

Search of 1P_1 charmonium in B decay

Mahiko Suzuki

Department of Physics and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
University of California, Berkeley, California 94720
(March 25, 2002)

There is no doubt that the 1P_1 charmonium h_c exists in the mass range between $J^P = 1^--$ and 0^- . While experiment produced a candidate in the past, it still requires a confirmation. Given the recent progress in the exclusive B decay into charmonia, we now have an opportunity to detect h_c by measuring the final state c of the cascade decay $B \rightarrow h_c K \rightarrow c K$. Confirmation of h_c may turn out to be much easier in the B decay than at charm factories although one may have to work a little harder to attain a high precision in the mass determination.

PACS numbers: 14.40.Gx, 13.25.Hw, 13.25.Gv, 13.40.Hq

I. INTRODUCTION

A few measurements suggested the 1P_1 charmonium around mass 3526 MeV [1,3]. In particular, the E760 Collaboration [2] studied the resonant production of h_c in $p\bar{p}$ annihilation¹ and quoted the h_c mass at 3526.2 MeV. This value is almost exactly equal to the center of gravity (3525.17 MeV) of the 3P_J charmonia χ_{cJ} ($J = 0, 1, 2$). However, the result has yet to be confirmed by the E835 Collaboration [5]. No evidence has so far been seen for h_c in e^+e^- annihilation. From the theoretical viewpoint, there is no reason to expect that the h_c mass should be so close to the center of gravity of the 3P_J masses, since such a relation based on the $L-S$ coupling and the tensor force of one-gluon exchange would break down when general spin-dependent interactions are included. Experimentally, the χ_{cJ} mass splitting gives

$$R = \frac{m_{\chi_{c2}} - m_{\chi_{c1}}}{m_{\chi_{c1}} - m_{\chi_{c0}}} \approx 0.476: \quad (1)$$

The right-hand side would be equal to 2 for the $L-S$ coupling alone, 0.8 with all spin-dependent forces of one-gluon exchange, and 0.8 \pm 1.4 after including the more general spin-spin interaction arising from the confining potential [6]. Since our knowledge of the spin-dependent charmonium potential is incomplete, there is no accurate theoretical prediction of m_{h_c} relative to $m_{\chi_{cJ}}$ even within the potential model. Furthermore, the

$E1$ transition matrix elements for $\chi_{cJ} \rightarrow J^P$ deviate largely from the nonrelativistic values. When relativistic corrections are large for the motion of c and \bar{c} , we should be cautious about accuracy of the potential model approach.

Review of Particle Physics [4] has not yet listed h_c among the confirmed particles. Undoubtedly, much effort will be devoted to pursuit of h_c at upcoming charm factories overcoming the odds against it. Meanwhile, the recent progress in B physics suggests a new opportunity to search for h_c . The purpose of this short note is to point out that we may be able to observe h_c more easily at the B-factories than at future charm factories and in hadron reactions.

Recently the Belle Collaboration discovered that the factorization-forbidden decay $B \rightarrow \chi_{c0} K$ occurs as vigorously as the factorization-allowed decays to other charmonia [7]. On the basis of this finding, we expect that another factorization-forbidden decay $B \rightarrow h_c K$ may also occur just as abundantly as $B \rightarrow \chi_{c0} K$. Since $h_c \rightarrow c$ is one of the two main decay modes of h_c , the decay $B \rightarrow h_c K$ cascades down to the final state $c K$ about half of the time. The only background for this process at the B-factories will be the process $B \rightarrow \chi_{c0} K \rightarrow c K$. Since the branching fraction for $\chi_{c0} \rightarrow c$ is insecure, however, this background is two orders of magnitude smaller than the signal. If one can reconstruct c from $K \bar{K}$ or by $\mu^+ \mu^-$ with 50% efficiency, for instance, 10 million B 's translate to roughly 100 events of the signal. Therefore we have a very good chance to observe h_c through $B \rightarrow c K$.

II. $B \rightarrow \text{CHARMONIUM} + K$

The Belle Collaboration reported for the decay $B \rightarrow \chi_{c0} K$ [7]

$$B(B^+ \rightarrow \chi_{c0} K^+) = (8.0^{+2.7}_{-2.4} \pm 1.0 \pm 1.1) \times 10^{-4}: \quad (2)$$

This number should be compared with the recent measurement by the BaBar Collaboration on the B decay into other charmonia [8]:

$$\begin{aligned} B(B^+ \rightarrow J/\psi K^+) &= (10.1 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.5) \times 10^{-4}; \\ B(B^+ \rightarrow \chi_{c1} K^+) &= (7.5 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-4}; \\ B(B^+ \rightarrow \chi_{c0} K^+) &= (6.4 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-4}: \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

Added to these is an earlier measurement on the branching fraction for $B \rightarrow c K$ by CLEO [9]:

¹ Although it is an odd naming, I call the 1P_1 charmonium as h_c following the Particle Data tabulation [4].

$$B(B^+ \rightarrow c_2 K^+) = (6.9^{+2.6}_{-2.1} \quad 0.8 \quad 2.0) \cdot 10^{-4}; \quad (4)$$

Most recently, however, Babar gave a preliminary result for this decay as [10]

$$B(B^+ \rightarrow c_2 K^+) = (15.0 \quad 1.9 \quad 1.5 \quad 4.6) \cdot 10^{-4}; \quad (5)$$

We should notice here that the decay $B \rightarrow c_0 K$ is forbidden by the factorization while $B \rightarrow J = (^0 K, B \rightarrow c_2 K, \text{ and } B \rightarrow c_1 K$ are all allowed. Nonetheless the branching fraction to $c_0 K^+$ is just as large as those into $J = (^0 K^+, c_2 K^+, \text{ and } c_1 K^+$. Since no effective decay operators allow $B \rightarrow c_0 K$ in the factorization limit, its decay amplitude must arise from the loop corrections of the energy scale below m_b to the tree-decay operators $O_{1,2}$. The relevant $\bar{c}c$ operator for production of c_0 is generated when the bilocal operator $\bar{c}(x)c(y)$ due to the loop correction is expanded in the series of local operators; $\bar{c}(x)c(y) \rightarrow \bar{c}(x)c(x) + \bar{c}(x)(y-x) \otimes c(x) + \dots$. If the relevant part of the loop energy is between m_b and m_c , then $|y-x| \sim 1/m_b \sim 1/m_c$ so that one may keep only the leading term of the expansion. In this case the QCD coupling g_s would suppress the $B \rightarrow c_0 K^+$ decay branching by $(g_s)^2$ though the suppression relative to the factorization-allowed processes may be somewhat moderated by the color structure. The experimental fact that $B(B^+ \rightarrow c_0 K^+)$ is comparable with $B(B^+ \rightarrow c_1 K^+)$ indicates that the factorization, even improved with perturbative QCD corrections, is in serious doubt for the B decay into charmonia. In terms of the local expansion of $\bar{c}(x)c(y)$, the magnitude of the relevant $|y-x|$ is as large as $1/m_{QCD}$ or, in the case of charmonia, could be the charmonium radius $1/m_{smc}$. If so, we must include not only all terms of the local expansion but also all orders of g_s in computation of decay amplitudes. Then a quantitative calculation based on perturbative QCD is intractable.

The decay $B \rightarrow h_c K$ is also forbidden by the factorization and has the same chiral structure $(\bar{c}_L c_R \bar{c}_R c_L)$ for charmonium as $B \rightarrow c_0 K$. The local operator of the lowest dimension leading to the decay $B \rightarrow h_c K$ is $\bar{c}_5 \otimes c$ [11]. When the factorization and perturbative QCD fail as proven by the $B \rightarrow c_0 K$ decay rate, it is very likely that the decay $B \rightarrow h_c K$ occurs as abundantly as $B \rightarrow c_0 K$ and the factorization-allowed B decays into charmonia.

A comment is in order for another factorization-forbidden decay, $B \rightarrow c_2 K$. The decay $B \rightarrow c_2 K$ occurs with $\bar{c} \otimes c$. The Belle Collaboration did not see a signal of $B \rightarrow c_2 K$ with a statistical significance [7]. However, since they searched $c_0; c_2$ by its $c_0; c_2 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ decay modes, their failure to see a clear signal for $B \rightarrow c_2 K$ may be due to the smaller branching fractions for $c_2 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $K^+ K^-$ as compared with $c_0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$ and $K^+ K^-$. On the other hand the CLEO Collaboration identified c_2 by $c_2 \rightarrow J/\psi$ and concluded that $B(B \rightarrow c_2 X)$ is significantly less than $B(B \rightarrow c_1 X)$. But they focused on the inclusive decays

and the uncertainties were large for the exclusive decays: $0.04 < B(B \rightarrow c_2 K = K) = B(B \rightarrow c_1 K = K) < 0.58$ with the 95% confidence level. (See the Sample B of Ref. [12].) Very recently, however, the Belle Collaboration reported the branching fraction for inclusive c_2 production [13],

$$B(B \rightarrow c_2 X) = (15.3^{+2.3}_{-2.8} \quad 2.6) \cdot 10^{-4}; \quad (6)$$

where the c_2 's fed by $J/\psi \rightarrow c_2$ have been subtracted out. This number is twice as large as the corresponding one of CLEO [12]. In view of this latest Belle measurement, it is possible that $B(B \rightarrow c_2 K)$ will eventually turn out to be comparable with $B(B \rightarrow c_0 K)$.

With these observations in theory and experiment, we proceed for the moment with the assumption,

$$B(B \rightarrow h_c K) \sim B(B \rightarrow c_0 K) \quad (7)$$

to explore the opportunity to detect h_c . Once we assume Eq.(7), we are assuming the same relation with K replaced with K or a higher strange meson. We emphasize that Eq.(7) is an assumption at present. However, the measurement we are discussing will test its validity, as we discuss below, and determine or set an upper bound on $B(B \rightarrow h_c K)$ with a good accuracy.

III. DECAY OF 1P_1

Numerous calculations were performed for the properties of charmonia in potential models [6,14]. The decay property of c_1 and h_c was specifically studied by Bodwin et al [15]. Production of h_c through $J/\psi \rightarrow h_c \psi$ in e^+e^- annihilation was also studied [16,18]. However, all that we need for our purpose here can be obtained directly from the experimental numbers for other charmonia if we make the approximation to use a common orbital wave function for the spin singlet and triplet of the same principal quantum number. This approximation is justified for the c and \bar{c} in nonrelativistic motion, and the results are independent of specific bound-state wave functions. Although the nonrelativistic treatment of charmonia is often limited in precision, we do not need much more than that for our discussion below.

The main decay modes of h_c are $h_c \rightarrow ggg$ and $h_c \rightarrow c\bar{c}$. The former is given by perturbative QCD to the leading logarithm of the h_c size [19]. By equating the h_c bound-state wave function at the origin to that of c_1 , we obtain with the experimental value $(c_1 \rightarrow ggg) = (c_1 \rightarrow \text{hadrons}) = 640 \pm 100 \text{ keV}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (h_c \rightarrow ggg) &= \frac{5}{6} (c_1 \rightarrow ggg); \\ &= 530 \pm 80 \text{ keV}; \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This numerical value does not depend on the magnitude of the fuzzy cut-off variable in the leading logarithmic term nor on specific binding potentials.

The radiative decay $h_c \rightarrow c$ is an allowed E1 transition similar to $\psi \rightarrow \gamma$. We can eliminate the E1 transition matrix element difference between the 1P and the 1S state by relating $h_c \rightarrow c$ to $\psi \rightarrow \gamma$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle h_c \rightarrow c \rangle &= \frac{\langle \psi \rightarrow \gamma \rangle}{\langle \psi \rightarrow \gamma \rangle} \langle \psi \rightarrow \gamma \rangle \\ &= 520 \pm 90 \text{ keV} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The central value of Eq.(9) is about 15% higher than the value computed by Bodwin et al [15], while the value 530 \pm 80 keV of Eq.(8) coincides with theirs. The rates for other modes such as $h_c \rightarrow \gamma$ and $h_c \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ are of O(1) keV. Therefore we obtain from the ggg and $h_c \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ decay modes the $h_c \rightarrow c$ branching fraction;

$$B(h_c \rightarrow c) = 0.50 \pm 0.11 \quad (10)$$

In this estimate the uncertainty is entirely due to those of the measured values for $\Gamma_{\text{tot}}(\psi)$ and $B(\psi \rightarrow \gamma)$. The value of Eq.(10) is a minimum number up to relativistic corrections and higher-order QCD corrections though the former corrections may turn out to be larger than we imagine.

Combining $B(h_c \rightarrow c)$ of Eq.(10) with Eqs.(2) and (7), we obtain the cascade branching fraction for $B \rightarrow h_c K \rightarrow c\bar{c} K$;

$$\begin{aligned} B(B^+ \rightarrow h_c K^+ \rightarrow c\bar{c} K^+) \\ = (4.0^{+1.6}_{-1.5} \pm 0.5 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-4} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

It goes without saying that the number on the right-hand side is subject to the uncertainty of the assumed equality in Eq.(7). If c is searched by $K\bar{K}$ or ψ (the branching fraction $\sim 5\%$ each), the cascade branching fraction is

$$\begin{aligned} B(B^+ \rightarrow h_c K^+ \rightarrow c\bar{c} K^+ \rightarrow (K\bar{K})K^+) \\ \sim 2 \times 10^{-5} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

When 10 millions of B mesons are accumulated, there will be about 100 events of the $c\bar{c} K^+$ signal just from $K\bar{K}$ or from ψ alone in the case that the reconstruction efficiency of h_c is 50% for these decay modes. One can increase statistics by including $B \rightarrow h_c K$ and by combining $B^0 = \bar{B}^0$ with B . There will be a sufficient number of the cascade $B \rightarrow h_c X \rightarrow c\bar{c} X$ events to search for h_c .

Let us compare Eq.(12) with the corresponding number in the h_c search through $\psi \rightarrow h_c$ at charm factories. According to the calculation by Yan et al [16] and more recently by Kuang [20] who included S-D mixing of ψ , the branching fraction for $\psi \rightarrow h_c \gamma$ is at the level of 1×10^{-3} at most, for $m_{h_c} = 3526 \pm 2 \text{ MeV}$. Taking account of the low reconstruction efficiency of the soft $\psi \rightarrow h_c \gamma$, Kuang estimates that detection of h_c through $\psi \rightarrow h_c \gamma$ requires 30 million ψ 's at charm factories. While h_c can be produced only through $\psi \rightarrow h_c \gamma$ at

charm factories, the h_c production occurs in the B decay in conjunction with K or a higher strange meson as well as with K . Furthermore, the production in conjunction with K tends to be stronger than that with K in the $B \rightarrow h_c$ charmonium decay. By and large, the search of h_c will be quite competitive with the search at charm factories, if not superior to it.

IV. POSSIBLE BACKGROUND EVENTS

The only decay mode that feeds $c\bar{c} K$ with the c invariant mass close to m_{h_c} is the cascade decay $B \rightarrow \psi K \rightarrow c\bar{c} K$. Since $\psi \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ is a hindered M1 transition with the branching fraction $(2.8 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-3}$, this cascade branching fraction is tiny;

$$B(B \rightarrow \psi K^+ \rightarrow c\bar{c} K^+) = (1.8 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-6} \quad (13)$$

It is more than two orders of magnitude smaller than the signal of Eq.(11). We can therefore choose a wide bin for $(p^+ p^-)$ in reconstruction of h_c without concern about the ψ contamination in $c\bar{c}$. This is fortunate from the viewpoint of raising the precision in mass determination. Since there is no competing decay process, we may fix the invariant mass of $K\bar{K}$ or ψ to $m_{c\bar{c}}$ once we find a cluster of candidate events. Although we certainly do not expect to determine the h_c mass to the accuracy anywhere close to its width ($\Gamma_{h_c} \sim 1 \text{ MeV}$), it will be easy to notice if the h_c mass is located substantially off the center of gravity of ψ .

It will be challenging to identify h_c directly by its hadronic decay modes. Since h_c is G-parity odd, the simplest decay mode is $h_c \rightarrow \pi\pi$, then $K\bar{K}$. The branching fractions to $\pi\pi$ and $K\bar{K}$ are no larger than at the level of 1% if we make a guess by rescaling the corresponding decays for ψ . Then the cascade branching fraction is most likely of the order,

$$B(B \rightarrow h_c K \rightarrow \pi\pi K) = O(1) \times 10^{-5} \quad (14)$$

After multiplying it with the reconstruction efficiency of $\psi \rightarrow \pi\pi$, it does not appear competitive with $B \rightarrow h_c K \rightarrow c\bar{c} K$. Although one can distinguish h_c from ψ by G-parity of the decay products, one can separate h_c from ψ only by the mass resolution when one searches h_c by its hadron decays. There are clear advantages for studying the cascade decay $B \rightarrow h_c K \rightarrow c\bar{c} K$.

V. SUMMARY

Nobody disputes the presence of h_c . Our real interest is in the values of its parameters. For this purpose the cascade decay process $B \rightarrow h_c K \rightarrow c\bar{c} K$ deserves a careful study at the B-factories. The search of h_c through the B decay is very competitive with the

search at charm factories and presumably superior to it. It will either confirm the controversial P_1 charm onium at the center of mass gravity of $c\bar{c}$ or discover it at the value suggested by $p\bar{p}$ annihilation. We should keep in mind that theory does not require that the h_c mass should be so close to the center of gravity of $c\bar{c}$.

We shall obtain the product of the branching fractions, $B(B \rightarrow h_c K) B(h_c \rightarrow c\bar{c} K)$ from the proposed B decay measurement. Since the value of $B(h_c \rightarrow c\bar{c})$ given in Eq.(10) is a fairly small number, measurement or nil measurement of the process $B \rightarrow h_c K \rightarrow c\bar{c} K$ will provide us with a meaningful number or a tight upper bound for $B(B \rightarrow h_c K)$. If we end up with a nil result for $B \rightarrow h_c K \rightarrow c\bar{c} K$, it would mean that $B(B \rightarrow h_c K)$ is for some reason much smaller than $B(B \rightarrow c\bar{c} K)$. Whatever the experimental outcome will be, such information will provide us with an opportunity to examine all of $B \rightarrow$ charm onium decays together and will advance our understanding of how or if the factorization plays a role in the B decay into charm onia.

V I. A C K N O W L E D G M E N T

I am benefited from conversations with R.N. Cahn on the mass resolution in the BaBar data analysis. This work was supported in part by the Director, Office of Science, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics, of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC03-76SF00098 and in part by the National Science Foundation under grant PHY-0098840.

- [14] E. Eichten and F. Feinberg, Phys. Lett. 43, 1205 (1979); Phys. Rev. D 23, 2724 (1982); W. Buchmüller, Phys. Lett. B 112, 479 (1982); W. Buchmüller, Y.J. Ng, and S.H.H. Tye, Phys. Rev. D 24, 3003 (1981); S.N. Gupta, S.F. Radford, and W.W. Repko, Phys. Rev. D 26, 3305 (1982); S.N. Gupta and S.F. Radford, Phys. Rev. D 25, 3430 (1982); J. Pantaleone, S.H.H. Tye, and Y.J. Ng, Phys. Rev. D 33, 777 (1986); Y.Q. Chen, Y.P. Kuang, and R.J. Oakes, Phys. Rev. D 52, 264 (1995); Y.Q. Chen and R.J. Oakes, Phys. Rev. D 53, 5051 (1996); N. Brambilla, A. Pineda, and J. Soto, Phys. Rev. D 63, 014023 (2001); A. Pineda and A. Vairo, Phys. Rev. D 63, 054007 (2001).
- [15] G.T. Bodwin, E. Braaten, and G.P. Lepage, Phys. Rev. 46, R1914 (1992).
- [16] Y.P. Kuang, S.F. Tuan, and T.M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D 37, 1210 (1988). See also T.M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D 22, 1652 (1980); Y.P. Kuang and T.M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D 24, 2874 (1981).
- [17] A. Andrikopoulos, Z. Phys. C 22, 63 (1984) and references therein.
- [18] M.B. Voloshin, Yd. Fiz. 43, 1517 (1986) [Sov. J Nucl. Phys. 43, 1011 (1986)].
- [19] R. Barbieri, R. Gatto, and E. Remiddi, Phys. Lett. 61B, 465 (1976).
- [20] Y.P. Kuang, hep-ph/0201210.

-
- [1] C. Baglin et al., Phys. Lett. 171B, 135 (1986).
 - [2] T.A. Armstrong et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2337 (1992).
 - [3] L. Antoniazzi et al., Phys. Rev. D 50, 4258 (1994).
 - [4] Particle Data Group, D.E. Groom et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 15, 1 (2000).
 - [5] A. Tomaradze, Talk presented at Hadron 2001 Conference, Protvino, Russia, Aug. 25 - Sept. 1, 2001.
 - [6] H.J. Schnitzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 1540 (1975). See also J. Pumplin, W. Repko, and A. Sato, Phys. Rev. Lett. 35, 1538 (1975).
 - [7] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe et al., hep-ex/0107050.
 - [8] BaBar Collaboration, B. Aubert et al., Phys. Rev. D 65, 032001 (2002).
 - [9] CLEO Collaboration, K.W. Edwards et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 30 (2001).
 - [10] BaBar Collaboration, B. Aubert et al., hep-ex/0203040.
 - [11] M. Suzuki, hep-ph/0202222; Phys. Rev. D, to be published.
 - [12] CLEO Collaboration, S. Chen et al., Phys. Rev. D 63, 031102 (2001).
 - [13] Belle Collaboration, K. Abe et al., hep-ph/0202028.