

# Study of the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$ process in the energy range 0.60 – 1.06 GeV.

M.N.Achasov, K.I.Beloborodov, A.V.Berdugin,  
 A.G.Bogdanchikov, A.V.Bozhenok, A.D.Bukin, D.A.Bukin,  
 A.V.Vasiljev, T.V.Dimova, V.P.Druzhinin, V.B.Golubev,  
 A.A.Korol\*, S.V.Koshuba, A.P.Lysenko, E.V.Pakhtusova,  
 S.I.Serednyakov, Yu.M.Shatunov, V.A.Sidorov, Z.K.Silagadze,  
 A.N.Skrinsky, Yu.V.Usov

*Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics  
 Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences*

September 2, 2003

## Abstract

The process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  in the energy range  $\sqrt{s} = 0.60 - 1.06$  GeV was studied at VEPP-2M collider with SND detector using  $\sim 14 pb^{-1}$  of integrated luminosity. Data were analyzed in the framework of the vector meson dominance model. Preliminary results on obtained cross-section and parameters of  $\rho^0, \omega, \phi \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  radiative decays are presented.

## 1 Introduction

In the vector meson dominance (VMD) model the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  process is considered as a transition  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \rho^0, \omega, \phi \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$ . Further the decay parameters can be related with  $\omega, \phi \rightarrow \rho^0\pi^0$  and  $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$  [1]. Another approach to the decays is a non-relativistic quark model (NQM). In this model vector mesons considered as composite from valent quark with codirected spins, while pseudoscalar mesons with opposite directed spins. The decay may be explained as spin overturn with photon emission (magneto-dipole transition)[2]. The study of such decays is important for understanding light mesons structure and tests of strong interactions at low energies.

---

\*Talk given at the X International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy, Aschaffenburg, Germany, August 31 - September 6, 2003  
*e-mail: korol@inp.nsk.su*

## 2 Experiment

The experiment was made with SND detector [3] at VEPP-2M collider[4]. The SND detector consists of tracking system, electromagnetic calorimeter and muon veto system. The principal part of the detector is an electromagnetic calorimeter. Full thickness of calorimeter for particles originating from the detector center is  $13.4 X_0$ , total solid angle is  $90\% \cdot 4\pi$ . Calorimeter energy resolution for photons is  $\frac{\sigma_E}{E} \approx \frac{4.2\%}{E(\text{GeV})^{1/4}}$ , its angle resolution is  $\sigma_{\varphi,\theta} \approx \frac{0.82^\circ}{\sqrt{E(\text{GeV})}} \oplus 0.63^\circ$  [5].

Presented work is an extension of the studies published in Ref.[6, 7] but using additional data. The data were collected in experiments in 1998 and 2000 [8]:

- PHI98: energy range 0.98 – 1.06 GeV, integrated luminosity  $7.83 \text{ pb}^{-1}$  ( $\sim 1.2 \cdot 10^7$   $\phi$ -mesons)
- OME00: energy range 0.60 – 0.97 GeV, integrated luminosity  $5.93 \text{ pb}^{-1}$  ( $\sim 2.5 \cdot 10^6$   $\omega$ -mesons)

## 3 Analysis

The process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  was studied in the  $3\gamma$  final state. Main background sources are  $e^+e^- \rightarrow 3\gamma$  (QED origin);  $e^+e^- \rightarrow 2\gamma$  misidentified because of additional clusters from machine background;  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\gamma$ , and cosmic background. For luminosity calculation events of the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow 2\gamma$  process were used.

The events were accepted by first level trigger which allows two or more clusters in calorimeter, no signal in either tracking or muon system, energy deposition in calorimeter greater than some threshold (which varied but never was greater than  $0.4\sqrt{s}$ ).

Preliminary selection included following cuts: no charged tracks, number of clusters in calorimeter  $N_{np} \geq 3$ , calorimeter energy deposition  $E_{cal} \geq 0.65\sqrt{s}$ , calorimeter total momentum  $P_{cal} \leq 0.3\sqrt{s}$ , polar angles of two most energetic clusters  $36^\circ \leq \theta_{1,2} \leq 144^\circ$ , polar angle of the next by energy cluster  $27^\circ \leq \theta_3 \leq 153^\circ$ , its energy deposition  $E_{cal3} \geq 0.1\sqrt{s}$ .

Kinematic fit with energy and momentum conservation constraints was applied to selected events. It improved  $\pi^0$  mass resolution from  $\sigma_{m_{\gamma\gamma}} = 11.2$  MeV to  $\sigma_{m_{\gamma\gamma}} = 8.6$  MeV. Cut on the fit quality parameter  $\chi_{3\gamma}^2 < 20$  was then applied. Selected events were subdivided into two classes:  $108 \text{ MeV} \leq m_{\gamma\gamma} \leq 162 \text{ MeV}$  (class A) and the rest (class B). Class B events were used to cross-check our understanding of background contribution and estimate related systematic uncertainty. For class A  $\sim 7 \cdot 10^4$  events were selected.

For luminosity calculation events were selected (class C) with no charged tracks, two or more clusters with calorimeter energy deposition  $E_{cal1,2} \geq 0.3\sqrt{s}$ , polar angles  $36^\circ \leq \theta_{1,2} \leq 144^\circ$ , acollinearity  $\Delta\varphi_{12} \leq 10^\circ$ ,  $\Delta\theta_{12} \leq 25^\circ$ . Events satisfying preliminary selection cuts for A and B classes were excluded. It is necessary to note significant contribution of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  events (up to 10% at  $\omega$  peak) to this class.

Table 1: Approximation results

No.	1	2	3	4
$\chi^2/N$	235/56	51/54	51/54	51/53
$\sigma_{\omega\pi^0\gamma}$ , nb	$174.1 \pm 0.9$	$151.9 \pm 1.5$	$152.1 \pm 1.6$	$152.4 \pm 1.6$
$\sigma_{\rho^0\pi^0\gamma}$ , nb	0	$0.59 \pm 0.07$	$0.58 \pm 0.07$	$0.56 \pm 0.07$
$\sigma_{\phi\pi^0\gamma}$ , nb	$6.11 \pm 0.17$	$5.58 \pm 0.29$	$5.73 \pm 0.31$	$5.64 \pm 0.37$
$\varphi_{\rho\omega}$ , °		$-9.3 \pm 3.3$	$-9.3 \pm 3.3^1$	$-12.6 \pm 1.1^2$
$\varphi_{\phi\omega}$ , °	$169 \pm 8$	$151 \pm 9$	$160 \pm 9$	$160 \pm 10$
$\text{Re } a_{\pi^0\gamma}$ , nb $^{\frac{1}{2}}$	0	0	0	$-0.05 \pm 0.07$

Cross section of the studied process was parametrized with usual variable width Breit-Wigner description [9]. More details published in Ref.[7]. Cross sections  $\sigma_{V\pi^0\gamma}$  of the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow V \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  transitions at resonances mass ( $V = \rho^0, \omega, \phi$ ) were approximation parameters. Other parameters considered were relative phases  $\varphi_{\rho\omega}$  and  $\varphi_{\phi\omega}$ , and constant real amplitude  $a_{\pi^0\gamma}$  taking into account possible contribution from higher resonances decays. Masses and widths of  $\omega, \rho^0, \phi$ -mesons and branching ratios of  $\omega$  and  $\phi$  major decay modes were taken from previous SND measurements [12], other external parameters were taken from review of particle physics [13].

Visible cross section of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  was calculated taking into account radiative correction [14] and dependency on registration efficiency from the energy of initial state radiation photons. Registration efficiency for all processes was calculated with Monte Carlo simulation.

Cross section of QED  $e^+e^- \rightarrow 2\gamma$  was calculated using Ref.[15]. Cross section for  $e^+e^- \rightarrow 3\gamma$  process was calculated from tree-level diagram corrected using Ref.[16]. Cosmic background events fraction was estimated from the data collected without beams.

Cross section approximation was done using maximum likelihood method. Classes A, B, C were approximated at the same fit. Integrated luminosity was recalculated at the every minimization step.

Four models were used for approximation: (1) no  $\rho$  meson decay contribution; (2) including  $\rho$  meson contribution, with fixed  $\rho - \omega$  relative phase; (3) including  $\rho$  meson contribution,  $\varphi_{\rho\omega}$  estimated from electromagnetic  $\rho - \omega$  mixing [10, 11]; (4) including  $\rho$  meson contribution, with electromagnetic  $\rho - \omega$  mixing fixed using  $B_{\omega \rightarrow 2\pi}$ , and constant real amplitude.

## 4 Results and discussion

The approximation results are summarized in the Table 1.

Model (1) contradicts to experimental data, models (2)–(4) describe data equally well. Obtained cross section is shown on Fig. 1. Main sources of sys-

<sup>1</sup>estimated from  $\rho - \omega$  mixing

<sup>2</sup>estimated from  $\rho - \omega$  mixing,  $\Pi_{\rho\omega} = -3676 \pm 303 \text{ MeV}^2$  fixed using  $B_{\omega \rightarrow 2\pi}$




Figure 1: Cross section of the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  process. Dots represent experimental data, solid curve depicts approximated theoretical form with  $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  (model 2), dashed curve — without  $\rho^0$  contribution (model 1).

tematic errors of cross section are uncertainty in luminosity determination (2%), in registration efficiency (2.5%), QED and  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta\gamma$  background subtraction (0.5 – 20% depends on energy point). Cosmic background contribution was found negligible (< 0.1%). Model and external parameters uncertainty also give contribution to systematic errors of cross section parameters.

Cross section parameters were found as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_{\rho^0\pi^0\gamma} &= (0.59 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.06) \text{ nb} \\
 \sigma_{\omega\pi^0\gamma} &= (151.9 \pm 1.5 \pm 4.6) \text{ nb} \\
 \sigma_{\phi\pi^0\gamma} &= (5.58 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.29) \text{ nb} \\
 \varphi_{\rho\omega} &= -9.3^\circ \pm 3.3^\circ \pm 2.4^\circ \\
 \varphi_{\phi\omega} &= 151^\circ \pm 9^\circ \pm 11^\circ
 \end{aligned}$$

and branching ratios of  $\rho^0, \omega, \phi \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  decays:

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_{\omega \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma} &= (8.45 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.25) \% \\
 B_{\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma} &= (5.32 \pm 0.63 \pm 0.50) \cdot 10^{-4} \\
 B_{\phi \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma} &= (1.34 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.07) \cdot 10^{-3}
 \end{aligned}$$

The measured decays partial widths and previous experimental data are summarized in the Table 2. Measured parameters agree with previous experimental data and mostly compatible with phenomenological expectations (see e.g. tables in Refs.[6, 7]). Relative phase of  $\rho$  and  $\omega$  decays may be attributed to  $\rho$ – $\omega$  mix-

Table 2: Comparison with previous experimental data.

Source	$\Gamma_\omega$ , keV	$\Gamma_\rho$ , keV	$\Gamma_\phi$ , keV
This work	$733 \pm 7 \pm 22$	$80.4 \pm 9.7 \pm 7.6$	$5.98 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.31$
SND (2000,2003) [6, 7]	$788 \pm 12 \pm 27$	$77 \pm 17 \pm 11$	$5.40 \pm 0.16^{+0.43}_{-0.40}$
PDG2002 [13]	$747 \pm 41$	$121 \pm 31$	$5.28 \pm 0.43$
$\omega \rightarrow \text{neutrals}$ (PDG2002 [13])	$767 \pm 79$		
$\rho^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm \gamma$ (PDG2002[13])		$68 \pm 7$	

ing ( $-12.6^\circ \pm 1.1^\circ$  from  $B_{\omega \rightarrow 2\pi}$ ). Partial width ratios  $\frac{\Gamma_{\omega \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma}}{\Gamma_{\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma}} = 9.11 \pm 1.10 \pm 0.90$  and  $\frac{\Gamma_{\phi \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma}}{\Gamma_{\omega \rightarrow \pi^0 \gamma}} = (8.16 \pm 0.43 \pm 0.48) \cdot 10^{-3}$  are compatible with SU(3) predictions.

## 5 Conclusion

The cross section of the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  process is measured in the c.m. energy region  $\sqrt{s} = 0.60 - 1.06$  GeV using the data obtained by the SND detector at the VEPP-2M collider. Total integrated luminosity used is  $\sim 14 pb^{-1}$ ,  $7 \cdot 10^4$  events were selected for analysis.

Data were analyzed in the framework of VMD model, parameters of decays  $\rho^0, \omega, \phi \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  were obtained. Parameters of decays agree with previous measurements and phenomenological estimations. Partial width of the  $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$  decay is close to the  $\rho^\pm \rightarrow \pi^\pm\gamma$  one. The relative phase for  $\rho^0, \omega$  decays can be attributed to electromagnetic  $\rho - \omega$  mixing.

## 6 Acknowledgments

One of the authors thanks organizers of the conference for the invitation and support. This work was supported in part by Presidential Grant 1335.2003.2 for support of Leading Scientific Schools and by Russian Science Support Foundation.

## References

- [1] M.Gell-Mann, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **8**, 261–262 (1962).
- [2] D.A.Geffen, and Wilson, W., *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **44**, 370 (1980).
- [3] Achasov, M. N., et al., *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.*, **A449**, 125–139 (2000).
- [4] Skrinsky, A. N., “VEPP-2M status and prospects and  $\phi$ -factory project at Novosibirsk,” in *Proc. of Workshop on physics and detectors for DAΦNE 95*, 1995, vol. IV, p. 3.
- [5] Achasov, M. N., et al., *Nucl. Instrum. Meth.*, **A411**, 337–342 (1998).

- [6] M.N.Achasov, et al., *Eur. Phys. J.*, **C12**, 25–33 (2000).
- [7] Achasov, M. N., et al., *Phys. Lett.*, **B559**, 171–178 (2003a).
- [8] Achasov, M. N., et al., *AIP Conf. Proc.*, **619**, 30–39 (2002a).
- [9] N.N.Achasov, et al., *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.*, **54**, 664–671 (1991).
- [10] Achasov, N. N., and Kozhevnikov, A. A., *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.*, **55**, 449–459 (1992).
- [11] H.B.O’Connell, et al., *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.*, **39**, 201–252 (1997).
- [12] Achasov, M. N., et al., *Phys. Rev.*, **D63**, 072002 (2001), Achasov, M. N., et al., *Phys. Rev.*, **D65**, 032002 (2002b), Achasov, M. N., et al., *Phys. Rev.*, **D66**, 032001 (2002c), Achasov, M. N., et al. (2003b), hep-ex/0305049 (to be published in *Phys. Rev. D*).
- [13] Hagiwara, K., et al., *Phys. Rev.*, **D66**, 010001 (2002).
- [14] E.A.Kuraev, and V.S.Fadin, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.*, **41**, 466–472 (1985).
- [15] Baier, V. N., et al., *Phys. Rept.*, **78**, 293–393 (1981).
- [16] Kuraev, E. A., and Silagadze, Z. K., *Jad. Fiz.*, **58**, 1843–1845 (1995).