

# Study of the $f_2(1270)$ and $a_2(1320)$ resonances in $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma$ collisions

N. N. Achasov, A. V. Kiselev, and G. N. Shestakov

Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, S. L. Sobolev Institute for Mathematics, 630090 Novosibirsk, Russia

We discuss studies of the  $Q^2$  dependence of the  $f_2(1270)$  and  $a_2(1320)$  production cross sections in  $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma$  collisions at current and coming into operation colliders with a high luminosity. Changing the dominant helicity amplitude occurs in the reactions  $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270)$  and  $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320)$  with increasing  $Q^2$ . This is caused by the coming of the QCD asymptotics. It is shown that the transition to the asymptotic behavior of QCD in the amplitudes  $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270), a_2(1320)$  is provided by the compensation of the contributions of ground vector states  $\rho$  and  $\omega$  in  $Q^2$ -channel with the contributions of their radial excitations.

PACS numbers: 13.40.Gp, 13.60.Le, 13.66.Jn

Physics of two-photon collisions entering into the era of ultra-high statistics gives unique opportunities to study the internal (quark-gluon) structure of hadrons [1–4]. For example, the recent experiments of the Belle Collaboration on the reactions  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  [5, 6],  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$  [7], and  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$  [8] established conclusively the smallness of the two-photon widths of the  $f_0(980)$  and  $a_0(980)$  resonances, which testifies in favor of their four-quark structure [9–11].<sup>1</sup>

The measurements of the two-photon widths of the light pseudoscalar mesons  $P = \pi^0, \eta, \eta'$  in  $\gamma\gamma$  collisions [1] and the transition form factors  $F_{\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow P}(Q^2)$  in  $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma$  collisions<sup>2</sup> performed by CELLO [12], CLEO [13], BaBar [14, 15] and Belle [16] Collaborations allowed to realize a critical test of QCD calculations of the processes at large  $Q^2$ .

Production of classical tensor  $q\bar{q}$  resonances by two real photons proceeds very intensively:  $f_2(1270)$  in the reactions  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  [5, 6, 17, 18] and  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$  [7, 19] and  $a_2(1320)$  in the reactions  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$  [8, 20] and  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$  [21–25] (see Fig. 1). This fact is a good reason to start detailed investigations of the  $Q^2$  dependence of the  $f_2(1270)$  and  $a_2(1320)$  production cross sections in  $\gamma^*\gamma$  collisions at  $e^+e^-$  colliders with a high luminosity.<sup>3</sup>

We now turn to the detailed discussion.

In  $\gamma\gamma$  collisions, the  $f_2(1270)$  and  $a_2(1320)$  resonances can be produced in the states with helicity  $\lambda=0$  and  $\pm 2$ . Helicity  $\lambda$  is defined in the resonance rest frame, in




Figure 1: Cross sections of the reactions (a)  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-$  [5, 6, 17, 18], (b)  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$  [7, 19], (c)  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$  [8], and (d)  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$  [23] as functions of the invariant mass,  $\sqrt{s}$ , of the final meson system. In plots (a)–(c)  $\theta$  denotes the polar angle of one of the outgoing mesons with respect to the incident photon direction in the  $\gamma\gamma$  center-of-mass system. The reactions  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$ , plot (b), and  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ , plot (d), seem more preferable in the sense of the smallness of the physical background under the  $f_2(1270)$  and  $a_2(1320)$  peaks, respectively.

<sup>1</sup> In 1982, the prediction  $\Gamma(f_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \approx \Gamma(a_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.27$  keV was done in the four-quark MIT bag model [9, 10]. In 2014, the Particle Data Group cited in the Review of Particle Physics the following data [1]:  $\Gamma(f_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.29$  keV and  $\Gamma(a_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \approx 0.3$  keV, which is an order of magnitude smaller than the  $\gamma\gamma$  width of the tensor  $q\bar{q}$  meson  $\Gamma(f_2(1270) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) \approx 3$  keV. The prediction of the  $q\bar{q}$  model  $\Gamma(f_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma)/\Gamma(a_0(980) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = 25/9$  is excluded experimentally.

<sup>2</sup>  $\gamma^*(Q^2)$  ( $\gamma^*$  below) denotes the photon with virtuality  $-Q^2$ .

<sup>3</sup> Currently, the maximum luminosity  $\approx 2 \cdot 10^{34} \text{ cm}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  is reached at the KEKB  $e^+e^-$  collider [1, 4]. The luminosity of  $8 \cdot 10^{35} \text{ cm}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$  is planned to have at the SuperKEKB factory [1, 3].

which  $\lambda = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$ , where  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_2$  are the helicities of incoming photons. According to the high-statistics measurements [6–8, 17–19, 23–25] the fraction of the  $f_2(1270)$  and  $a_2(1320)$  production in states with  $\lambda = \pm 2$  in  $\gamma\gamma$  collisions is more than 95%.

This remarkable experimental fact of  $\lambda = \pm 2$  dominance is naturally reproduced by the effective gauge-invariant Lagrangian, describing the tensor meson production by two photons with opposite helicities only

[10, 26, 27],

$$L = g_{T\gamma\gamma} T_{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\sigma} F_{\nu\sigma}, \quad (1)$$

where  $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$  is the tensor of the electromagnetic field  $A_\mu$ ,  $T_{\mu\nu}$  is the field of the tensor meson  $T$  ( $T = f_2(1270)$ ,  $a_2(1320)$ );  $T_{\mu\nu} = T_{\nu\mu}$ ,  $T_{\mu\mu} = 0$ ,  $\partial_\mu T_{\mu\nu} = 0$ ;  $g_{T\gamma\gamma}$  is the coupling constants of the  $T$  meson to the energy-momentum tensor of the electromagnetic field.

Using Lagrangian (1) one can unambiguously predict the hierarchy of the  $Q^2$  dependencies of the helicity amplitudes  $V_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{(\lambda)}(T; s, Q^2) = V_{-\lambda_1, -\lambda_2}^{(-\lambda)}(T; s, Q^2)$  describing the  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow T$  vertices [26, 28]:

$$V_{1,-1}^{(2)}(T; s, Q^2) = V_T(s, Q^2) \left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{s}\right), \quad (2)$$

$$V_{1,0}^{(1)}(T; s, Q^2) = V_T(s, Q^2) \sqrt{\frac{Q^2}{2s}} \left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{s}\right), \quad (3)$$

$$V_{1,1}^{(0)}(T; s, Q^2) = -V_T(s, Q^2) \frac{Q^2}{\sqrt{6}s} \left(1 + \frac{Q^2}{s}\right). \quad (4)$$

Here  $s = (q_1 + q_2)^2$ ;  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are the four-momenta of the incident photons,  $q_1^2 = 0$ ,  $q_2^2 = -Q^2$ ;

$$V_T(s, Q^2) = g_{T\gamma\gamma} s F_T(Q^2)/2, \quad F_T(0) = 1, \quad (5)$$

$$g_{T\gamma\gamma} s = 2V_{1,-1}^{(2)}(T; s, 0) = \sqrt{320 \pi \sqrt{s} \Gamma_{T \rightarrow \gamma\gamma}(s)}, \quad (6)$$

and  $F_T(Q^2)$  is the transition form factor which is common for all vertices.

The vertex  $V_{1,0}^{(1)}(T; s, Q^2)$  vanishes for  $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$  as  $\sqrt{Q^2}$ . This is a consequence of gauge invariance. The vertex  $V_{1,1}^{(0)}(T; s, Q^2)$  is proportional to  $Q^2$  for  $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$  owing to a specific selection of the  $\gamma^*\gamma T$  interaction which consists with the experimental fact of  $\lambda = \pm 2$  dominance in  $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow T$  transitions (see  $V_{1,-1}^{(2)}(T; s, 0)$  in Eq. (6)).

For small  $Q^2$ , the dominance of  $V_{1,-1}^{(2)}(T; s, Q^2)$  over  $V_{1,0}^{(1)}(T; s, Q^2)$  and  $V_{1,1}^{(0)}(T; s, Q^2)$  is certainly maintained. However, for large  $Q^2$  the situation changes radically. Asymptotically

$$V_{1,-1}^{(2)}(T; s, Q^2) \sim F_T(Q^2) Q^2, \quad (7)$$

$$V_{1,0}^{(1)}(T; s, Q^2) \sim F_T(Q^2) Q^3, \quad (8)$$

$$V_{1,1}^{(0)}(T; s, Q^2) \sim F_T(Q^2) Q^4 \quad (9)$$

and the  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow T$  vertex with  $\lambda=0$  becomes dominant.




Figure 2: The  $Q^2$  dependencies of the normalized vertex functions  $2|V_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{(\lambda)}(T; m_T^2, Q^2)| / (g_{T\gamma\gamma} m_T^2)$  calculated according to Eqs. (2)–(6) and (10). For the  $f_2(1270)$  and  $a_2(1320)$  resonances these dependencies practically coincide because  $m_{f_2} \approx m_{a_2}$ .

From the parton model considerations [29] and the QCD analysis of hard exclusive processes [30, 31] it follows that for large  $Q^2$  the tensor meson production amplitude with zero helicity (in the  $\gamma^*\gamma$  center-of-mass system) should tend to the constant value (with logarithmic accuracy), and other amplitudes should be suppressed by powers of  $Q^2$ . This implies that  $F_T(Q^2) \sim 1/Q^4$  for large  $Q^2$ . In the generalized vector meson dominance model (GVDM) such an asymptotic behavior is provided by the compensation in  $Q^2$ -channel of the contributions of ground and excited states of vector mesons  $V = \rho, \omega, \phi$ ,  $V' = \rho', \omega', \phi'$ ,  $V'' = \rho'', \omega'', \phi''$ , etc. [28].

It is interesting to find out, at least roughly, how fast the angular distributions can vary with  $Q^2$  in the reactions  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270) \rightarrow \pi\pi$ ,  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ , and  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \rho^\pm\pi^\mp \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$  for  $0 < Q^2 < 40 \text{ GeV}^2$  (in the case of the processes  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0, \eta, \eta'$  the asymptotic regime apparently occurs near  $40 \text{ GeV}^2$ ).

We put  $m_\rho = m_\omega$ ,  $m_{\rho'} = m_{\omega'}$ , etc., and will consider that the resonance  $f_2(1270)$  does not contain strange valent quarks (as  $\omega, \omega'$ , etc.). Then, in GVDM, a simplest expression for  $F_T(Q^2)$  with the required asymptotic behavior has the form

$$F_T(Q^2) = \frac{1}{(1 + Q^2/m_\rho^2)(1 + Q^2/m_{\rho'}^2)}. \quad (10)$$

Figure 2 shows the  $Q^2$  dependencies of the normalized vertex functions  $2|V_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{(\lambda)}(T; m_T^2, Q^2)| / (g_{T\gamma\gamma} m_T^2)$  calculated according Eqs. (2)–(6) and (10) at  $m_\rho = 0.775 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_{\rho'} = 1.465 \text{ GeV}$ , and  $s = m_T^2$ . As is seen from Fig. 2, the main at  $Q^2=0$  vertex function with helicity  $\lambda=2$  decreases very rapidly with increasing  $Q^2$ . For  $Q^2 \gtrsim 10 \text{ GeV}^2$  the vertex function with helicity  $\lambda=0$  be-

comes main and close to its asymptotic value.

The angular distributions in the reactions  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270) \rightarrow \pi\pi$  [26],  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ , and  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \rho^\pm\pi^\mp \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$  reshape as  $Q^2$  increases with the same rate.

The differential cross sections for  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270) \rightarrow \pi\pi$  and  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$  (integrated over the azimuth angle of one of the outgoing mesons in the  $\gamma^*\gamma$  center-of-mass system) have the following form:  $\sin^4\theta$  for the tensor meson decays from the helicity  $\lambda=\pm 2$  states,  $4\cos^2\theta\sin^2\theta$  for  $\lambda=\pm 1$ , and  $\frac{2}{3}(3\cos^2\theta-1)^2$  for  $\lambda=0$ , where  $\theta$  is the polar angle of one of the outgoing mesons. These angular distributions are equally normalized. Thus, the  $\sin^4\theta$  distribution dominating at  $Q^2=0$  should be replaced by the  $\frac{2}{3}(3\cos^2\theta-1)^2$  distribution with increasing  $Q^2$ .

The amplitude of the reaction  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \rho^\pm\pi^\mp \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$  is described by two diagrams and therefore the corresponding angular distributions for  $\lambda=\pm 2, \pm 1$ , and 0 have a rather cumbersome form. Nevertheless these distributions are sensitive to the  $a_2(1320)$  helicity  $\lambda$ . They are exhaustively represented in Refs. [21–25]. Here we consider as an example the contribution of one diagram  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \rho^+\pi^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$  only. Then the angular distributions (integrated over the azimuth angle of the outgoing  $\pi^-$  meson) corresponding to the  $\lambda=\pm 2, \pm 1$ , and 0 helicity contributions are

$$\sin^2\theta_{\rho^+}\sin^2\theta_{\pi^+}(\cos^2\theta_{\rho^+}\sin^2\varphi_{\pi^+} + \cos^2\varphi_{\pi^+}), \quad (11)$$

$$\sin^2\theta_{\pi^+}[\sin^2\varphi_{\pi^+}(2\cos^2\theta_{\rho^+}-1)^2 + \cos^2\varphi_{\pi^+}\cos^2\theta_{\rho^+}], \quad (12)$$

$$6\sin^2\theta_{\rho^+}\sin^2\theta_{\pi^+}\cos^2\theta_{\rho^+}\sin^2\varphi_{\pi^+}, \quad (13)$$

respectively, where  $\theta_{\rho^+}$  is the polar angle of the  $\rho^+$  in the  $\gamma^*\gamma$  center-of-mass system, with the z-axis along the incident photon direction; the angles  $\theta_{\pi^+}$  and  $\varphi_{\pi^+}$  describe the decay of the  $\rho^+$  in its helicity system;  $\varphi_{\pi^+}$  is measured from the plane defined by the momenta of the  $\rho^+$  and photons. As  $Q^2$  increases, the distribution from Eq. (11) should be replaced by that from Eq. (13).

Note that the form factors of a more general form than that in Eq. (10) may be required for the treatment of real data, for example,

$$F_T(Q^2) = \frac{1 + \xi Q^2}{(1 + Q^2/m_\rho^2)(1 + Q^2/m_{\rho'}^2)(1 + Q^2/m_{\rho''}^2)} \quad (14)$$

with varying masses  $m_{\rho'}$  and  $m_{\rho''}$  and an additional free parameter  $\xi$ .

Deviations from the above picture are possible in principle since the tensor meson production in  $\gamma^*\gamma$  collisions can be described in the general case by three independent invariant amplitudes. However, our scenario is based on the well-established dominance of the  $\lambda=\pm 2$  helicity states in the tensor meson production by two real photons. This allows us to hope that possible deviations will be small.

Thus, the experiments on the reactions  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270)$  and  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320)$  will allow to check the theoretical predictions about the changing of the dominant helicity amplitude with increasing  $Q^2$ . The dynamics of this change can be tracked by analyzing the angular distributions of the final mesons in the reactions  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270) \rightarrow \pi\pi$ ,  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \pi^0\eta$ , and  $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \rightarrow a_2(1320) \rightarrow \rho^\pm\pi^\mp \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ . The information obtained on three transition form factors, corresponding to the  $\lambda=2, 1$ , and 0  $\gamma^*\gamma$  helicity amplitudes, would be crucial for the selection of dynamical models of the  $f_2(1270)$  and  $a_2(1320)$  resonance production.

We have shown that the transition to the asymptotic behavior of QCD in the amplitudes  $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270), a_2(1320)$  is provided by the compensation of the contributions of ground vector states  $\rho$  and  $\omega$  in  $Q^2$ -channel with those of their radial excitations.

More recently, the Belle Collaboration represented the first data on the processes  $\gamma^*(Q^2)\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270)$  extracted from the measured differential cross section of the reaction  $\gamma^*\gamma \rightarrow f_2(1270) \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0$  for  $Q^2$  up to 30 GeV<sup>2</sup> [32]. In Fig. 3, the curves transferred from Fig. 2 are compared with the Belle data which we multiplied by a factor  $(1 + Q^2/m_{f_2}^2)$  in order to match the definition of the transition form factors with  $\lambda=2, 1$ , and 0 used in Ref. [32] with our definition of the normalized vertex functions. The theoretical curves are in satisfactory agreement with the data.

The present work is partially supported by the RFBR grant No. 13-02-00039 and by the Interdisciplinary project No. 102 of the Siberian Branch of RAS.

- 
- [1] K.A. Olive, K. Agashe, C. Amsler et al. (Particle Data Group), *Chin. Phys. C* **38**, 090001 (2014).  
 [2] D.M. Asner, T. Barnes, J.M. Bian et al. (BESIII Collab.), *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **24**, S1 (2009).  
 [3] T. Aushev, W. Bartel, A. Bondar et al. (Su-

- perKEKB/Belle II Collab.), arXiv:1002.5012.  
 [4] A.J. Bevan, B. Golob, Th. Mannel et al. (BaBar and Belle Collab.), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 3026 (2014).  
 [5] T. Mori, S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe et al. (Belle Collab.), *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 051101(R) (2007).




Figure 3: Comparison of the  $Q^2$  dependencies of the normalized vertex functions  $2|V_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2}^{(\lambda)}(f_2(1270); m_{f_2}^2, Q^2)| / (g_{f_2 \gamma \gamma} m_{f_2}^2)$ , calculated according to Eqs. (2)–(6) and (10), with the Belle data. [32]. The curves are the same as in Fig. 2. The Belle data are reduced to our normalization.

- [6] T. Mori, S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe et al. (Belle Collab.), J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **76**, 074102 (2007).
- [7] S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe, I. Adachi et al. (Belle Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **78**, 052004 (2008).
- [8] S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe, H. Nakazawa et al. (Belle Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **80**, 032001 (2009).
- [9] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, and G.N. Shestakov, Phys. Lett. **108 B**, 134 (1982).
- [10] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, and G.N. Shestakov, Z. Phys. C **16**, 55 (1982).
- [11] N.N. Achasov, G.N. Shestakov, Physics–Uspekhi **54**, 799 (2011) [Usp. Fiz. Nauk **181**, 827 (2011)].
- [12] H.-J. Behrend, L. Criegee, T.H. Field et al. (CELLO Collab.), Z. Phys. C **49**, 401 (1991).
- [13] J. Gronberg, T.S. Hill, R. Kutschke et al. (CLEO Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **57**, 33 (1998).
- [14] B. Aubert, Y. Karyotakis, J.P. Lees et al. (BaBar Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **80**, 052002 (2009).
- [15] P. del Amo Sanchez, J.P. Lees, V. Poireau et al. (BaBar Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **84**, 052001 (2011).
- [16] S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe, H. Nakazawa et al. (Belle Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 092007 (2012).
- [17] J. Boyer, F. Butler, G. Gidal et al. (Mark II Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **42**, 1350 (1990).
- [18] H.-J. Behrend, L. Criegee, T.H. Field et al. (CELLO Collab.), Z. Phys. C **56**, 381 (1992).
- [19] H. Marsiske, D. Antriasyan, H.W. Bartels et al. (Crystal Ball Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **41**, 3324 (1990).
- [20] D. Antreasyn, D. Aschman, D. Besset et al. (Crystal Ball Collab.), Phys. Rev. D **33**, 1847 (1986).
- [21] Ch. Berger, A. Deuter, H. Genzel et al. (PLUTO Collab.), Phys. Lett. **149 B**, 427 (1984).
- [22] S.E. Baru, A.E. Blinov, V.T. Blinov et al. (MD-1 Collab.), Z. Phys. C **48**, 581 (1990).
- [23] H. Albrecht, T. Hamacher, R.P. Hofmann et al. (ARGUS Collab.), Z. Phys. C **74**, 469 (1997).
- [24] M. Acciarri, O. Adriani, M. Anuilar-Btnitez et al. (L3 Collab.), Phys. Lett. B **413**, 147 (1997).
- [25] K. Abe, K. Abe, I. Adachi et al. (Belle Collab.), arXiv:hep-ex/0610022.
- [26] N.N. Achasov and V.A. Karnakov, Z. Phys. C **30**, 141 (1986).
- [27] N.N. Achasov, A.I. Goncharenko, A.V. Kiselev, and E.V. Rogozina, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 114001 (2013); Phys. Rev. D **89**, 059906(E) (2014).
- [28] N.N. Achasov, A.V. Kiselev, and G.N. Shestakov, arXiv:1504.07346.
- [29] G. Köpp, T.F. Walsh, and P. Zerwas, Nucl. Phys. B **70**, 461 (1974).
- [30] V.L. Chernyak and A.R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rep. **112**, 173 (1984).
- [31] V.N. Baier and A.G. Grozin, Sov. J. Part. Nucl. **16**, 1 (1985) [Fiz. Elem. Chast. At. Yad. **16**, 5 (1985)].
- [32] M. Masuda, S. Uehara, Y. Watanabe et al. (Belle Collab.), arXiv:1508.06757.