

ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫЙ
ИНСТИТУТ
ЯДЕРНЫХ
ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ
ДУБНА



Г-98

15/3-76

E2 - 9430

980/2-76

E.A.Ivanov

RADIATIVE DECAYS OF VECTOR MESONS
AND ω - φ MIXING

1975

E2 - 9430

E.A.Ivanov

**RADIATIVE DECAYS OF VECTOR MESONS
AND ω - φ MIXING**

Submitted to "Письма в ЖЭТФ"

Объединенный институт
ядерных исследований
Библиотека

1. Recently radiative widths $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma$ and $K_0^{*0} \rightarrow K_0 \gamma$

$$\Gamma(\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma) = 35 \pm 10 \text{ keV} \quad /1/ \quad (1)$$

$$\Gamma(K_0^{*0} \rightarrow K_0 \gamma) = 75 \pm 35 \text{ keV} \quad /2/ \quad (2)$$

have been measured. Their ratio agrees with SU(3)-prediction, /2/ but widths themselves are ~ 3 times lower than one could expect from the simplest assumptions /3,4/.

- (a) The effective VPP Lagrangian transforms as an octet;
- (b) The Lagrangian is a U-spin scalar;
- (c) The system ω - φ is described by the "mass-mixing" model /5/.

We argue that SU(3)-symmetry itself (i.e., requirements (a), (b)) does not contradict data (1),(2). For satisfactory description of the latter it is sufficient to use the "current-mixing" model /6/ of the SU(3)-breaking instead of the "mass-mixing" one. Assumption (c) can be left unaffected only if both natural assumptions (a), (b) are given up, that seems unreasonable.

2. Assumptions (a),(b),(c) result in the sum rules /3,4/

$$g_{\rho^0 \pi^0} = -\frac{1}{2} g_{K_0^{*0} K_0} = g_{K_+^{*0} K_+} \quad , \quad (3)$$

$$g_{\rho^0 \pi^0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (g_{\varphi \pi^0} \cos \theta_V - g_{\omega \pi^0} \sin \theta_V) \quad (\theta_V = 39^\circ) \quad , \quad (4)$$

where g_{VP} are the phenomenological $V \rightarrow P\ell$ decay constants

$$\Gamma(V \rightarrow P\ell) = \frac{\alpha}{24} g_{VP}^2 m_V^3 \left(1 - \frac{m_P^2}{m_V^2}\right)^3.$$

Relations (3) agree with observable values:

$$|g_{\rho^0\pi^0}| = 0.52 \pm 0.07 \text{ GeV}^{-1}; \quad |g_{K^*K_0}| = 1.03 \pm 0.25 \text{ GeV}^{-1} \quad (5)$$

and with upper limit ^{17/}

$$|g_{K^*K_+}| < 1.12 \text{ GeV}^{-1}. \quad (6)$$

At the same time, relation (4) is not satisfied by data. With experimental values $|g_{\rho\pi^0}| = 0.14 \pm 0.03 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ ^{18/} $|g_{\omega\pi^0}| = 2.50 \pm 0.12 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ ^{17/} as input it predicts:

$$1.02 \pm 0.05 \text{ GeV}^{-1} \quad \beta \equiv \text{sgn } g_{\omega\pi^0}/g_{\rho\pi^0} < 0$$

$$|g_{\rho\pi^0}| = 0.30 \pm 0.05 \text{ GeV}^{-1} \quad \beta > 0$$

that is 1.5-2 times the experimental value of constant $g_{\rho^0\pi^0}$.

To remove this difficulty one needs to relax the set of initial assumptions or to modify them.

3. The "mass-mixing" model is the simplest ω - φ mixing scheme. Just this model provides the best description of leptonic decays $\rho^0, \omega, \varphi \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$. Therefore it would not be desirable to affect assumption (a).

Assumptions (b), (c) together suggest the relation

$$g_{\rho^0\pi^0} - g_{K^*K_0} = \sqrt{3} (g_{\varphi\pi^0} \cos\theta_V - g_{\omega\pi^0} \sin\theta_V) \quad (7)$$

which disagrees with the data for any signs of constants

$g_{\rho^0\pi^0}, g_{\varphi\pi^0}$. Thus, by giving up only assumption (a) ^{x)} one improves nothing.

If the U-spin invariance is broken but assumptions (a), (c) still hold the following sum rules

$$g_{\rho^0\pi^0} + 2g_{K^*K_0} = \sqrt{3} (g_{\omega\pi^0} \sin\theta_V - g_{\varphi\pi^0} \cos\theta_V), \quad (8)$$

$$g_{K^*K_+} = -g_{\rho^0\pi^0} - g_{K^*K_0} \quad (9)$$

must take place. For $\text{sgn } g_{K^*K_0}/g_{\rho^0\pi^0} < 0$ relation (8) does not agree with data. For $\text{sgn } g_{K^*K_0}/g_{\rho^0\pi^0} > 0$ the agreement can be achieved, however, in this case relation (9) gives $|g_{K^*K_+}| = 1.55 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ that contradicts inequality (6).

Thus, in the case of the "mass-mixing" model rates (1), (2) agree neither with assumption (a) nor with assumption (b). To abandon these natural assumptions means to lose the predictive power of SU(3)-symmetry for $V \rightarrow P\ell$ decays, that seems unsatisfactory. Therefore it is natural to choose another scheme of ω - φ mixing.

4. The "current-mixing" model ^{16/} implies: ^{14/}

$$g_{\rho^0\pi^0} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{m_\rho}{m_{K^*}} g_{K^*K_0} = \frac{m_\rho}{m_{K^*}} g_{K^*K_+}, \quad (10)$$

$$g_{\rho^0\pi^0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(\frac{m_\rho}{m_\varphi} g_{\varphi\pi^0} \cos\theta_V - \frac{m_\rho}{m_\omega} g_{\omega\pi^0} \sin\theta_V \right)_{(\theta_V=26^\circ)} \quad (11)$$

^{x)} For instance, (a) may be incorrect if the electromagnetic current of hadrons contains a SU(3) invariant piece.

Relations (10) are consistent with data. Sum rule (11), in contrast to (3), gives

$$|g_{\rho\pi^0}| = \begin{matrix} 0.67 \pm 0.04 \text{ GeV}^{-1} & \beta < 0 \\ 0.57 \pm 0.04 \text{ GeV}^{-1} & \beta > 0 \end{matrix} \quad (12)$$

The lower prediction agrees very well with experimental value (5a).

The decays $V \rightarrow 2\rho$ and $\rho_s \rightarrow V\rho$ (where ρ_s denotes the ninth pseudoscalar meson, i.e., ρ' (958) or $E(1416)$) also can be described in the "current-mixing" model without contradiction with existing experimental data ^{x)}.

The conclusion is that the present experimental data on decays $V \rightarrow P\rho$ (and $P \rightarrow V\rho$) can be interpreted within the framework of assumptions (a),(b) and "current-mixing" model. It is the indication in favour just of this scheme of ω - φ mixing. (Of course, if experimental results on $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\rho$, $K_0^* \rightarrow K_0\rho$ persist).

Note that our consideration is not affected by taking into account the mixing with new vector meson $\psi(3100)$ (in the framework of SU(4) symmetry). Indeed, the ω - φ mixing angle practically is not altered ¹⁹⁾ and, besides, the contribution of constant $g_{\psi\rho^0}$ to sum rules (4),(11) is negligible ($|g_{\psi\rho^0}| \ll |g_{\rho\rho^0}|, |g_{\omega\rho^0}|$).

I am grateful to Drs. G.M. Asatryan, D.Y. Bardin, S.B. Gerasimov, A.B. Govorkov, V.I. Ogievetsky and A.N. Zaslavsky for useful discussions.

^{x)} At present, it is difficult to say which ω - φ mixing scheme is better for these processes because experimental information on them is rather poor.

References:

1. B. Gobbi et al. Phys.Rev.Lett., 33, 1450, 1974.
2. W.C. Carithers et al. Phys.Rev.Lett., 35, 349, 1975.
3. M. Gourdin. Preprint TH-1320-CERN, 1971.
A. Kotlewski, W. Lee, M. Suzuki, J. Thaler. Phys.Rev., D8, 348, 1973.
4. G. Morpurgo. Lectures given at the E. Majorana 1971 Summer School, Erice, 1971.
5. S. Okubo. Phys.Lett., 5, 165, 1963; J.J. Sakurai. Phys.Rev., 132, 434, 1963.
6. S. Coleman, H.J. Schnitzer. Phys.Rev., 134B, 863, 1964.
7. N. Barash-Schmidt et al. Phys.Lett., 50B, 1, 1974.
8. G. Cosme et al. Preprint L.A.L. 1279, Orsay, 1975.
9. M. Gourdin. Preprint PAR /LPTHE 75.5. Paris, 1975.

Received by Publishing Department
on December 31, 1975.