

Interference in $J = 0$ Decays and $\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ Decay

Liu Fang^{1,2}, Li Jin², Yi Bin Huang¹, Mu-Lin Yan^{1,2}

¹ Interdisciplinary Center for Theoretical Study, University of Science and Technology of China Hefei, Anhui 230026, P.R. China

² Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100039, P.R. China

Abstract We study $\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ interference by analyzing $J = 0$ PDG-2002 data on $J = 0$ decays into PP and PV (P denotes pseudoscalar mesons; V , vector mesons) are used to fit a generic model which describes the $J = 0$ decays. From the fits, we obtain anomalously large branching ratio $\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0) \sim 10^{-3} - 10^{-2}$. A theoretical analysis for it is also provided, and the prediction is in good agreement with the anomalously large $\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0)$. By the fit, we also get the ρ^0 mixing angle $\theta = 19.68^\circ - 1.49^\circ$ and the constituent quark mass ratio $m_u = m_s = 0.6$ which are all reasonable.

Keyword $J = 0$ decays, $\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ interference, $SU(3)$ -breaking effect, ρ^0 mixing

1 introduction

Recently it has been predicted in ref.^[1] that there is a large isospin symmetry breaking enhancement effect in the decay $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$ comparing with $\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ due to ρ^0 -interference, which was called as hidden isospin-breaking effects in ^[1]. This prediction has been confirmed by the renewed data in PDG-2002^[2]. Following the discussion of ^[1], it could be expected that a similar large hidden isospin-breaking effect should also exist in $\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ due to ρ^+ -interference. In this paper we try to analyze $J = 0$ ($\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$), ($\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$), ($\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$), and to reveal ρ^+ -interference effect and then finally to abstract out the branching ratio of $\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$. Such an analysis should be necessary for further confirming the enhancement effects mentioned above, and be also interesting for the G -parity violating process studies.

It is very difficult to directly measure $\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0)$ experimentally both because $\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ ($m_\rho > m_\pi$) and because the G -parity conserving decay mode of $\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ is dominant. This is the reason why there is still no a reliable value for $\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0)$ yet so far in the literature^{[2],[3]}. Fortunately, this quantity can be obtained by fitting the data of $J = 0$ PP and PV (where P

Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (90103002)

[†]E-mail address: liuff@mail.hep.ac.cn

[‡]Corresponding author; E-mail address: mlyan@ustc.edu.cn

denotes the pseudoscalar meson nonet ($\pi; K; \eta; \eta'$), and V , the vector mesons ($\rho; \omega; K^*; \phi$)^[4]. Actually, more than fifteen years ago, $B_r(\eta' \rightarrow 3\pi)$ was estimated in ref.^[4] by using the MARK-III data of ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow PP; PV$)-decays with $P = (\pi; K)$ and $V = (\rho; \omega; K^*)$. However, people including the authors of ref.^[4] does not think their result of $B_r(\eta' \rightarrow 3\pi)$ is very reliable (see the discussion in ref.^[4] and ref.^[2]). The reasons are multiply, and some of them may be as follows: 1, the $J^P = 1^-$ -decay data quality at that time was not good enough; 2, the fitting is not complete because the processes of ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow V; {}^0V; P$) were not considered; 3, lacking a theoretical understanding why their result is so significantly different from the result of ref.^[3] which is quoted by PDG^[2]. Our motive of this paper is to try to solve those problems: 1, We shall use nowadays data of ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow PP; PV$) in PDG-2002^[2] to perform the fit; 2, ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow V; {}^0V; P$) will be considered in our analysis; 3, And the rationality of the result will be argued, i.e., we'll see that the result is just consistent with the theoretical analysis in ref.^[1].

The contents of the paper are organized as follows. In section 2 we describe the η' -interference in the process $J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$, and give the the branching ratio formulas for ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow PP; PV$). In section 3, by using the PDG-2002 $J^P = 1^-$ decay data and the formulas given in the section 2 we perform the datum fits. The $B_r(\eta' \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0)$ is obtained. The section 4 is devoted to estimate $B_r(\eta' \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0)$ by theoretical analysis. Finally, we briefly discuss the results.

2 η' -Interference and branching ratios of $J^P = 1^-$ decays into PV and PP

The elusive $\eta' \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$ decay could be observed in $J^P = 1^-$ decays into the $\pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$ final state^[4]. Indeed, this decay can proceed through the interfering channels $J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0 \pi^0$ and $J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \omega \pi^0 \pi^0$. Because $J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0 \pi^0$ is caused both by strong interaction via 3 gluons and by electromagnetic (EM) interaction and $J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \omega \pi^0 \pi^0$ is caused by EM interaction merely, the possibility of the decay $J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0 \pi^0$ is much larger than one of $J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \omega \pi^0 \pi^0$, i.e., ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0 \pi^0$) \gg ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \omega \pi^0 \pi^0$) (by using the 2002-PDG data^[2] we have ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0 \pi^0$)' 2.5×10^2 ($J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \omega \pi^0 \pi^0$)). Consequently, even though ($\rho^0 \pi^+ \pi^0$) may be much larger than ($\omega \pi^+ \pi^0$), it is still hopeful to measure ($\eta' \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$) by studying the ρ^0 -interference effects in the process of $J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0 \pi^0$.

To $J^P = 1^- (\pi; \eta) \rightarrow 3\pi^0$, the corresponding s-dependence Breit-Wigner is written as^[4]

$$F(s) = B W_i(s) + e^{i\phi_i} B W_i(s),$$
 where

$$B W_i = \frac{r}{m_i} \frac{1}{m_i^2 - s - i m_i \Gamma_i} \quad (1)$$

is the normalized Breit-Wigner curve for $i = \rho, \omega$ resonance with the mass of m_i and total width of Γ_i . The factor $e^{i\phi_i}$ is the modulus (phase) of the amplitude proceeding through the resonance relative to ρ resonance, which can be written as:

$$= \frac{\mathcal{A}(J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0 \pi^0)}{\mathcal{A}(J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \omega \pi^0 \pi^0)} e^{i\phi_i} = \frac{B R(\eta' \rightarrow 3\pi^0)}{B R(\rho \rightarrow 3\pi^0)} \quad (2)$$

and $\phi_i = \arg(\mathcal{A}(J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \rho^0 \pi^0 \pi^0)) - \arg(\mathcal{A}(J^P = 1^- \rightarrow \omega \pi^0 \pi^0))$ with $i = \rho, \omega$.

As we have the relations $m' = m$ and $\epsilon = 1$, the total effect is integrated over s ,

$$\int ds F(s) f^2 = 1 + \alpha^2 + 2 \cos \theta \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2} \quad (3)$$

The third term of the expression (3), $2 \cos \theta \frac{\alpha^2}{1 + \alpha^2}$, is the interference term. According to ref.^{[4]1}, the phase θ is equal to zero, and the interference effect produces a magnification factor as a whole (we assume that the ω resonance contribution is one), i.e.

$$\int ds F(s) f^2 = 1 + \alpha^2 + \alpha^2 \quad (4)$$

where $\alpha = 16$ ^[2] has been used. Then, the interference between ω and ω' in the $J = 1^- 4^-$ provides a relation as follows

$$BR(J = 1^- 4^- (\omega) \rightarrow 1^- 4^-) = (1 + \alpha^2 + \alpha^2) BR(J = 1^- 4^- (\omega') \rightarrow 1^- 4^-); \quad (5)$$

The $BR(J = 1^- 4^- (\omega) \rightarrow 1^- 4^-)$ can be detected directly in experiments, but there is no a direct experiment way to measure $BR(J = 1^- 4^- (\omega') \rightarrow 1^- 4^-)$ in the right hand side of the above relation. Fortunately, it can be got by fitting the branch ratios of $J = 1^- PP$ and PV (where P and V denote pseudoscalar- and vector mesons respectively)^{[4]1}. As both $BR(J = 1^- 4^- (\omega) \rightarrow 1^- 4^-)$ and $BR(J = 1^- 4^- (\omega') \rightarrow 1^- 4^-)$ are known, we will have α by Eq.5 and then obtain desired quantity $BR(\omega' \rightarrow 3^-)$ via Eq.2.

Decays of $J = 1^-$ into (PV) and into (PP) can be factorized by a very simple and general consideration described as follows^{[4]1}. The decays proceed through a strongly interacting three-gluon (ggg) intermediate state and through electromagnetic interaction mediated by one photon and (gg) states. In the gluonic case, there are two $I = 0$ transitions $cc' \rightarrow ggg \rightarrow \frac{(uu+dd)}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $cc' \rightarrow ggg \rightarrow ss$, which are proportional to the amplitude A and $\frac{A}{2}$ respectively. The parameter accounts for flavor-SU(3) breaking effect. The electromagnetic transitions generate the $I = 1$ state $\frac{(uu-dd)}{\sqrt{2}}$ and two $I = 0$ states ($\frac{(uu+dd)}{\sqrt{2}}$ and ss). Their amplitude are proportional to $3a$; a and $\frac{a}{2}$ respectively. The flavor space wave functions for P including ω and ω' read

$$P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) K^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) K^+ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \right) K^0 \right] \quad (6)$$

where $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = \cos \theta + \sin \theta$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} = \cos \theta - \sin \theta$ with θ as (ω, ω') -mixing angle, and the V -wave functions including ω 's read

$$V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) K^0 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) K^+ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right) K^0 \right] \quad (7)$$

With the above, the decay amplitudes of $(J = 1^- PP; PV)$ are as follows

$$A(\omega \rightarrow 1^-) = 3a; \quad (8)$$

¹ $\omega = 0$ in $J = 1^- (\omega \text{ or } \omega') \rightarrow 1^- 2^0$ and $\omega = 2$ in $J = 1^- (\omega \text{ or } \omega') \rightarrow 1^- 0^+$ in the paper of A. Bramon and J.C. Asulleras, Phys.Lett., 1986, 173B : 97.

$$A(K^+K^-) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)A + (2 + \alpha)a; \quad (9)$$

$$A(K^0\bar{K}^0) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)A - (1 + \alpha)a; \quad (10)$$

$$A(\pi^+\pi^0) = f_v(A + a); \quad (11)$$

$$A(K^{*+}K^-) = f_v \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)A + (2 + \alpha)a \right]; \quad (12)$$

$$A(K^{*0}\bar{K}^0) = f_v \left[\frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)A - (1 + \alpha)a \right]; \quad (13)$$

$$A(\rho^+\pi^0) = f_v(3a); \quad (14)$$

$$A(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v(3aX_0); \quad (15)$$

$$A(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v \left[(A + a)X_0 + \frac{P^-}{2rA} \left(\frac{P^-}{2}X_0 + Y_0 \right) \right]; \quad (16)$$

$$A(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v(3aX_0); \quad (17)$$

$$A(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v \left[(A + a)X_0 + \frac{P^-}{2rA} \left(\frac{P^-}{2}X_0 + Y_0 \right) \right]; \quad (18)$$

$$A(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v \left[(A - 2a)Y_0 + rA \left(\frac{P^-}{2}X_0 + Y_0 \right) \frac{(1 + \alpha)}{2} \right]; \quad (19)$$

$$A(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v \left[(A - 2a)Y_0 + rA \left(\frac{P^-}{2}X_0 + Y_0 \right) \frac{(1 + \alpha)}{2} \right]; \quad (20)$$

where $X = \frac{q}{3} \cos \frac{q}{3}$, $X_0 = \frac{q}{3} \sin \frac{q}{3}$, $X_0 = \frac{q}{3} \sin \frac{q}{3} + \frac{q}{3} \cos \frac{q}{3}$, $Y = X_0$, $Y_0 = X_0$. The additional parameter r is the relative weight of the disconnected diagram to connected diagram for the decays involving the final state π^0 or ρ^0 [5][6]. The Eqs. 8-14 are same as ones in ref.[4], and others are new.

The corresponding branching ratios of these decays are following

$$Br(K^+) = 9a^2; \quad (21)$$

$$Br(K^+K^-) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)A + (2 + \alpha)ae^i f; \quad (22)$$

$$Br(K^0\bar{K}^0) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)A - (1 + \alpha)ae^i f; \quad (23)$$

$$Br(\pi^+\pi^0) = f_v^2 j(A + ae^i) f; \quad (24)$$

$$Br(K^{*+}K^-) = f_v^2 \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)A + (2 + \alpha)ae^i f; \quad (25)$$

$$Br(K^{*0}\bar{K}^0) = f_v^2 \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha)A - (1 + \alpha)ae^i f; \quad (26)$$

$$Br(\rho^+\pi^0) = (1 + \alpha^2) f_v^2 9a^2; \quad (27)$$

$$Br(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v^2 \beta a X_0 f; \quad (28)$$

$$Br(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v^2 j(A + ae^i) X_0 + \frac{P^-}{2rA} \left(\frac{P^-}{2}X_0 + Y_0 \right) f; \quad (29)$$

$$Br(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v^2 \beta a X_0 f; \quad (30)$$

$$Br(\rho^0\pi^0) = f_v^2 j(A + ae^i) X_0 + \frac{P^-}{2rA} \left(\frac{P^-}{2}X_0 + Y_0 \right) f; \quad (31)$$

$$\text{Br}(\rho) = f_v^2 j(A - 2ae^i) Y + rA \left(\frac{p}{2X} + Y \right) \frac{1+}{2} j; \quad (32)$$

$$\text{Br}(\rho^0) = f_v^2 j(A - 2ae^i) Y_0 + rA \left(\frac{p}{2X_0} + Y_0 \right) \frac{1+}{2} j; \quad (33)$$

where δ is their relative phase between A and a , and the parameter A and a are real. In the Eq.24 the δ interference effect is subtracted from the branching ratio of $J = \rho^0$. In the Eq.27, a magnetic factor $1 + \delta^2$ has been added due to Eq.5 in order to taking the δ interference effects into account. Actually, through directly detecting the data of $J = \rho^0$ one can only get $\text{Br}(\rho^0)$ rather than $\text{Br}(\rho)$ which is equal to $f_v^2 9a^2$.

In the branching ratio formulae of Eqs.21-33 we do not write out the corresponding phase-space factors explicitly which are proportional to the cube of the final momenta in two-body decays. They will be taken into account in the practical phenomenological fit later.

3 Datum fit to obtain $\text{BR}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)$

Let's now use the data in PDG-2002^[2] to perform the fit to all branching ratios of Eq.21-33. This fit will lead to determining the δ and $\text{BR}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)$. The experimental branching ratio data of PDG-2002 are listed in the second column of Table 1.

Firstly, following ref.^[4], we use the branch ratio data of $(J = \rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0; V(\rho^0; K))$ only to perform a fit to Eqs.21-27 (call it as $(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0; V(\rho^0; K))$ fit hereafter). In this case, there are seven equations with six adjustable free parameters $a; A; \delta; f_v; r$, and hence it is an over-determination problem with potential of predictions. The fit with minimum $\chi^2 = 0.46$ leads to the values of the parameters and seven corresponding branching ratios listed in the third column of Table 1, in which $(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)_{\text{uncor}}$ and $(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)_{\text{cor}}$ represent $\text{Br}(J = \rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0; V(\rho^0; K))$ and $\text{Br}(J = \rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0; V(\rho^0; K))$ respectively, i.e.,

$$\text{Br}(J = \rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)_{\text{cor}} = f_v^2 9a^2; \quad (34)$$

In the fit (see Table 1), we have $(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)_{\text{uncor}} = (4.2 \pm 0.61) \times 10^{-4}$, $a = 0.21 \pm 0.02$, $A = 2.94 \pm 0.72$ and the interference factor $\delta = 0.71 \pm 0.58$, then we obtain $(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)_{\text{cor}} = f_v^2 9a^2 = (1.89 \pm 0.83) \times 10^{-4}$. In other hand, from Eqs.(2) (11) (14), δ reads

$$\delta = \frac{A + ae^i j}{\beta a j} \frac{\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)}{\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)}; \quad (35)$$

Then the branching ratio of $\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0$ is predicted as follows

$$\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0) = \text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0) \left(\frac{3\beta j}{A + ae^i j} \right)^2; \quad (36)$$

Substituting the $a; A$ and δ values obtained from the fit (see the third column of Table 1) and experiment data of $\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)$ into Eq. 34 and Eq. 36, we then obtain the $(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0; V(\rho^0; K))$ fit's results as follows

$$\text{Br}(J = \rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0)_{\text{cor}} |_{(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0; V(\rho^0; K))} = (1.89 \pm 0.83) \times 10^{-4}; \quad (37)$$

$$\text{Br}(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0) |_{(\rho^+ \rightarrow \rho^0; V(\rho^0; K))} = (2.0 \pm 1.64) \times 10^{-2}; \quad (38)$$

TABLE 1: The second column displays the experimental values for the branch ratios of $J=1 \rightarrow PP$ and $J=1 \rightarrow PV$ in PDG-2000 datum. The results of a fit to the first seven branching ratios is listed in the third column. The results of a fit to the total thirteen branching ratios is listed in the fourth column.

| J= decay | PDG-2002 (10^{-4}) | a partial t_1 (10^{-4}) | a global t_2 (10^{-4}) |
|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1: $^+$ | 1.47 0.23 | 1.44 0.23 | 1.92 0.05 |
| 2: $K^+ K$ | 2.37 0.31 | 2.45 0.28 | 2.04 0.08 |
| 3: $K^0 K^0$ | 1.08 0.14 | 1.06 0.14 | 0.87 0.05 |
| 4: 0 | 42.0 5 | 43.04 4.48 | 41.97 0.68 |
| 5: $K^{*+} K$ | 25.0 2.0 | 24.11 1.41 | 23.64 0.5 |
| 6: $K^{*0} K^0$ | 21.0 2.0 | 21.66 1.7 | 24.21 0.49 |
| 7: $(^0)_{uncor}$ | 4.2 0.6 | 4.2 0.61 | 4.2 0.2 |
| 8: $(^0)$ | 1.05 0.18 | | 0.7 0.05 |
| 9: $(^0)$ | 1.67 0.25 | | 1.73 0.11 |
| 10: $(^0)$ | 1.93 0.23 | | 1.82 0.08 |
| 11: $(^0)$ | 15.8 1.6 | | 18.32 0.36 |
| 12: $(^0)$ | 6.5 0.7 | | 5.85 0.23 |
| 13: $(^0)$ | 3.3 0.4 | | 2.55 0.23 |
| 2 | | 0.46=1 | 21.4=5 |
| EDM | | 0.45E 06 | 0.69E 06 |
| t_a | | 0.21 0.02 | 0.24 0.012 |
| A | | 2.94 0.72 | 2.69 0.17 |
| | | 0.6 0.1 | 0.62 0.03 |
| f_V | | 1.37 0.14 | 1.6 0.11 |
| | | 1.26 0.36 | 1.38 0.1 |
| | | 0.71 0.58 | 0.3 0.16 |
| r | | | 0.343 0.026 |
| | | | 0.144 0.001 |
| $(^0)_{cor}$ | | (1.89 0.83) 10^{-4} | (3.02 0.2) 10^{-4} |
| $! 3$ | | (2.0 1.64) 10^{-2} | (0.59 0.315) 10^{-2} |

Secondly, we perform more complete datum fit in which the processes of $J=1 \rightarrow V$ and $J=1 \rightarrow V^0$ are included. In this case, there are 13 equations (21-33) and eight free parameters: $a; A; ; ; f_V; ; ; r$. And hence it is an over-determination problem with more constraints, and will be called as $(PP;V(^0;K; ;^0))$ fit hereafter. The results are as follows

$$Br(J=1 \rightarrow ^0)_{cor} (PP;V(^0;K; ;^0)) = (3.02 0.2) 10^{-4}; \quad (39)$$

$$Br(^1 \rightarrow ^0) (PP;V(^0;K; ;^0)) = (0.59 0.315) 10^{-2}; \quad (40)$$

$$= 0.343 0.026 = 19.68^\circ 1.49^\circ; \quad (41)$$

where 0 mixing angle is agreement with one in ref.^{[5][6]}, and both $Br(J=1 \rightarrow ^0)_{cor}$ and $Br(^1 \rightarrow ^0)$ are reasonable agreement with the results (37) (38) obtained by $(PP;V(^0;K))$ fit within the errors.

The parameter r is the constituent quark mass ratio $m_u=m_s$ which should be about 0.6^{[6][7][8]} due to light flavor SU(3)-breaking. The results of $r' 0.6 0.1$ for $(PP;V(^0;K))$ fit and $r' 0.62 0.03$ for $(PP;V(^0;K; ;^0))$ fit indicate the fits meet this requirement, and, hence, the results yielded by them are rather reliable.

4 Large isospin breaking effect in decay $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$

In this section, following ref.^[1], we provide a theoretical estimation to $BR(\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0)$. Using Feynman propagators method, the on-shell amplitude^[1] of the decay $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ is determined by

$$M_{\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0} = f_3 + \frac{f_3(p^2)}{p^2 - m_\rho^2 + im_\rho}; \quad (42)$$

where, the momentum-dependent $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ interference amplitude $f_3(p^2)$ is defined by the interaction Lagrangian L_I as follows

$$L_I = \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} e^{ip \cdot x} f_3(p^2) (g \frac{p \cdot p}{p^2}) \rho^0(x); \quad (43)$$

The first and second term of expression (42) correspond to the contributions of direct coupling ($\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$) and ρ resonance exchange respectively. Because $m_\rho \gg m_\pi$ and π is small, the denominator of the second term is small. Therefore, contribution from ρ resonance exchange is large. This is called "hidden isospin symmetry breaking effect" according to ^[1]. This effect brings a significant contribution and plays an essential role in the decay $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$. So when we deal with the decay of $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$, the process $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ must be considered.

In fact, the contributions of $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ interference are dominant and the direct coupling can be omitted. The direct coupling $f_3 \sim (m_d - m_u)/f_\pi$, therefore, it is very small. In order to be sure of this point, we derive this quantity in a practical model called as $U(2)_L \times U(2)_R$ chiral theory of mesons ^[9] in follows. Denoting the direct vertices of $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ as $L_3 = f_3 \delta_{ijk} \rho^0 \partial^i \pi^j \partial^k \pi^k$, then f_3 can be calculated in this theory^[9] and has the form

$$f_3 = \frac{m_d - m_u}{2gf^3m} \left[1 - \frac{16c}{3g} + \frac{6c^2}{g^2} - \frac{8c^3}{3g^3} \right] \approx 2 \times 10^{-11} M eV^{-3}; \quad (44)$$

where the values of model's parameters m ; g ; c determined in ref.^[9] have been used. To the second term in the parentheses of expression (42), $f_3(m^2)$ has been determined to approximate

$4 \times 10^3 M eV^2$ ^[10; 11]. $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ is the dominant channel for ρ decays, and hence f_3 can be estimated by using the width $\Gamma_{\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0} = 7.5 M eV$. Its approximate value is about $3 \times 10^7 M eV^{-3}$. Thus the typical value of the second term in expression (42) is $(5 + 2i) \times 10^8 M eV^{-3}$ approximately. Comparing it with expression (44), we can see that the direct coupling f_3 is indeed very small, and it is ignorable. Therefore, discarding f_3 in expression (42), we have, approximately,

$$M_{\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0} = \frac{f_3(m^2)}{m^2 - m_\rho^2 + im_\rho} \Gamma_{\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0}; \quad (45)$$

This equation means that the contributions due to $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ interference to $BR(\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0)$ are dominant, or the hidden isospin-breaking effects introduced in ^[1] are dominant for the process $\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$: From expression (45) we obtain desired result as follows

$$BR(\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0) \approx 0.2 \times 10^{-2}; \quad (46)$$

Our experiment datum fitting result (40) is consistent with this theoretical estimation result. This fact indicates that both $(PP; V(\rho^0; K)) \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ and $(PP; V(\rho^0; K; \pi^0)) \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ are reasonable even though the resulting $BR(\rho^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0)$ is much larger than one in ref.^[3] and rather closes the upper limit for it in ref.^[12].

5 Discussion

Through the study presented in the above, we conclude that π^0 interference effects can be detected in the $J/\psi \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ decay, which receives a contribution from the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$ decay mode. J/ψ decays offer an almost unique opportunity for observing $\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$, where the smallness of $\text{Br}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) = \text{Br}(\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0)$ is compensated by the large ratio $A(J/\psi \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0) = A(J/\psi \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0)$ between a (simply Zweig-forbidden) strong amplitude over an EM one. This is the key point for the practical determining $\text{Br}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)$ through employing J/ψ decay branching ratios. Our results for 2 datum - ts are $\text{Br}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)_{\text{PP;V}(\pi^0, K; \pi^0)} = (2.0 \pm 1.64) \times 10^{-2}$ and $\text{Br}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)_{\text{PP;V}(\pi^0, K; \pi^0)} = (0.59 \pm 0.315) \times 10^{-2}$ respectively, which are anomalously large and match each other within the errors.

In order to pursue whether these anomalously large results of $\text{Br}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)$ are reasonable or not, a theoretical estimation for π^0 interference effects to the process of $(\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0)$ has also been discussed in this paper. Following ref.^[1], we found that the contributions due to so called hidden isospin-breaking effects are dominant for the process $\pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$. The theoretical prediction is $\text{BR}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) \approx 0.2 \times 10^{-2}$ which is in good agreement with our datum - t results. Then, considering this fact and noting that both result of π^0 angle and the result of constituent quark ratio $r_u = r_s$ obtained by the ts are also reasonable, we conclude that $\text{Br}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-) \approx 10^{-3} \sim 10^{-2}$ is reliable.

Finally, we like to argue that in order to reduce the error-bar of $\text{Br}(\pi^0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-)$, more precisely experimental measurements to $(J/\psi \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0; P; V)$ are expected. The high quality data for J/ψ in the future BESIII would be useful.

We would like to thank Zheng Zhi-Peng, Shen Xiao-Yan, Zhu Yucan, Yuan Chang-zheng, Fang Shuang-shi for helpful discussions. This work is partially supported by NSF of China 90103002 and the Grant of National Laboratory at the Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing.

References

- [1] X. J. Wang, J. H. Jiang, M. L. Yan, *Eur. Phys. J. A*, 2002, 14: 219-224
- [2] Particle Data Group, *Phys. Rev.*, 2002, D 66: 010001-458
- [3] I. B. Vasserman, et al, *Sov. J. of Nucl. Phys.*, 1988, 48:480 (translated from *YAF*, 1988, 48:753)
- [4] A. Bramon and J. Casulleras, *Phys. Lett.*, 1986, 173B:97
- [5] J. Jousset, et al, *Phys. Rev.*, 1990, D 41:1389
- [6] R. M. Baltusaitis, D. Coman et al, *Phys. Rev.* 1985, D 32:2883
- [7] A. de Rújula, H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, *Phys. Rev.*, 1975, D 12:147
- [8] L. Lam et al and A. Bramon, *Ann. Phys. (NY)*, 1984, 154:308
- [9] B. A. Li, *Phys. Rev.*, 1995, D 52:5165
- [10] S. A. Coon, R. C. Barrett, *Phys. Rev.*, 1987, C 36:2189
- [11] D. N. Gao and M. L. Yan, *Eur. Phys. J. A*, 1998, 3:293.
- [12] G. S. Abrams, et al, *Phys. Rev.*, 1971, D 4:1092.