

UAB-FT/97-412
hep-ph/yymmxxx
March 1997

**MIXING OF η - η' MESONS IN J/ψ DECAYS INTO
A VECTOR AND A PSEUDOSCALAR MESON**

A. BRAMON^a, R. ESCRIBANO^{a,b} and M. D. SCADRON^c

^aDepartament de Física and ^bInstitut de Física d'Altes Energies,
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, E-08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain

^cPhysics Department, University of Arizona,
Tucson, AZ 85721, USA

ABSTRACT

The octet-singlet mixing angle θ_P in the pseudoscalar meson nonet is deduced from the rich set of accurate data on J/ψ decays into a vector and a pseudoscalar meson. Corrections due to non-ideal ω - ϕ mixing have been included for the first time and turn out to be crucial to find $\theta_P = -16.9^\circ \pm 1.7^\circ$, which is appreciably less negative than previous results coming from similar analyses.

The value of the η - η' mixing angle θ_P in the pseudoscalar-meson nonet has been discussed many times in the last thirty years. A well-known contribution to this discussion is the phenomenological analysis performed by Gilman and Kauffman [1] almost a decade ago. The approximate value $\theta_P \simeq -20^\circ$ was proposed by these authors through a rather exhaustive discussion of the experimental evidence available at that time. Another, more recent analysis by two of the present authors [2] concluded that a somewhat less negative value, $\theta_P = -14^\circ \pm 2^\circ$, seems to be favoured. A significant difference between these two independent analyses concerns the set of rich data on J/ψ decays into a vector and a pseudoscalar meson, $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$, which were included in the first analysis [1] but not in the second one [2]. The purpose of the present note is to extract a value for θ_P from this relevant set of $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ decay data. In this sense, we will follow quite closely the similar analyses in Refs. [3, 4, 5] except that the apparently negligible effects of non-ideal mixing in the vector-meson nonet will be now taken into account. Ignoring these effects, *i.e.*, assuming that the physical ω and ϕ coincide precisely with the ideally mixed states $\omega_0 \equiv (u\bar{u} + d\bar{d})/\sqrt{2}$ and $\phi_0 \equiv s\bar{s}$, lead to $\theta_P = -19.2^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ$ (Ref. [3]), $\theta_P = -19.1^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ$ (Ref. [4]) and $\theta_P \simeq -20^\circ$ (Ref. [5]). Introducing the small, but certainly non-vanishing, departure of ω and ϕ from the above ideally mixed states ω_0 and ϕ_0 , and using essentially the same set of $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ data as in Refs. [3, 4, 5], we will obtain $\theta_P = -16.9^\circ \pm 1.7^\circ$.

Experimental information concerning strong and electromagnetic J/ψ decays into a vector and a pseudoscalar meson, $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ with $V = \rho, \omega, \phi$ or K^* and $P = \pi, \eta, \eta'$ or K , comes mainly from the MARK III [3] and DM2 [4] detectors. We have collected all this information on the $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ branching ratios (BR), as averaged by the PDG compilation [6], in the first column of Table 1. The highly accurate value for $BR(\rho\pi)$ comes from Ref. [3] and other papers listed in [6]; the upper limit for $BR(\phi\pi)$ has been established by [3]; and the nine remaining BR 's, with relative experimental errors ranging from about 8 to 17 %, come from Refs. [3] and [4]. Altogether they constitute an excellent and exhaustive set of data which remains unchanged in the recent editions of the PDG compilations. Part of these data were already used in the analyses of Refs. [3, 4, 5]; our purpose here consists also in improving these analyses by using the complete set.

Attempts to understand these decays in a phenomenological context started immediately after the appearance of the data and all these attempts were based on the same essential model with slight variations [3, 4, 5, 7]. The dominant piece of the amplitude is unanimously assumed to proceed through the annihilation of the initial $c\bar{c}$ pair into the $SU(3)$ -flavorless part of the final VP system via three (or more) gluons; we will denote this strong

interaction piece of the amplitude by g . The non-vanishing of the $BR(\omega\pi)$ and the differences between the BR 's into charged or neutral $K^*\bar{K} + K\bar{K}^*$ systems, clearly requires an electromagnetic piece in the amplitude coupling to both the isoscalar and isovector parts of the final VP ; this correction to the dominant part of the amplitude will be denoted by e (the phase of e relative to g is defined to be θ_e). Apart from these two contributions, associated to “connected” diagrams, a good fit is achieved only if “disconnected” (Ref. [3]) or, equivalently, “doubly-OZI-violating” (Ref. [4]) diagrams are introduced too; their contribution to the amplitude will be denoted by rg , with $r < 1$ being the ratio between this latter correction and the dominant piece g . The explicit amplitudes of Ref. [4] are then easily obtained (with our gs terms called h in Ref. [4]),

$$\begin{aligned}
A(\rho\pi) &= g + e , \\
A(K^{*\pm}K^\mp) &= g(1 - s) + e(2 - x) , \\
A(K^{*0}\bar{K}^0) &= g(1 - s) - 2e(1 + x)/2 , \\
A(\omega_0\eta) &= (g + e)X_\eta + \sqrt{2}rg(\sqrt{2}X_\eta + Y_\eta) , \\
A(\omega_0\eta') &= (g + e)X_{\eta'} + \sqrt{2}rg(\sqrt{2}X_{\eta'} + Y_{\eta'}) , \\
A(\phi_0\eta) &= [g(1 - 2s) - 2ex]Y_\eta + rg(1 - s)(\sqrt{2}X_\eta + Y_\eta) , \\
A(\phi_0\eta') &= [g(1 - 2s) - 2ex]Y_{\eta'} + rg(1 - s)(\sqrt{2}X_{\eta'} + Y_{\eta'}) , \\
A(\rho\eta) &= 3eX_\eta , \\
A(\rho\eta') &= 3eX_{\eta'} , \\
A(\omega_0\pi^0) &= 3e , \\
A(\phi_0\pi^0) &= 0 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $X_\eta = Y_{\eta'} = \cos\phi_P$ and $X_{\eta'} = -Y_\eta = \sin\phi_P$, and the first three amplitudes include all final particle charge states. The two η - η' mixing angles, θ_P and $\phi_P \equiv \theta_P + 54.7^\circ$, refer to the octet-singlet and non-strange–strange basis, respectively,

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta &\equiv \cos\theta_P\eta_8 - \sin\theta_P\eta_1 \equiv \cos\phi_P(u\bar{u} + d\bar{d})/\sqrt{2} - \sin\phi_P s\bar{s} , \\
\eta' &\equiv \sin\theta_P\eta_8 + \cos\theta_P\eta_1 \equiv \sin\phi_P(u\bar{u} + d\bar{d})/\sqrt{2} + \cos\phi_P s\bar{s} .
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The parameters s and x in Eq. (1) account for $SU(3)$ -breaking corrections penalizing the creation of strange quarks over non-strange ones; s is left as a free parameter, but x is fixed to $x = 0.64$ in the DM2 analysis [4]. This latter value can be qualitatively understood as the ratio of non-strange to strange constituent quark masses arising from the quark propagators [8, 9]. Alternatively, one can fix x to its $SU(3)$ -symmetric value, $x = 1$, as in the MARK III analysis [3]. The amplitudes used in Ref. [3] follow from Eq. (1) by simply

fixing $x = 1$ and ignoring (second order) correction terms proportional to sr . The differences in our results induced by this different treatment of non-leading corrections will be later used to estimate the theoretical uncertainties associated to the model.

We have now the possibility of performing the fits corresponding to the slightly different models in Refs. [3] and [4] using now the whole set of data. The various branching ratios, $BR(VP)$, are simply related to the corresponding amplitude in Eq. (1) by $BR(VP) = |A(VP)|^2 |p_V^-|^3$, where $BR(VP)$ is given in 10^{-3} if the V -meson momentum in the phase-space factor is given in GeV . Proceeding precisely either as in Ref. [3] or as in Ref. [4], our fit to the whole set of data leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_P &= -19.6^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ (x = 1) , \\ \theta_P &= -18.9^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ (x = 0.64) ,\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

with χ^2 -values for 4 degrees of freedom (d.o.f.) of 7.3 or 6.2, respectively. Our results for the mixing angle are therefore quite consistent with those coming from the two previous analyses leading to $\theta_P = -19.2^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ$ [3] and $\theta_P = -19.1^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ$ [4], where different subsets of the presently available (and consistent) data had been used. We can also attempt a global fit with the amplitudes proposed in Ref. [5] which differ from those in Eq. (1) only in non-leading sr terms and the value of x ($x = 0.70$). We obtain $\theta_P = -19.4^\circ \pm 1.4^\circ$ in agreement with $\theta_P = -20.2^\circ$ from Ref. [5] (Solution II) but with a poor $\chi^2 = 12.3$ for 4 d.o.f. A similar value, $\theta_P \simeq -19^\circ$, was obtained in Ref. [7]. Averaging the values in Eq. (3) and estimating from their difference (or from this whole discussion) the uncertainties in the model, one can safely conclude that $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ data favour the value $\theta_P = -19.3^\circ \pm 1.7^\circ$ for the η - η' mixing angle if ω and ϕ are assumed to coincide with the ideally mixed states ω_0 and ϕ_0 .

The possibility of improving our previous fits and modifying our latter value for the η - η' mixing angle is apparent if one simply restricts the analysis to the subset of data in Table 1 which do not involve ω and ϕ . For instance, from the ratio between $BR(\rho\eta')$ and $BR(\rho\eta)$, which is proportional to $\tan^2 \phi_P$, one immediately obtains $\phi_P = 40.0^\circ \pm 3.3^\circ$ or, equivalently, $\theta_P = -14.7^\circ \pm 3.3^\circ$. Similarly, performing a partial fit to the six BR 's with $V \neq \omega, \phi$ leads to $\theta_P = -14.5^\circ \pm 2.8^\circ$ (with $x = 1$, as in [3], and $\chi^2 = 0.62$ for one d.o.f.) and to the same value $\theta_P = -14.5^\circ \pm 2.8^\circ$ (with $x = 0.64$, as in [4], and $\chi^2 = 0.62$ for one d.o.f.). In all these cases, the value for θ_P turns out to be considerably less negative than the values in Eq. (3). This strongly suggests that a more detailed analysis incorporating the small, but unambiguously established, ω - ϕ mixing effects can be particularly relevant. The rest of the present note is devoted to this kind of analysis.

The departure from ω - ϕ “ideal” mixing is usually parametrized by the small angle ϕ_V defined through

$$\begin{aligned}\omega &\equiv \cos \phi_V \omega_0 - \sin \phi_V \phi_0 , \\ \phi &\equiv \sin \phi_V \omega_0 + \cos \phi_V \phi_0 ,\end{aligned}\tag{4}$$

where from now on ω and ϕ refer to the physical states and ω_0 and ϕ_0 refer to the ideally mixed states $(u\bar{u} + d\bar{d})/\sqrt{2}$ and $s\bar{s}$ used so far. The value of the ω - ϕ mixing angle is well known and will be fixed to

$$\sin \phi_V \simeq \tan \phi_V = +0.059 \pm 0.004 ,\tag{5}$$

or $\phi_V \simeq +3.4^\circ$. The modulus of $\tan \phi_V$ can be obtained via the well-known and clearly understood ratio [6, 8]

$$\Gamma(\phi \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma) / \Gamma(\omega \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma) = \tan^2 \phi_V |p_\phi / p_\omega|^3 = (8.10 \pm 0.94) \times 10^{-3} ,\tag{6}$$

and is fully compatible with the values coming from the squared Gell-Mann–Okubo mass formula ($\phi_V \sim 39^\circ - 35.3^\circ \sim +3.7^\circ$, see Ref. [6]) and from ω - ϕ interference in $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ data (see Ref. [10]). Apart from confirming the modulus of $\tan \phi_V$, these latter data fix unambiguously its phase too.

An improved description of the J/ψ decay amplitudes into $P = \eta, \eta'$ and $V = \omega, \phi$ can now be immediately obtained from Eqs. (1), (4) and (5), and the corresponding fits to the same global set of data can be performed as before. The results of these fits are shown in the second and third columns of Table 1. For the η - η' mixing angle one now obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_P &= -17.3^\circ \pm 1.3^\circ (x = 1) , \\ \theta_P &= -16.6^\circ \pm 1.3^\circ (x = 0.64) ,\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

which are values significantly less negative (by almost 2 standard deviations) than the corresponding ones, Eqs. (3), obtained neglecting ω - ϕ mixing effects. The quality of the fits has also been slightly improved to $\chi^2 = 6.0$ and 5.4 for the same four d.o.f. as before; indeed, the only difference between the fits leading to (3) or to (7) is having fixed the value of ϕ_V either to 0 or to 3.4 degrees. If the value of ϕ_V is left as a free parameter to be fixed through $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ decay data, one then obtains $\theta_P = -16.9^\circ \pm 2.6^\circ$, $\phi_V = 4.0^\circ \pm 3.2^\circ$ and $\chi^2 = 6.0/3$ d.o.f. (for $x = 1$, Ref. [3]) or $\theta_P = -16.8^\circ \pm 2.7^\circ$, $\phi_V = 3.1^\circ \pm 3.2^\circ$ and $\chi^2 = 5.4/3$ d.o.f. ($x = 0.64$, Ref. [4]). These latter results suggest that in the set of $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ decay data *alone* there are indications of slightly non-ideal ω - ϕ mixing compatible with Eq. (5) thus confirming our whole approach. Obviously, the previously discussed information on ϕ_V ,

Eq. (5), coming from non- J/ψ physics has to be taken into account too, as we did when obtaining our values for θ_P in Eqs. (7). Taking their average and estimating the theoretical error as before leads to

$$\theta_P = -16.9^\circ \pm 1.7^\circ, \quad (8)$$

which seems to us the most reasonable value for the η - η' mixing angle that one can extract from the available $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ decay data.

Our final value $\theta_P = -16.9^\circ \pm 1.7^\circ$ is somehow in between the values $\theta_P \simeq -20^\circ$ and $\theta_P = -14^\circ \pm 2^\circ$ obtained in the old but more general analyses in Refs. [1, 2]. A similarly exhaustive analysis, including all the relevant experimental information, is presently in progress. A recent discussion involving several channels concludes independently that θ_P can range between -20 and -17 degrees [11]. Also, the dedicated analysis by the Crystal Barrel Collaboration [12] (not discussed by the previous authors) favours $\theta_P = -17.3^\circ \pm 1.8^\circ$, quite in line with our final result (8). A further confirmation comes from the recent analysis of semileptonic D_s decays [13] favouring a mixing angle in the range $-18^\circ \leq \theta_P \leq -10^\circ$ with the best agreement observed for $\theta_P = -14^\circ$. However, a crucial test for the value of θ_P is expected to come in a near future from DAΦNE, where the ratio $R_\phi \equiv \Gamma(\phi \rightarrow \eta'\gamma)/\Gamma(\phi \rightarrow \eta\gamma)$ will be accurately measured; an analysis following Ref. [2] predicts $R_\phi = 7.6 \times 10^{-3}$ for $\theta_P = -20^\circ$ and $R_\phi = 6.2 \times 10^{-3}$ for our slightly less negative value $\theta_P = -16.9^\circ$. Our prediction for the branching ratio $J/\psi \rightarrow \phi\pi^0$ are not much below the available experimental upper limit (see Table 1). A measurement of this $BR(\phi\pi^0)$ would also be crucial to confirm or falsify our approach.

One can use our value for θ_P to estimate the parameter Δ (see Ref. [6]) or Δ_M (see Ref. [14]) accounting for the violation of the Gell-Mann–Okubo mass formula,

$$m_{88}^2 = \frac{1}{3}(4m_K^2 - m_\pi^2)\{1 + \Delta\} \equiv \frac{1}{3}(4m_K^2 - m_\pi^2) + \frac{4}{3}(m_K^2 - m_\pi^2)\Delta_M. \quad (9)$$

From these Eqs., our result (8) and the well-known relation $\theta_P = -10.1^\circ(1 + 8.5\Delta)$ [6], one obtains $\Delta_M = 0.074 \pm 0.019$ quite in line with $\Delta_M = 0.065 \pm 0.065$ coming from the recent analysis in Ref. [14]. Moreover, from the discussion in Ref. [15] one has

$$\left(\frac{\hat{m} + m_s}{\hat{m}}\right)\{1 + \Delta_M\} = \frac{m_{K^0}^2 + m_{K^+}^2 - r_D(m_{\pi^+}^2 - m_{\pi^0}^2)}{m_{\pi^0}^2}, \quad (10)$$

where $2\hat{m} \equiv m_u + m_d$ and $r_D \simeq 1.8 \pm 0.2$ accounts for the departure from the Dashen theorem value, $r_D = 1$, of the photonic (self-energy) contribution to

pseudoscalar mass differences. From Eq. (10) one gets $m_s/\hat{m} = 24.0 \pm 0.4$ to be compared with $m_s/\hat{m} = 24.4 \pm 1.5$ from Ref. [15]. An alternative (but compatible) approach to Refs. [14, 15], based on the tadpole scheme of Coleman and Glashow [16], has been recently discussed in Ref. [17]. In that case the Dashen theorem corrections are built in (properly explaining the $SU(2)$ electromagnetic mass splittings of ground state hadrons) with $r_D = 3/2$ in Eq. (10).

In summary, from the excellent and exhaustive sets of $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ decay data measured by the MARK III and DM2 detectors, one can extract a rather accurate value for the η - η' mixing angle using widely accepted models and well-tested phenomenology. The value is found to be $\theta_P = -16.9^\circ \pm 1.7^\circ$, more than one standard deviation less negative than all previous estimates. This difference is essentially due to the introduction in our analysis of the corrections originated by the departure of ω - ϕ mixing from the ideal mixing considered by the other authors.

Acknowledgements: Thanks are due to the grants CICYT-AEN95-815 and CIRIT-96SGR-21 for financial support. M. D. S. appreciates the hospitality at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

References

- [1] F. Gilman and R. Kauffman, Phys. Rev. **D36** (1987) 2761.
- [2] A. Bramon and M. D. Scadron, Phys. Lett. **234** (1990) 346.
- [3] D. Coffman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D38** (1988) 2695.
- [4] J. Jousset *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D41** (1990) 1389.
- [5] N. Morisita *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 175.
- [6] Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 1.
- [7] A. Bramon and J. Casulleras, Z. Phys. **C32** (1986) 467.
- [8] H. H. Jones and M. D. Scadron, Nucl. Phys. **B155** (1979) 409.
- [9] M. D. Scadron, Phys. Rev. **D29** (1984) 2076.
- [10] A. Cordier *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B172** (1980) 13;
S. I. Dolinsky *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **202** (1991) 99;
A. Bramon, A. Grau and G. Pancheri, Phys. Lett. **283** (1992) 416, and
The Second Daphne Physics Handbook, 477, edited by L. Maiani, G.
Pancheri and N. Paver, INFN-LNF publication 1995.
- [11] P. Ball, J.-M. Frère and M. Tytgat, Phys. Lett. **B365** (1996) 367.
- [12] C. Amsler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B294** (1992) 451.
- [13] D. Melikhov, Phys. Lett. **B394** (1997) 385.
- [14] H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. **B374** (1996) 181.
- [15] H. Leutwyler, Phys. Lett. **B378** (1996) 313.
- [16] S. Coleman and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **6** (1961) 423; Phys.
Rev. **134** (1964) B671.
- [17] S. A. Coon and M. D. Scadron, Phys. Rev. **C51** (1995) 2923.

Table 1: Experimental $J/\psi \rightarrow VP$ branching ratios from PDG [6] and results of our fits. BR 's for all VP channels are in 10^{-3} .

	Exp. Ref. [6]	Fit (Ref. [3])	Fit (Ref. [4])
$\rho\pi$	12.8 ± 1.0	11.1 ± 0.8	11.2 ± 0.8
$K^{*+}K^- + c.c.$	5.0 ± 0.4	5.17 ± 0.51	5.05 ± 0.48
$K^{*0}\bar{K}^0 + c.c.$	4.2 ± 0.4	4.41 ± 0.56	4.48 ± 0.55
$\omega\eta$	1.58 ± 0.16	1.71 ± 0.14	1.69 ± 0.14
$\omega\eta'$	0.167 ± 0.025	0.173 ± 0.030	0.177 ± 0.031
$\phi\eta$	0.65 ± 0.07	0.665 ± 0.122	0.671 ± 0.115
$\phi\eta'$	0.33 ± 0.04	0.305 ± 0.086	0.278 ± 0.074
$\rho\eta$	0.193 ± 0.023	0.212 ± 0.019	0.209 ± 0.019
$\rho\eta'$	0.105 ± 0.018	0.0963 ± 0.0079	0.0996 ± 0.0081
$\omega\pi^0$	0.42 ± 0.06	0.373 ± 0.031	0.374 ± 0.031
$\phi\pi^0$	< 0.0068	0.0011 ± 0.0001	0.0011 ± 0.0001
g		1.065 ± 0.036	1.075 ± 0.038
s		0.097 ± 0.031	0.112 ± 0.027
e		0.117 ± 0.005	0.117 ± 0.005
θ_e		1.29 ± 0.16	1.35 ± 0.16
r		-0.148 ± 0.009	-0.151 ± 0.009
X_η		0.794 ± 0.014	0.786 ± 0.014