

The new analysis of the KLOE data on the $\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ decay

N.N. Achasov * and A.V. Kiselev †

Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Sobolev Institute for Mathematics, Novosibirsk, 630090

(November 10, 2018)

Abstract

In this paper we present the fit to the recent high-statistical KLOE data on the $\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ decay. This decay mainly goes through the $a_0\gamma$ intermediate state. The obtained results differ from those of the previous fits: data prefer a high a_0 mass and a considerably large a_0 coupling to the $K\bar{K}$.

I. INTRODUCTION

The lightest scalar mesons $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$, discovered more than thirty years ago, became the hard problem for the naive quark-antiquark ($q\bar{q}$) model from the outset. Really, on the one hand the almost exact degeneration of the masses of the isovector $a_0(980)$ and isoscalar $f_0(980)$ states revealed seemingly the structure similar to the structure of the vector ρ and ω mesons, and on the other hand the strong coupling of $f_0(980)$ with the $K\bar{K}$ channel pointed unambiguously to a considerable part of the strange quark pair $s\bar{s}$ in the wave function of $f_0(980)$. It was noted late in the 1970s that in the MIT bag model there are light four-quark scalar states and suggested that $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ might be these states [1]. From that time $a_0(980)$ and $f_0(980)$ resonances came into beloved children of the light quark spectroscopy, see, for example, Refs. [2,3,4].

Ten years later there was proposed in Ref. [5] to study radiative ϕ decays $\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ and $\phi \rightarrow f_0\gamma \rightarrow \pi^0\pi^0\gamma$ to solve the puzzle of the lightest scalar mesons. Over the next ten years before the experiments (1998), this question was examined from different points of view [6,7,8,9,10].

Now these decays have been studied not only theoretically but also experimentally. The first measurements have been reported by the SND [11,12,13,14] and CMD-2 [15] Collaborations which obtain the following branching ratios

$$Br(\phi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0\eta) = (8.8 \pm 1.4 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-5} \quad [13],$$

*achasov@math.nsc.ru

†kiselev@math.nsc.ru

$$Br(\phi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0\pi^0) = (12.21 \pm 0.98 \pm 0.61) \times 10^{-5} \quad [14]$$

$$Br(\phi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0\eta) = (9.0 \pm 2.4 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-5},$$

$$Br(\phi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0\pi^0) = (9.2 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-5} \quad [15].$$

More recently the KLOE Collaboration has measured [16,17]

$$Br(\phi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0\eta) = (8.51 \pm 0.51 \pm 0.57) \times 10^{-5} \text{ in } \eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma \quad [16],$$

$$Br(\phi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0\eta) = (7.96 \pm 0.60 \pm 0.40) \times 10^{-5} \text{ in } \eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0 \quad [16],$$

$$Br(\phi \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0\pi^0) = (10.9 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-5} \quad [17],$$

in agreement with the Novosibirsk data [13,14,15] but with a considerably smaller error.

In this work we present the new analysis of the recent KLOE data on the $\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ decay [16,18]. In contradistinction to [16], we

- 1) treat the a_0 mass m_{a_0} as a free parameter of the fit;
- 2) fit the phase δ of the interference between $\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ (signal) and $\phi \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ (background) reactions;
- 3) use new more precise experimental values of the input parameters.

All formulas for the $\phi \rightarrow (a_0\gamma + \rho^0\pi^0) \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ reaction taking the background into account are shown in Sec.II. The results of the 4 different fits are presented in Sec.III. A brief summary is given in Sec.IV.

II. THE FORMALISM OF THE $\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ AND $\phi \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ REACTIONS

In Ref. [19] was shown that the process $\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ dominates in the $\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ decay (see also [5,7], where it was predicted in four-quark model). This was confirmed in [16,18]. Nevertheless, the main background process $\phi \rightarrow \rho\pi^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ should be taken into account also (see [19,16]).

The amplitude of the background process $\phi(p) \rightarrow \pi^0\rho^0 \rightarrow \gamma(q)\pi^0(k_1)\eta(k_2)$ is [19]:

$$M_B = \frac{g_{\phi\rho\pi}g_{\rho\eta\gamma}}{D_\rho(p-k_1)}\phi_\alpha k_{1\mu}p_\nu\epsilon_\delta(p-k_1)_\omega q_\epsilon\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}\epsilon_{\beta\delta\omega\epsilon}. \quad (1)$$

According to the one-loop mechanism of the decay $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow \gamma a_0$, suggested in Ref. [5], the amplitude of the signal $\phi \rightarrow \gamma a_0 \rightarrow \gamma\pi^0\eta$ has the form:

$$M_a = g(m)\frac{g_{a_0K^+K^-}g_{a_0\pi\eta}}{D_{a_0}(m)}\left((\phi\epsilon) - \frac{(\phi q)(\epsilon p)}{(pq)}\right), \quad (2)$$

where $m^2 = (k_1 + k_2)^2$, ϕ_α and ϵ_μ are the polarization vectors of ϕ meson and photon, the forms of $g_R(m)$ and $g(m) = g_R(m)/g_{RK^+K^-}$ everywhere over the m region are in Refs. [5] and [20] respectively:

For $m < 2m_{K^+}$

$$\begin{aligned}
g(m) = & \frac{e}{2(2\pi)^2} g_{\phi K^+ K^-} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1 - \rho^2(m^2)}{\rho^2(m_\phi^2) - \rho^2(m^2)} \times \right. \\
& \left[2|\rho(m^2)| \arctan \frac{1}{|\rho(m^2)|} - \rho(m_\phi^2) \lambda(m_\phi^2) + i\pi \rho(m_\phi^2) - \right. \\
& \left. \left. - (1 - \rho^2(m_\phi^2)) \left(\frac{1}{4} (\pi + i\lambda(m_\phi^2))^2 - \right. \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. \left. - \left(\arctan \frac{1}{|\rho(m^2)|} \right)^2 \right) \right] \right\}, \tag{3}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\rho(m^2) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_{K^+}^2}{m^2}}; \quad \lambda(m^2) = \ln \frac{1 + \rho(m^2)}{1 - \rho(m^2)}; \quad \frac{e^2}{4\pi} = \alpha = \frac{1}{137}. \tag{4}$$

For $m \geq 2m_{K^+}$

$$\begin{aligned}
g(m) = & \frac{e}{2(2\pi)^2} g_{\phi K^+ K^-} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1 - \rho^2(m^2)}{\rho^2(m_\phi^2) - \rho^2(m^2)} \times \right. \\
& \times \left[\rho(m^2) (\lambda(m^2) - i\pi) - \rho(m_\phi^2) (\lambda(m_\phi^2) - i\pi) - \right. \\
& \left. \left. \frac{1}{4} (1 - \rho^2(m_\phi^2)) \left((\pi + i\lambda(m_\phi^2))^2 - (\pi + i\lambda(m^2))^2 \right) \right] \right\}. \tag{5}
\end{aligned}$$

The mass spectrum is

$$\frac{d\Gamma(\phi \rightarrow \gamma \pi^0 \eta, m)}{dm} = \frac{d\Gamma_{a_0}(m)}{dm} + \frac{d\Gamma_{back}(m)}{dm} + \frac{d\Gamma_{int}(m)}{dm}, \tag{6}$$

where the mass spectrum for the signal is

$$\frac{d\Gamma_{a_0}(m)}{dm} = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{m^2 \Gamma(\phi \rightarrow \gamma a_0, m) \Gamma(a_0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta, m)}{|D_{a_0}(m)|^2} = \frac{2|g(m)|^2 p_{\eta\pi} (m_\phi^2 - m^2)}{3(4\pi)^3 m_\phi^3} \left| \frac{g_{a_0 K^+ K^-} g_{a_0 \pi \eta}}{D_{a_0}(m)} \right|^2. \tag{7}$$

The mass spectrum for the background process $\phi \rightarrow \pi^0 \rho \rightarrow \gamma \pi^0 \eta$ is [19]:

$$\frac{d\Gamma_{back}(m)}{dm} = \frac{(m_\phi^2 - m^2) p_{\pi\eta}}{128\pi^3 m_\phi^3} \int_{-1}^1 dx A_{back}(m, x), \tag{8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{back}(m, x) = & \frac{1}{3} \sum |M_B|^2 = \\
= & \frac{1}{24} (m_\eta^4 m_\pi^4 + 2m^2 m_\eta^2 m_\pi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^2 - 2m_\eta^4 m_\pi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^2 - 2m_\eta^2 m_\pi^4 \tilde{m}_\rho^2 + \\
& 2m^4 \tilde{m}_\rho^4 - 2m^2 m_\eta^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^4 + m_\eta^4 \tilde{m}_\rho^4 - 2m^2 m_\pi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^4 + 4m_\eta^2 m_\pi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^4 + m_\pi^4 \tilde{m}_\rho^4 + \\
& 2m^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^6 - 2m_\eta^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^6 - 2m_\pi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^6 + \tilde{m}_\rho^8 - 2m_\eta^4 m_\pi^2 m_\phi^2 - 2m^2 m_\eta^2 m_\phi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^2 + \\
& 2m_\eta^2 m_\pi^2 m_\phi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^2 - 2m^2 m_\phi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^4 + 2m_\eta^2 m_\phi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^4 - 2m_\phi^2 \tilde{m}_\rho^6 + m_\eta^4 m_\phi^4 + m_\phi^4 \tilde{m}_\rho^4) \times \\
& \left| \frac{g_{\phi\rho\pi} g_{\rho\eta\gamma}}{D_\rho(\tilde{m}_\rho)} \right|^2, \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{m}_\rho^2 &= m_\eta^2 + \frac{(m^2 + m_\eta^2 - m_\pi^2)(m_\phi^2 - m^2)}{2m^2} - \frac{(m_\phi^2 - m^2)x}{m} p_{\pi\eta} \\ p_{\pi\eta} &= \frac{\sqrt{(m^2 - (m_\eta - m_\pi)^2)(m^2 - (m_\eta + m_\pi)^2)}}{2m}.\end{aligned}\quad (10)$$

Note that there is a misprint in Eq.(6) of Ref. [19], which describes $A_{back}(m, x)$: the 7th term in the brackets " $+2m_\eta^4 \tilde{m}_\rho^4$ " should be replaced by " $+m_\eta^4 \tilde{m}_\rho^4$ ", as above in Eq.(9). Emphasize that all evaluations in Ref. [19] were done with the correct formula.

The term of the interference between the signal and the background processes is written in the following way:

$$\frac{d\Gamma_{int}(m)}{dm} = \frac{(m_\phi^2 - m^2)p_{\pi\eta}}{128\pi^3 m_\phi^3} \int_{-1}^1 dx A_{int}(m, x), \quad (11)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}A_{int}(m, x) &= \frac{2}{3} Re \sum M_a M_B^* = \frac{1}{3} \left((m^2 - m_\phi^2) \tilde{m}_\rho^2 + \frac{m_\phi^2 (\tilde{m}_\rho^2 - m_\eta^2)^2}{m_\phi^2 - m^2} \right) \times \\ &Re \left\{ \frac{e^{i\delta} g(m) g_{a_0 K^+ K^-} g_{a_0 \pi \eta} g_{\phi \rho \pi} g_{\rho \eta \gamma}}{D_\rho^*(\tilde{m}_\rho) D_{a_0}(m)} \right\}.\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

Note that the phase δ isn't taken into account in [19]. The inverse propagator of the scalar meson R (a_0 in our case), is presented in Refs. [21,22,5,7]:

$$D_R(m) = m_R^2 - m^2 + \sum_{ab} [Re \Pi_R^{ab}(m_R^2) - \Pi_R^{ab}(m^2)], \quad (13)$$

where $\sum_{ab} [Re \Pi_R^{ab}(m_R^2) - \Pi_R^{ab}(m^2)] = Re \Pi_R(m_R^2) - \Pi_R(m^2)$ takes into account the finite width corrections of the resonance which are the one loop contribution to the self-energy of the R resonance from the two-particle intermediate ab states.

For the pseudoscalar ab mesons and $m_a \geq m_b$, $m \geq m_+$ one has [21,22,9,3,23]¹:

$$\begin{aligned}\Pi_R^{ab}(m^2) &= \frac{g_{Rab}^2}{16\pi} \left[\frac{m_+ m_-}{\pi m^2} \ln \frac{m_b}{m_a} + \right. \\ &\left. + \rho_{ab} \left(i + \frac{1}{\pi} \ln \frac{\sqrt{m^2 - m_-^2} - \sqrt{m^2 - m_+^2}}{\sqrt{m^2 - m_-^2} + \sqrt{m^2 - m_+^2}} \right) \right]\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

For $m_- \leq m < m_+$

¹Note that in Ref. [21] $\Pi_R^{ab}(m^2)$ differs by a real constant from those determined in other enumerated works in the case of $m_a \neq m_b$, but obviously it has no effect on Eq.(13).

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_R^{ab}(m^2) &= \frac{g_{Rab}^2}{16\pi} \left[\frac{m_+ m_-}{\pi m^2} \ln \frac{m_b}{m_a} - |\rho_{ab}(m)| + \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{2}{\pi} |\rho_{ab}(m)| \arctan \frac{\sqrt{m_+^2 - m^2}}{\sqrt{m^2 - m_-^2}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

For $m < m_-$

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_R^{ab}(m^2) &= \frac{g_{Rab}^2}{16\pi} \left[\frac{m_+ m_-}{\pi m^2} \ln \frac{m_b}{m_a} - \right. \\ &\left. - \frac{1}{\pi} \rho_{ab}(m) \ln \frac{\sqrt{m_+^2 - m^2} - \sqrt{m_-^2 - m^2}}{\sqrt{m_+^2 - m^2} + \sqrt{m_-^2 - m^2}} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and

$$\rho_{ab}(m) = \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{m_+^2}{m^2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{m_-^2}{m^2}\right)}, \quad m_{\pm} = m_a \pm m_b \quad (17)$$

The constants g_{Rab} are related to the width

$$\Gamma(R \rightarrow ab, m) = \frac{g_{Rab}^2}{16\pi m} \rho_{ab}(m). \quad (18)$$

In our case we take into account intermediate states $ab = \eta\pi^0$, $K\bar{K}$ and $\eta'\pi^0$:

$$\Pi_{a_0} = \Pi_{a_0}^{\eta\pi^0} + \Pi_{a_0}^{K^+K^-} + \Pi_{a_0}^{K^0\bar{K}^0} + \Pi_{a_0}^{\eta'\pi^0}, \quad (19)$$

$g_{a_0 K^+ K^-} = -g_{a_0 K^0 \bar{K}^0}$. Note that the $\eta'\pi^0$ contribution is of small importance due to the high threshold. Even fitting with $|g_{a_0 \eta' \pi^0}| = 0$ changes the results less than 10% of their errors. We set $|g_{a_0 \eta' \pi^0}| = |1.13 g_{a_0 K^+ K^-}|$ according to the four-quark model, see [5], but this is practically the same as the 2-quark model prediction $|g_{a_0 \eta' \pi^0}| = |1.2 g_{a_0 K^+ K^-}|$, see [5].

The inverse propagator of the ρ meson has the following expression

$$D_\rho(m) = m_\rho^2 - m^2 - im^2 \frac{g_{\rho\pi\pi}^2}{48\pi} \left(1 - \frac{4m_\pi^2}{m^2}\right)^{3/2}. \quad (20)$$

The coupling constants $g_{\phi K^+ K^-} = 4.376 \pm 0.074$ and $g_{\phi\rho\pi} = 0.814 \pm 0.018 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ are taken from the new most precise measurement Ref. [24]. Note that in Ref. [16,19] the value $g_{\phi K^+ K^-} = 4.59$ was obtained using the [26] data. The coupling constant $g_{\rho\eta\gamma} = 0.56 \pm 0.05 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ is obtained from the data of Ref. [25] with the help of the expression

$$\Gamma(\rho \rightarrow \eta\gamma) = \frac{g_{\rho\eta\gamma}^2}{96\pi m_\rho^3} (m_\rho^2 - m_\eta^2)^3. \quad (21)$$

FIGURES




FIG. 1. The comparison of fit 1 (solid line) with the KLOE data (points). The signal contribution and the interference term are shown with the dashed line and the dotted line. Cross points are omitted in fitting. The box point (0.999 GeV) is omitted in fits 3 and 4.

III. RESULTS

The KLOE data on the $\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ decay may be found in Table 5 of Ref. [18] (see also Fig.1). Note that as in Refs. [16,18], we don't fit 1st,10th and 27th points of this table (cross points in the Fig. 1). Emphasize that the 10th (1.014 GeV) and 27th (1.019 GeV) points are obvious artifacts because the mass spectrum behaviour on the right slope of the resonance has the form the (photon energy)³ according to gauge invariance.

In the experiment the whole mass region ($m_\eta + m_{\pi^0}, m_\phi$) is divided into some number of bins. Experimenters measure the average value \bar{B}_i ("i" is the number of bin) of $dBr(\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)/dm$ around each i-th bin:

$$\bar{B}_i = \frac{1}{m_{i+1} - m_i} \int_{m_i}^{m_{i+1}} dBr(\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)/dm, \quad (22)$$

In this case one should define χ^2 function as:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \frac{(\bar{B}_i^{th} - \bar{B}_i^{exp})^2}{\sigma_i^2}, \quad (23)$$

where \bar{B}_i^{exp} are the experimental results, σ_i are the experimental errors, and

$$\bar{B}_i^{th} = \frac{1}{m_{i+1} - m_i} \int_{m_i}^{m_{i+1}} dBr^{th}(\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)/dm$$

($dBr^{th}(\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)/dm$ is the theoretical curve).

The free parameters of the fit are m_{a_0} , $g_{a_0K^+K^-}^2/4\pi$, the phase δ (we assume it is constant) and the ratio $g_{a_0\eta\pi}/g_{a_0K^+K^-}$. The results are shown in Table 1 (fit 1) ².

The quality of the fit is good. The phase δ is consistent with zero, so we make a fit with $\delta = 0$ (fit 2 in Table 1).

To check the correctness of treating the phase δ as a constant, we have done a fit with δ taken in the form $\delta(m) = bp_{\eta\pi}(m)$ (the phase of the elastic background in $\eta\pi^0$ scattering may have such behaviour), and found out that the constant $b=(2.8 \pm 3.2)$ GeV⁻¹ is also consistent with zero. Change of the other values is not principal.

Table 1.

fit	m_{a_0} , MeV	$\frac{g_{a_0K^+K^-}^2}{4\pi}$, GeV ²	$g_{a_0\eta\pi}/g_{a_0K^+K^-}$	δ , °	$\chi^2/n.d.f.$
1	1003_{-13}^{+32}	$0.82_{-0.27}^{+0.81}$	$1.06_{-0.27}^{+0.20}$	27 ± 29	24.2/20
2	995_{-8}^{+22}	$0.65_{-0.18}^{+0.42}$	$1.17_{-0.24}^{+0.17}$	0	25.2/21
3	994_{-8}^{+22}	$0.62_{-0.17}^{+0.4}$	$1.21_{-0.24}^{+0.17}$	21 ± 30	16.3/19
4	992_{-7}^{+14}	$0.55_{-0.13}^{+0.27}$	$1.26_{-0.2}^{+0.16}$	0	16.9/20

Since the discrepancy between fits and the experimental point number 26 (0.999 GeV) in the Table 5 of Ref. [18] (the box point in Fig.1) is about 3 standard deviations (i.e. this point may be an artifact also), we make another fit without this point (fit 3). The phase δ is again consistent with zero, so we make a fit without it (fit 4).

In Table 2 we present the results on the total branching ratio $\text{Br}(\phi \rightarrow (a_0\gamma + \rho\pi^0) \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)$, the signal contribution $\text{Br}(\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)$, $\Gamma_{a_0\eta\pi^0} \equiv \Gamma(a_0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0, m_{a_0}) = g_{a_0\eta\pi}^2 \rho_{\eta\pi^0}(m_{a_0})/(16\pi m_{a_0})$ and the ratio $R = g_{f_0K^+K^-}^2/g_{a_0K^+K^-}^2$. The last is obtained using the Ref. [17] value $g_{f_0K^+K^-}^2/(4\pi) = 2.79 \pm 0.12$ GeV². The branching ratio of the background $\text{Br}(\phi \rightarrow \rho\pi^0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)$ accounts for $(0.5 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-5}$.

Table 2.

fit	$\Gamma_{a_0\eta\pi^0}$, MeV	R	$10^5 \times \text{Br}(\phi \rightarrow (a_0\gamma + \rho\pi^0) \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)$	$10^5 \times \text{Br}(\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)$
1	153_{-17}^{+22}	3.4 ± 1.7	7.6 ± 0.4	7.3 ± 0.4
2	148_{-15}^{+17}	4.3 ± 1.7	7.6 ± 0.4	7.1 ± 0.4
3	149_{-16}^{+19}	4.5 ± 1.7	7.6 ± 0.4	7.2 ± 0.4
4	146_{-15}^{+17}	5.0 ± 1.6	7.6 ± 0.4	7.1 ± 0.4

IV. CONCLUSION

Note that the obtained value of the ratio $g_{a_0\eta\pi}/g_{a_0K^+K^-}$ doesn't contradict the first predictions based on the four-quark model of the a_0 : $g_{a_0\eta\pi}/g_{a_0K^+K^-} \approx 0.85$ [5]³. But even if

²Note that fitting without averaging the theoretical curve (changing $\bar{B}_i^{th} \rightarrow d\text{Br}^{th}(\phi \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma)/dm \Big|_{m=(m_{i+1}+m_i)/2}$) results to worse $\chi^2/n.d.f. = 28.8/20$. The results in this case are consistent within errors with those obtained with averaging the theoretical curve.

³Note that the prediction $g_{a_0\eta\pi}/g_{a_0K^+K^-} \approx 0.93$, made in [1], was corrected in [27]

$g_{a_0\eta\pi}/g_{a_0K^+K^-}$ deviates from 0.85, there is no tragedy, because those variant of the four-quark model is rather rough, it is considered as a guide.

For all fits the obtained value R differs from the [16] value $R = 7.0 \pm 0.7$. So the conclusion that the constant $g_{a_0K^+K^-}^2/(4\pi)$ is small, obtained in [16,18] ($g_{a_0K^+K^-}^2/(4\pi) = 0.4 \pm 0.04 \text{ GeV}^2$), is the result of the parameters restrictions, especially fixing m_{a_0} at the PDG-2000 value 984.8 MeV. Note that a high a_0 mass is also needed to describe $\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0$ experiment, see [28].

There should be no confusion due to the large a_0 width. In the peripheral production of the a_0 (for example, in the reaction $\pi^- p \rightarrow \eta\pi^0 n$) the mass spectrum is given by the relation

$$\frac{dN_{\eta\pi^0}}{dm} \sim S_{per}(m) = \frac{2m^2 \Gamma(a_0 \rightarrow \eta\pi^0, m)}{\pi |D_{a_0}(m)|^2}. \quad (24)$$

The effective (visible) width of this distribution is much less then the nominal width $\Gamma_{a_0\eta\pi^0}$. For example, for the fit 1 results (Table 1) the effective width is $\sim 50 \text{ MeV}$, see Fig. 2.




FIG. 2. Plot of the function $S_{per}(m)$, GeV^{-1} , for fit 1 results.

As it is noted in Ref. [29], there is no tragedy with the relation between branching ratios of a_0 and f_0 production in ϕ radiative decays. The early predictions [5] are based on the one-loop mechanism $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow a_0\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma$ and $\phi \rightarrow K^+K^- \rightarrow f_0\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma$ at $m_{a_0} = 980 \text{ MeV}$, $m_{f_0} = 975 \text{ MeV}$ and $g_{a_0K^+K^-} = g_{f_0K^+K^-}$ ⁴, that leads to $\text{Br}(\phi \rightarrow a_0\gamma \rightarrow \eta\pi^0\gamma) \approx \text{Br}(\phi \rightarrow f_0\gamma \rightarrow \pi\pi\gamma)$. But it is shown in Ref. [7], that the relation between branching ratios of a_0 and f_0 production in ϕ radiative decays essentially depends on a $a_0 - f_0$ mass splitting. This strong mass dependence is the result of gauge invariance, the (photon energy)³ law on the right slope of the resonance. Our present analysis confirms this conclusion. Note

⁴Emphasize that the isotopic invariance doesn't require $g_{a_0K^+K^-} = g_{f_0K^+K^-}$.

that a noticeable deviation from the naive four-quark model equality $g_{a_0 K^+ K^-} = g_{f_0 K^+ K^-}$ is not crucial. What is more important is the mechanism of the production of the a_0 and f_0 through the charged kaon loop, i.e. the four-quark transition. As is shown in Ref. [4], this gives strong evidence in favor of the four-quark model of the $a_0(f_0)$.

Note that the constant $g_{f_0 K^+ K^-}^2/(4\pi)$ also can differ a lot from those obtained in [17]. The point is that the extraction of this constant is very model dependent. For example, fitting with taking into account the mixing of the resonances can decrease the value of $g_{f_0 K^+ K^-}^2/(4\pi)$ considerably. For instance, fitting the data of [14] without mixing one has $g_{f_0 K^+ K^-}^2/(4\pi) = 2.47_{-0.51}^{+0.37} \text{ GeV}^2$ [14], while fitting with taking the mixing into account gives $g_{f_0 K^+ K^-}^2/(4\pi) = 1.29 \pm 0.017 \text{ GeV}^2$ [19]. Note also that in [17] the phase δ_B of the background is taken from the work [19], where it is obtained by the simultaneous fitting the $m_{\pi^0 \pi^0}$ spectrum and the phase δ_0 of the $\pi\pi$ scattering, taking into account the mixing of the resonances. In [17] the mixing isn't taken into account, so additional phase dealing with it is omitted.

V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank C. Bini very much for providing the useful information, discussions and kind contacts. This work was supported in part by RFBR, Grant No 02-02-16061.

REFERENCES

- [1] R.L. Jaffe, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 267, 281 (1977).
- [2] L. Montanet, Rep. Prog. Phys. **46**, 337 (1983); F.E. Close, Rep. Prog. Phys. **51**, 833 (1988); L.G. Landsberg, Usp. Fiz. Nauk. **160**, 3 (1990) [Sov. Phys. Usp. **33**, 1 (1990)]; M.R. Pennington, HADRON '95, Proceedings of the 6h International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy, Manchester, UK, 10th-14th July 1995, Eds. M.C. Birse, G.D. Lafferty, and J.A. McGovern, page 3, World Scientific, Singapore; T. Barnes, HADRON SPECTROSCOPY, VII International Conference, Upton, NY August 1997, Eds. S.U. Chung, H.J. Willutzki, AIP CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS 432, page 3; C. Am- sler, Rev.Mod.Phys. **70**, 1293 (1998); Muneyuki Ishida, Shin Ishida, and Taku Ishida, Prog.Theor.Phys. **99**, 1031 (1998); S. Godfrey and J. Napolitano, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 1411 (1999); P. Minkowski and W. Ochs, Eur. Phys. J. C **9**, 283 (1999); O. Black, A. Fariborz, F. Sannino, and J. Schechter, Phys.Rev. D **59**, 074026 (1999); S. Spanier and N.A. Törnqvist, Eur. Phys. J. C **15**, 437 (2000).
- [3] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin and G.N. Shestakov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk. **142**, 361 (1984) [Sov. Phys. Usp. **27**, 161 (1984)]; N.N. Achasov and G.N. Shestakov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk. **161** (6), 53 (1991)[Sov. Phys. Usp. **34** (6), 471 (1991)]; N.N. Achasov, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **21**, 189 (1991); N.N. Achasov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk. **168**, 1257 (1998) [Phys. Usp. **41**, 1149 (1998)]. N.N. Achasov, Nucl. Phys. A **675**, 279c (2000).
- [4] N.N. Achasov (Plenary session talk), HADRON SPECTROSCOPY, Ninth International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy, Protvino, Russia 25 August – 1 September 2001, HADRON 2001, edited by D. Amelin and A.M. Zaitsev, AIP CONFERENCE PRO- CEEDINGS, Vol. 619, p. 112; N.N. Achasov, hep-ph/0201299.
- [5] N.N. Achasov and V.N. Ivanchenko, Nucl. Phys. B **315**, 465 (1989); Preprint INP 87-129 (1987) Novosibirsk.
- [6] A. Bramon, A. Grau, and G. Pancheri, Phys.Lett. B **289**, 97 (1992); F.E. Close, N. Isgur, and S. Kumano, Nucl. Phys. B **389**, 513 (1993); J.L. Lucio, M. Napsuciale, Phys. Lett. B **331**, 418 (1994).
- [7] N.N. Achasov and V.V. Gubin, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 4084 (1997); Yad. Fiz. **61**, 274 (1998) [Phys. At. Nucl. **61**, 224 (1998)].
- [8] N.N. Achasov, V.V. Gubin, and V.I. Shevchenko, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 203 (1997); Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **12**, 5019 (1997); Yad. Fiz. **60**, 89 (1997) [Phys. At. Nucl. **60**, 81 (1997)].
- [9] N.N. Achasov, V.V. Gubin, and E.P. Solodov, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 2672 (1997); Yad. Fiz. **60**, 1279 (1997) [Phys. At. Nucl. **60**, 1152 (1997)].
- [10] N.N. Achasov and V.V. Gubin, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 1987 (1998); Yad. Fiz. **61**, 1473 (1998) [Phys. At. Nucl. **61**, 1367 (1998)].
- [11] M.N. Achasov et al., Phys. Lett. B438, 441 (1998).
- [12] M.N. Achasov et al., Phys. Lett. B440, 442 (1998).
- [13] M.N. Achasov et al., Phys. Lett. B479, 53 (2000).
- [14] M.N.Achasov et al., Phys. Lett. B485, 349 (2000).
- [15] R.R. Akhmetshin et al., Phys. Lett. B462, 380 (1999).
- [16] KLOE Collaboration, A.Aloisio et al., Phys. Lett. B536 (2002).
- [17] KLOE Collaboration, A.Aloisio et al., Phys. Lett. B537 (2002).
- [18] C. Bini, S. Giovanella, D. Leone, and S. Miscetti, KLOE Note 173 06/02, <http://www.lnf.infn.it/kloe/>.

- [19] N.N. Achasov, V.V. Gubin, Phys.Rev.D63,094007 (2001); Yad. Fiz. **65**, 1566 (2002) [Phys. At. Nucl. **65**, 1528 (2002)].
- [20] N.N. Achasov and V.V. Gubin, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 094016 (2001); Yad. Fiz. **65**, 1939 (2002) [Phys. At. Nucl. **65**, 1887 (2002)].
- [21] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, and G.N. Shestakov, Yad. Fiz. **32**, 1098 (1980)[Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **32**, 566 (1980)].
- [22] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, and G.N. Shestakov, Z. Phys. C22(1984), 56-61.
- [23] N.N. Achasov, *THE SECOND DAΦNE PHYSICS HANDBOOK*, Vol. II, edited by L. Maiani, G. Pancheri, N. Paver, dei Laboratory Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy (May 1995), p. 671.
- [24] M.N. Achasov et al, Phys. Rev D63, 072002 (2001).
- [25] Particle Data Group-2002: K. Hagiwara et al., Phys. Rev. D66 010001 (2002)
- [26] Particle Data Group-2000: D. E. Groom et al., Eur. Phys. J. **C15**, 1 (2000).
- [27] N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin, and G.N. Shestakov, Phys. Lett. B108, 134(1982); N.N. Achasov, S.A. Devyanin and G.N. Shestakov, Z. Phys. C16 (1982), 55.
- [28] N.N. Achasov and G.N. Shestakov, Z. Phys. C41 (1988), 309.
- [29] N.N. Achasov and A.V. Kiselev, Phys. Lett. B534 (2002), 83.