma} &= -ic_1(\bar{b}\gamma^\sigma\gamma^5b)\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F^{\mu\nu}A^\rho, \\ \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}^{\ell\bar{\ell}} &= -c_2(\bar{b}\gamma^\mu b)(\ell\gamma_\mu\bar{\ell}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

with $c_1 \simeq \frac{Q_b^2(4\pi\alpha_{em})}{M_{\eta_b}^2 + b_{\eta_b}M_{\eta_b}}$ and $c_2 = \frac{Q_b(4\pi\alpha_{em})}{M_{\Upsilon}^2}$.

The factor $1/(M_{\eta_b}^2 + b_{\eta_b}M_{\eta_b})$ in c_1 contains the binding-energy effects [13, 14] and is obtained from the denomina-

tor of the bottom-quark propagator. $b_{\eta_b} (= 2m_b - M_{\eta_b})$ is the bound-state binding energy and M_Q its mass (in order to be consistent, we keep only terms linear in b_{η_b} , since the $O(q^2/m_b^2)$ terms have been neglected in the propagator). Since $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} \ll m_b$ the above effective Lagrangians should work better for bottomonia than for charmonia.

Defining $\langle 0|\bar{b}\gamma^\mu b|\Upsilon\rangle \equiv f_{\Upsilon}M_{\Upsilon}\varepsilon^\mu$, similarly to [1], we have for the leptonic width

$$\Gamma_{\ell\bar{\ell}}(\Upsilon) = \frac{1}{64\pi^2 M_{\Upsilon}} \int d\Omega |\mathcal{M}|^2 = \frac{4\pi Q_b^2 \alpha_{em}^2 f_{\Upsilon}^2}{3M_{\Upsilon}}. \quad (2)$$

Using $M_{\Upsilon}f_{\Upsilon}^2 = 12|\psi(0)|^2$ [15], the non-relativistic result of Kwong *et al.* [16] is recovered.

Similarly, with $\langle 0|\bar{b}\gamma^\mu\gamma^5 b|\eta_b\rangle \equiv if_{\eta_b}P^\mu$, the $\eta_b(nS)$ width into two photons is readily obtained:

$$\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{64\pi^2 M_{\eta_b}} \int d\Omega |\mathcal{M}|^2 = \frac{4\pi Q_b^4 \alpha_{em}^2 M_{\eta_b}^3 f_{\eta_b}^2}{(M_{\eta_b}^2 + b_{\eta_b}M_{\eta_b})^2}, \quad (3)$$

the factor $\frac{1}{2}$ being the Bose-symmetry factor.

NLO corrections are taken into account thanks to [16]

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^{NLO}(^3S_1) &= \Gamma^{LO} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \frac{16}{3} \right), \\ \Gamma^{NLO}(^1S_0) &= \Gamma^{LO} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \frac{(20 - \pi^2)}{3} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Apart from predictions of decay rates, it is also very fruitful to consider ratios of decay rates, since in some interesting cases radiative corrections cancel out –up to a shift of the renormalisation scale due to different bottomonium masses, that we can safely neglect.

Indeed, a very convenient way [1] to calculate decay width of excited-pseudoscalar states (η'_b and η''_b) is to use the following relation derived from Eq. (2), Eq. (3) and

HQSS:

$$\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b(nS)) = \Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b) \left(\frac{M_{\eta_b}^2 + b_{\eta_b} M_{\eta_b}}{M_{\eta_b(nS)}^2 + b_{\eta_b(nS)} M_{\eta_b(nS)}} \right)^2 \times \frac{M_{\eta_b(nS)}^3}{M_{\eta_b}^3} \left(\frac{\Gamma_{e^+e^-}(\Upsilon(nS))}{\Gamma_{e^+e^-}(\Upsilon(1S))} \frac{M_{\Upsilon(nS)}}{M_{\Upsilon(1S)}} \right), \quad (5)$$

where the bracket in the second line is equivalent to $\frac{f_{\Upsilon(nS)}^2}{f_{\Upsilon(1S)}^2}$. Its main asset is to provide with predictions independent of radiative corrections as soon as $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b)$, $\Gamma_{e^+e^-}(\Upsilon(nS))$ and $\Gamma_{e^+e^-}(\Upsilon(1S))$ are known.

We can also consider the ratio of $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b)$ over $\Gamma_{\ell\bar{\ell}}(\Upsilon)$. For the ground state η_b , the effect of the binding energy b_{η_b} , which depends on the pole mass m_b (around 4.75 GeV [17]), is small and can be neglected. Including NLO corrections, from Eq. (4), we find:

$$R_{\eta_b} = \frac{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b)}{\Gamma_{\ell\bar{\ell}}(\Upsilon)} = 3 Q_b^2 \frac{M_{\Upsilon}}{M_{\eta_b}} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \frac{(\pi^2 - 4)}{3} \right) \quad (6)$$

Finally, we can compute the branching ratio into two photons which is given [16] by

$$\frac{\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b)}{\Gamma_{gg}(\eta_b)} = \frac{9}{2} Q_b^4 \frac{\alpha_{em}^2}{\alpha_s^2} \left(1 - 7.8 \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right). \quad (7)$$

This relation is expected to give a good prediction for the $\eta_b \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ branching ratio since a corresponding expression for η_c gives the $\eta_c \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ branching ratio in good agreement with experiment.

II. RESULTS

Inserting the experimental value of $\Gamma_{e^+e^-}(\Upsilon)$, 1.340 ± 0.018 keV, as well as its mass, in Eq. (2), we get an estimate of f_{Υ} , 836 MeV, taking into account NLO corrections thanks to Eq. (4) (we have set $\alpha_s(M_{\Upsilon}) = 0.16$). For excited Υ states, we correspondingly get $f_{\Upsilon'}$ at 583 MeV and 504 MeV for the Υ'' .

As suggested by HQSS, we suppose the equality between f_{Υ} and f_{η_b} ; from Eq. (3) with $b_{\eta_b(1S)} \simeq 0$, we obtain the following evaluation, $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b) = 560$ eV ($\alpha_s(M_{\Upsilon}) = 0.16$, $M_{\eta_b} = 9300$ MeV).

Extrapolating HQSS to $2S$ states, *i.e.* $f_{\Upsilon(2S)} = f_{\eta'_b}$ and $f_{\Upsilon(3S)} = f_{\eta''_b}$, and neglecting mass effects ($b = 0$, $M_Q = 2m_b$), we obtain from Eq. (5) $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta'_b) = \Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b) \frac{f_{\Upsilon(2S)}^2}{f_{\Upsilon(1S)}^2} = 250$ eV as well as $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta''_b) = \Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b) \frac{f_{\Upsilon(3S)}^2}{f_{\Upsilon(1S)}^2} = 187$ eV.

To take into account binding-energy effects, we need to evaluate $b_{\eta_b(2S)}$ and $b_{\eta_b(3S)}$ and thus a prediction of their mass. We shall use 10.00 GeV for the $\eta_b(2S)$ and 10.35 GeV for the $\eta_b(3S)$ following the predictions of [17, 18].

Inserting our evaluation of $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b)$ in Eq. (5), we eventually obtain $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta'_b) = 269$ eV & $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta''_b) = 208$ eV. A variation of ± 25 MeV in the mass of $\eta_b(2S)$ and $\eta_b(3S)$ only affect our prediction by 1-2 eV and it is therefore negligible. We conclude that the introduction of mass effects has shifted up the widths by about 20 eV.

Again, in Eq. (5), the radiative corrections are cancelled up to corrections due to differences in the scale of α_s and can be also used to predict the width of $\eta_b(2S)$ and $\eta_b(3S)$ once an experimental value for $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b(1S))$ is available.

Another point underlying the importance of measuring the two-photon width of η_b lies in the fact that the ratio of the two-photon decay rate of η_b to the Υ leptonic width, as given by the quantity R_{η_b} in Eq. (6), depends essentially on the QCD coupling constant α_s . Since HQSS is found to work for η_c and since it is expected to work better for η_b , this relation could be used to determine in a reliable way the value of α_s for the process. Given the measured value of α_s at M_Z , the momentum scale at which α_s is to be evaluated here could be in principle be fixed with R_{η_b} . This ratio was also considered in the context of the nonrelativistic renormalisation group approach at NNLL [19]. For a recent review on pNRQCD, see [20].

As done in the past with the leptonic and hadronic branching ratio for Υ [16, 21], one can further check the consistency of the value for α_s by considering also the branching ratio for $\eta_b \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ which is given by Eq. (7).

$\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}$	This paper	Sch. [22]	Lak. [17]	Ack. [23]	Kim [24]	Ahm. [25]	Mün. [26]	Eb. [27]	God. [18]	Fab. [28]	Pen. [19]
η_b	560	460	230	170	384 ± 47	520	220 ± 40	350	214	466 ± 101	659 ± 92
η'_b	269	200	70	-	191 ± 25	-	110 ± 20	150	121	-	-
η''_b	208	-	40	-	-	-	84 ± 12	100	90.6	-	-

TABLE I: Summary of theoretical predictions for $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b)$, $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta'_b)$ and $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta''_b)$. (All values are in units of eV).

III. CONCLUSION

In [1], we have recently stressed that there may exist a specificity in the two-photon decay of the first radially-

excited pseudoscalar charmonium η'_c whereas it is usu-

ally the production of heavy-quarkonium which creates the greatest debates (for recent reviews, see [29, 30]). More specifically, we have shown that the inclusion of the mass effects for η'_c —supposedly important for excited states—worsens the comparison between theoretical expectation and the recent measurement by the CLEO collaboration [31].

In this work, we have evaluated the two-photon width of the pseudoscalar bottomonia $\eta_b(nS)$ through the simple application of HQSS. For $n > 1$ states, we have taken into account binding-energy corrections, or equally speaking mass effects. They amount to up to 10 % and our prediction depend little on the value of their mass.

As HQSS and local operator expansion are supposed to hold better for ground-state bottomonia, the forthcoming measurement of $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b(1S))$ would allow a determination of the α_s coupling constant. We note also that our three predictions for the $\eta_b(nS)$ two-photon width (as well as the one from ref.[28] for $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta_b(1S))$ which is also based on spin symmetry) differ significantly from a number of other predictions (see Table (I)). It would be also very interesting to have experimental indications whether or not heavy-quark spin symmetry could be broken for excited states, in view of the aforementioned possible anomaly for $\Gamma_{\gamma\gamma}(\eta'_c)$.

-
- [1] J. P. Lansberg and T. N. Pham, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 034001 [arXiv:hep-ph/0603113].
- [2] M. Neubert, Phys. Rept. **245**, 259 (1994); [arXiv:hep-ph/9306320].
- [3] R. Casalbuoni, A. Deandrea, N. Di Bartolomeo, R. Gatto, F. Feruglio and G. Nardulli, Phys. Rept. **281**, 145 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9605342].
- [4] F. De Fazio, in *At the Frontier of Particle Physics/Handbook of QCD*, edited by M. A. Shifman (World Scientific, 2001) 1671 [arXiv:hep-ph/0010007] ; arXiv:hep-ph/0010007.
- [5] A. Heister *et al.* [ALEPH Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **530** (2002) 56 [arXiv:hep-ex/0202011].
- [6] W.-M. Yao *et al.* [Particle Data Group], J. Phys. G **33** (2006) 1.
- [7] F. Maltoni and A. D. Polosa, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 054014 [arXiv:hep-ph/0405082].
- [8] E. S. Swanson, Phys. Rept. **429** (2006) 243 [arXiv:hep-ph/0601110].
- [9] J. L. Rosner, arXiv:hep-ph/0609195.
- [10] P. Colangelo, F. De Fazio, R. Ferrandes and S. Nicotri, arXiv:hep-ph/0609240.
- [11] L. J. Reinders, H. R. Rubinstein and S. Yazaki, Phys. Lett. B **113** (1982) 411.
- [12] J. J. Dudek, R. G. Edwards and D. G. Richards, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 074507 [arXiv:hep-ph/0601137].
- [13] J. H. Kuhn, J. Kaplan and E. G. O. Safiani, Nucl. Phys. B **157** (1979) 125.
- [14] T. N. Pham and G. h. Zhu, Phys. Lett. B **619** (2005) 313 [arXiv:hep-ph/0412428].
- [15] V. A. Novikov, L. B. Okun, M. A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, M. B. Voloshin and V. I. Zakharov, Phys. Rept. **41** (1978) 1.
- [16] W. Kwong, J. L. Rosner and C. Quigg, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **37** (1987) 325.
- [17] O. Lakhina and E. S. Swanson, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 014012 [arXiv:hep-ph/0603164].
- [18] S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32** (1985) 189.
- [19] A. A. Penin, A. Pineda, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Nucl. Phys. B **699** (2004) 183 [arXiv:hep-ph/0406175].
- [20] N. Brambilla, A. Pineda, J. Soto and A. Vairo, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77** (2005) 1423 [arXiv:hep-ph/0410047].
- [21] P. B. Mackenzie and G. P. Lepage, Phys. Rev. Lett **47** (1981) 1244
- [22] G. A. Schuler, F. A. Berends and R. van Gulik, Nucl. Phys. B **523** (1998) 423 [arXiv:hep-ph/9710462].
- [23] E. S. Ackleh and T. Barnes, Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) 232.
- [24] C. S. Kim, T. Lee and G. L. Wang, Phys. Lett. B **606** (2005) 323 [arXiv:hep-ph/0411075].
- [25] M. R. Ahmady and R. R. Mendel, Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995) 141 [arXiv:hep-ph/9401315].
- [26] C. R. Munz, Nucl. Phys. A **609**, 364 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9601206].
- [27] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **18**, 601 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0302044].
- [28] N. Fabiano, Eur. Phys. J. C **26** (2003) 441 [arXiv:hep-ph/0209283].
- [29] N. Brambilla *et al.*, *Heavy quarkonium physics*, CERN Yellow Report, CERN-2005-005, 2005 Geneva : CERN, 487 pp [arXiv:hep-ph/0412158].
- [30] J. P. Lansberg, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **21** (2006) 3857 [arXiv:hep-ph/0602091].
- [31] D. M. Asner *et al.* [CLEO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **92** (2004) 142001 [arXiv:hep-ex/0312058].