

SUMMARY OF GLUONIUM 95 AND HADRON 95 CONFERENCES

Nils A. Tomqvist

University of Helsinki, SEFT, P.O. Box 9, Fin-00014 Helsinki, Finland

Abstract

A short summary of two conferences on the hadron and gluonium spectrum is given, with personal comments on the status of the best candidates for gluonium or non- $q\bar{q}$ states, such as $f_0(1370)$; $f_0(1500)$; $f_{0=2}(1720)$, $f_J(2230)$, (1410) ; (1460) ; and $f_1(1420)$.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since, at this conference¹, there is no plenary talk on hadron spectroscopy, the organizers gave me the opportunity to summarize two recent conferences, which were especially devoted to this field. This is thus a short personal summary of two conferences on possible gluonium candidates and on the hadron spectrum held this summer. The first was Gluonium '95 held in Propriano, Corsica, 30.6.-4.7. 1995, and the second was Hadron'95 or the "6th International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy" held in Manchester 9.7-14.7 1995. Of course, I cannot do justice to all interesting results reported at these conferences. I shall, in fact, devote most of my time on the new results on non- $q\bar{q}$ candidates. For summaries of Hadron95 see S.J. Chung's and M.R. Pennington's summaries in the Hadron95 proceedings [1].

II. GLUONIUM

Gluonium or glueball states are the missing links in the standard model, which predicts that these states should exist beyond any reasonable doubt. Most people would agree that the search for these states is just as important as the search for the top quark or the Higgs boson. If these gluonium states do not exist, it would be a serious blow to our understanding of QCD. Thus to find these states is one of the most important tasks for all experimental groups in high energy physics. Unfortunately the search has not yet been quite successful. We have no "gold plated" gluonium state, only a few good "candidates". One serious problem in sorting out the experimental candidates is that we haven't had a good enough model

¹International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, Brussels, July 27th - August 2 1995. To be published in Conference proceedings by World Scientific Publishing Company

to treat broad and light $q\bar{q}$ states, by which one can distinguish these from gluonium. In addition, almost certainly there exists 4-quark states, at least in the form of meson-meson bound states. These mess up the meson spectrum, and for these our models are even less developed.

At Propriano a rather informal meeting, devoted mainly to these gluonium candidates, was held with 33 registered participants. The small number of participants allowed for a very loose organization. Thus there was no advance schedule of speakers, the talks and discussions were usually decided the same or the previous day, and all who wanted to contribute were given time. This gave the meeting a special relaxed atmosphere where ideas and results could be communicated in a spontaneous way.

We learned that there had been a remarkable advance in the results from lattice gauge theory calculations. Although one is still far from having very reliable results, the different groups now agree that the lightest glueball, which should be a flavour singlet 0^{++} state, should exist in the 1.5-1.75 GeV region, while the first tensor or pseudoscalar glueball is expected somewhere near 2.15-2.45 GeV. The actually favoured numbers from the IBM group of D. Weingarten et al. [2] is for 0^{++} 1740 \pm 71 MeV and for 2^{++} 2400 MeV, while UKQCD reports [3] for the 0^{++} 1550 \pm 50 MeV and for the 2^{++} 2270 \pm 100 MeV. This is a substantial improvement in narrowing down the glueball masses to rather small intervals. The improvement is mainly due to the fact that today's computers allow for of the order of 30000 field configurations on the lattice instead of previously about 3000. Of course all this is still in the quenched or valence approximation, i.e., without quark loops, which is a very drastic simplification of the actual situation. Generally, from quantum mechanics, if one adds the new degrees of freedom due to the coupling to the multi-hadron continuum states, then the gluonium masses should be shifted down in mass, since the dominant part of the hadron continuum is above the pure glue gluonium mass. However, this argument is not 100% full proof, since presumably part of this mixing with the continuum is phenomenologically already taken into account by the mixing of scales in the pure glue lattice gauge theory calculations.

As to the magnitude of glueball widths one is usually rather vague, but it is generally believed that they should be smaller or at most equal to normal hadronic widths. A simple argument for a smallish width is based upon the fact that a pure glue system must produce at least two $q\bar{q}$ pairs in order to make the transition into two normal hadrons, compared to only one pair for a $q\bar{q}$ meson. Therefore, the gluonium width should roughly be of the order of the geometric average of a normal meson width and a small OZI rule violating width as, say $\Gamma \approx \sqrt{\Gamma_{\text{meson}} \Gamma_{\text{OZI}}}$. This would be important to elaborate upon, because one argument for why we haven't seen a gold plated glueball state is that glueballs are extremely broad. Then we could not easily distinguish them from a smooth background. Weingarten [2] calculates a width of the scalar gluonium to two pseudoscalars of 108 \pm 29 MeV. The naive prediction of flavour isotropic glueball decay is disputed because of form factor effects, such that decays with large phase space are suppressed. It was also argued that glue should be strongly connected to η 's and η' 's following models of Gershtein [4] and Frere et al. [5].

Two recent experimental glueball candidates were discussed at some length. One was the Crystal Barrel $f_0(1500)$ [6], which Amaler and Close [7] have argued is a strong candidate for a glueball. Certainly, the mass is right if one believes the UKQCD lattice calculation. Also the fact that it is seen in the "gluon rich" channels is an argument in favour of a gluonium interpretation. Such channels are radiative $J=0 \rightarrow 4$ decay and central production or production by two pomerons. The $f_0(1500)$ is produced both in radiative $J=0$ decay (see the reanalysis of D. Bugg et al. discussed below) and in central production by GAMSS, (as the " $f_0(1590)$ "). In addition, signals for the $f_0(1500-1590)$ appear to be prominent in decay channels involving η and η' , which as discussed above favours gluonium. However, the nearness of the important η and η' thresholds to the $f_0(1500)$ should make one seriously consider the possibility that the $f_0(1500)$ may be a loosely bound meson-meson deuteron like bound state or deuson [8].

The second glueball candidate is the Beijing results on the narrow, 20 MeV, $f_J(2230) =$

(2230) [1], which was seen first by Mark II in $J = 1^-$ $K \bar{K}$. Now BES sees it also in $p\bar{p}$. The fact that the reduced Γ and $K \bar{K}$ widths are nearly equal speaks for favour isotropic decay, and gluonium interpretation. Also the production in the gluon-rich $J = 1^-$ radiative decay can be argued to favour a gluonium interpretation. The (2230) could be the tensor glueball if $f_0(1500)$ is the scalar. But, the fact that it lies precisely at the 1^- threshold makes one a little suspicious - maybe it could be a 1^- bound state. The most serious non- $q\bar{q}$ candidates are listed in table 1.

At Gluonium '95 there was one half day devoted to informal discussions of how to interpret the problematic mesons and meson candidates. During this discussion one reached the remarkable agreement that the LEAR $f_0(1500)$ and the GAMMA $f_0(1590)$ could be the same state, in spite of the fact that the experiments find different branching ratios. In particular the 4^- decay channel is found to be large by the Crystal Barrel for the $f_0(1500)$, while GAMMA found large branching ratios $f_0(1590) \rightarrow 4^-$ and 0^- , while $f_0(1590) \rightarrow 4^-$ was small.

III. LIGHT MESONS

A. Light scalars

At the Manchester Hadron95 conference there was much interest in the controversial scalar meson sector. The lightest scalar nonet were discussed in theoretical models by M. Scadron [1] and myself [9]. Also new interesting results are now emerging as many experimental papers now have begun to include the sigma meson in their analysis of multipion channels. Here the σ is a very broad structure peaking around 600-900 MeV and which is analytically described by the $\pi\pi$ phase shifts.

There was an interesting reanalysis by D. Bugg et al. [1] of Mark III data on $J = 1^-$ $\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$. This was previously analysed assuming dominance in the four pion system. Then one found the puzzling result that pseudoscalar resonances dominate the mass spectrum, whose masses did not agree with any previously seen states. Now by including $\pi\pi$ in the 4 pion system the authors find much more reasonable results. They find a superior fit with $I = 0$ resonances at 1505, 1750, and 2104 MeV, as well as the conventional resonances $f_2(1275)$, $f_2(1640)$ and $\rho(1440)$. The $I = 0$ resonances decay predominantly to $\pi\pi$. It is natural to identify their $I = 0$ resonance at 1505 with the LEAR glueball candidate $f_0(1500)$.

There was much discussion on the mass of the 4^- resonance listed in the 1994 tables [10] under the entry $f_0(1370)$. In a previous analysis by Gaspero [11], in which he reanalysed old Rome-Syracuse bubble chamber data with 4 charged pions, including for the first time the intermediate channel, he found a 1386 ± 30 MeV mass value. This was surprising, since the 4 pion mass distribution peaks clearly at a higher mass, near 1500 MeV, and the analysis needed only one resonance and no large interfering background, which could shift the peak. Also the Crystal Barrel reported a mass 1374 ± 38 MeV in $p\bar{p} \rightarrow (\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0)^0$, and OBELIX a mass of 1345 ± 12 MeV in $\pi p \rightarrow (2^+\pi^-)^+$. All these analyses had a very broad width of almost 400 MeV. I have been skeptical for long about this low mass value for the $f_0(1370)$, suspecting that there was a mistake in flux or phase space factors in the analyses.

Therefore, I was happy to hear that now S. Resag [1], also from Crystal Barrel finds in a careful analysis of $p\bar{p} \rightarrow 5^-$ data with large statistics no resonance at 1370 MeV in the 4^- system, but instead a resonance at the mass of 1500 ± 10 MeV and with a width of 185 ± 20 MeV. He also includes the decay mode $f_0 \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ and finds that the 1500 decays mainly into $\pi\pi$. Now, if $f_0(1370) \rightarrow \pi\pi$ would be present in the charged pions, as the previous three analyses found, it must by isospin be even more clearly be seen in 4 neutral

pions, where there is no background. Thus the " $f_0(1370)$ " must, if it exists, show up in Resag's analysis, but he finds only the $f_0(1500)$. In another paper on the same question of the mass of the $f_0(1370)$, Achasov and Shestakov [1] conclude that the true mass of this 4 resonance cannot be at 1370 MeV, but must lie above 1500 MeV. If this is so, it seems clear that the mass of the $f_0(1370)$ (at least in the 4 channel) is much too low in the 1994 PDG tables. If it is instead around 1500 MeV, then the $f_0(1370)$ in the 4 mode and $f_0(1500)$ are likely to be the same resonance, while the entries under $f_0(1370)$ of the PDG 1994 [10] in the two pseudoscalar mode are likely to belong to the $f_0(1300)$. Hopefully the situation will be cleared up till the next conference, since the $f_0(1500)$ is an important non- $q\bar{q}$ and glueball candidate, while $f_0(1370)$ is an extra state, which does not have an obvious place in the meson spectrum.

B. The (1410) ; (1460) and $f_1(1420)$

Many new results were reported on these controversial mesons, and we are gradually getting a much better picture of what is really observed.

In central production of the $K_S K$ system in pp reactions with a LH_2 target and a 800 GeV/c beam the E690 experiment clearly sees the $f_1(1420)$, which predominantly decays into $K \bar{K} + c.c.$. They have a very clear peak at 1420 MeV. A Dalitz plot analysis shows an interference pattern of the two K bands, which very convincingly is consistent only with a spin parity assignment of 1^{++} . Any background of 0^{++} ; 1^+ or 1^{+-} is small. This spin parity is also supported by the fact that the $f_1(1420)$ is also seen in $\pi\pi$ production. Thus in central production one produces the $f_1(1420)$, which by now is a very well established resonance, but no pseudoscalar $(1400-1460)$ is observed in central production. The $f_1(1420)$ is very likely a non- $q\bar{q}$ resonance (see table 1), since the $f_1(1520)$ already completes the 1^{++} nonet as the favoured $s\bar{s}$ state. The $f_1(1520)$ must also be considered as a well established resonance, since it is clearly seen in four experiments [10] and in three reactions:

$p \rightarrow (K^+ \bar{K}^0)n, K^- p \rightarrow (K_S K^-)n$, and $\pi^+ \pi^- \rightarrow \pi^0 \pi^0$. On the other hand only $f_1(1420)$, not $f_1(1520)$, is seen in central production, which clearly shows the very different nature of these two axial resonances.

The extra state, the $f_1(1420)$, is generally not believed to be a glueball, since its mass is too low. Possibly it could be a hybrid state, but a more likely situation is that it is a 4 quark state, probably in the form of (a virtually bound) $K \bar{K}$ system.

If so, it shows that multi-quark states can be produced preferably in the "gluon rich" environment of central production or radiative $J=0$ decay. This should be a warning to those who want to use such environments as a good place to look for glueballs.

In $N\bar{N}$ annihilation studied by the Crystal Barrel and OBELIX at LEAR collaborations one does not see a strong $f_1(1420)$ but instead the "iota" pseudoscalars in the $\pi\pi$ and $K \bar{K}$ systems. There is now mounting evidence, which shows that the "iota" peak is actually two resonances, one low mass decaying mainly into $a_0(980) \rightarrow \pi\pi$ and $(K \bar{K})_{S\text{-wave}}$, and a heavier one decaying into mainly $K \bar{K}$.

In the $\pi\pi$ decay mode the Crystal Barrel sees an resonance at 1409 \pm 3 MeV with a width of 86 \pm 10 MeV. The final state is reached via two intermediate states $\pi\pi$ and $a_0(980)$. The $a_0(980)$ then decays both into $K \bar{K}$ and $\pi\pi$, such that the ratio $K \bar{K} = \pi\pi$ is 1.1 \pm 0.3, when one integrates over the a_0 peak.

The OBELIX collaboration has about 4000 $p\bar{p} \rightarrow (K \bar{K})$ events from a sample of 18 million annihilations at rest. They see two peaks one lower ($m = 1415 \pm 2$ MeV, $\Gamma = 59 \pm 4$ MeV) decaying into $(K \bar{K})_{S\text{-wave}}$ and a heavier one ($m = 1460 \pm 10$ MeV, $\Gamma = 100 \pm 10$ MeV), which decays into $K \bar{K} + c.c.$

Certainly two pseudoscalars in the 1400-1460 MeV region is at least one too many. One of the peaks can be the $s\bar{s}$ partner of the $\chi(1295)$ completing the 2^1S_0 $q\bar{q}$ nonet, but the second one is a non- $q\bar{q}$ candidate. The mass is believed to be too low for being a good gluonium candidate. Thus it is perhaps more likely a 4 quark, $K\bar{K}$ or possibly a hybrid state.

IV. HEAVY HADRONS

There were reports from LEP and the Delphi collaboration by M. Feindt [1] with updates on B , B_s and B_c masses and lifetimes. Also better determination of the B mass were reported. More interesting was the first discoveries of the orbitally excited $b\bar{q}$ P-wave states, generically called B^* and B_s^* . These would belong to the $0^{++}; 1^{++}; 1^{+}$ and 2^{++} multiplets of the normal quark model. They are expected to lie very close to each others and should be overlapping, since their widths should be larger than their mass splittings, and the two axial states should mix like already the K_{1A} and K_{1B} states do in the light sector. Heavy quark symmetry is here more useful than conventional flavour symmetry. The mass of the B meson is found to be 5712 \pm 11 MeV by OPAL, 5732 \pm 20 MeV by DELPHI and 5734 \pm 3 \pm 18 MeV by ALEPH. The width is of the order 100 MeV. For the B_s OPAL reports 5884 \pm 15 MeV and a width of 47 \pm 22 MeV, and the preliminary results from DELPHI on the B_s are similar.

From CLEO there were also interesting new results on the spectroscopy of charmed states reported by J. Bartelt [1]. Perhaps the most interesting result is the first observation of the isospin violating $D_s^+ \rightarrow D_s^0 \pi^+$ decay, which can provide a good measurement of the π^0 mixing. Also, this decay mode gives a new very accurate measurement of the $D_s^+ - D_s^0$ mass splitting of 143.76 \pm 0.39 \pm 0.40 MeV.

For more details on heavy meson spectroscopy one should of course consult the original papers.

V. PANEL DISCUSSION

At the hadron95 conference there was a special session with a round table discussion on general problems of the future for hadron spectroscopy. Here people could express their views on what experiments should be performed, which models should be studied, how many glueballs should be found, which facilities are needed etc.

The scheduled shutdown of LEAR at the end of 1996 was very much regretted. Colleagues working in other fields of particle physics do not today seem to consider hadron spectroscopy as important enough compared to, say, the search for the top or the Higgs boson. However, the elusive gluonium states are indeed more fundamental to the understanding of the non-Abelian nature of QCD than anything else, including the top. For spontaneous symmetry breaking and mass generation the sigma meson (which we still really don't know exactly where it is) is equally important for the masses of the nucleon, constituent quarks and hadrons in general, as the Higgs boson is for the masses of current quarks, leptons, W and Z. Confinement and nonperturbative aspects of QCD are still not understood and hadron spectroscopy is the crucial experimental input for their theoretical understanding.

The many exciting results presented at these two conferences from Beijing, BNL CERN, Fermilab, KEK, Serpukhov etc. on glueball candidates as well as on many other mesons show that the field is still very much alive, and that many important new discoveries certainly lie ahead.

REFERENCES

- [1] See Proceedings of Hadron95, Manchester 9-14.7 1995, to be published by World Scientific.
- [2] J. Sexton, A. Vaccarino and D. Weingarten, "Numerical evidence for the observation of a scalar glueball", IBM preprint IBM-HET-95-2; See also D. Weingarten, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 34 (1994) 29.
- [3] M. Teper, Oxford university preprint OUTP-95-06P (1994), G. Bali et al. Phys. Lett. B 309 (1994) 29, F. Butler et al. Nucl. Phys. B 430 (1994) 179, Nucl. Phys. B 421 (1994) 217.
- [4] S. Gershtein, Zeit. Phys. C 24 (1984) 305.
- [5] P. Ball, J.-M. Frère and M. Tytgat, "Phenomenological evidence for the gluon content", CERN TH 95/220, (to appear in Phys. Lett. B); R. Akhouri and J.-M. Frère, Phys. Lett. B 220 (1988) 258.
- [6] C. Amisler et al., Phys. Lett. B 291 (1995) 433.
- [7] C. Amisler and F.E. Close, "Evidence for a Scalar Glueball" Rutherford lab. preprint RAL-95-036, RAL-TR-95-003.
- [8] N.A. Tomqvist, Zeit. Phys. C 61 (1994) 525.
- [9] N.A. Tomqvist, "The scalar $q\bar{q}$ nonet" these proceedings and Zeit. Phys. C 68 (1994) 647.
- [10] The Particle Data Group, Phys. Rev. D 50 (1994) 1173.
- [11] M. Gaspero, Nucl. Phys. A 562 (1993) 407.

TABLES

TABLE I. Main non- $q\bar{q}$ candidates.

$f_0(1500-1590)$	Gluonium, $\pi\pi$; $\eta\eta$, or 4q state?
$f_{0=2}(1720)$	Gluonium, $K\bar{K}$, or 4q state?
$f_J(2230)$	Gluonium, $\pi\pi$, or 4q state?
$(1410); (1460)$	Gluonium, $K\bar{K}$, or 4q state?
$f_1(1420)$	Gluonium, $K\bar{K}$, or 4q state?