

The π<sup>0</sup> and η meson decays and near threshold production and low energy QCD

> Joanna Stepaniak National Centre for Nuclear Studies Various Faces of QCD, Świerk, 8-9 October 2016

# Outline

- Light pseudoscalar mesons π and η threshold production and decays - what can we learn from them?
- WASA experiment and world competition
- Theoretical description at low energies Effective Chiral Lagrangian and OBE
- The  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi$  decays : light quarks masses
- Rare decays and new physics

## Low energy regime

 The Lagrangian of QCD is invariant under the interchange of the three light quarks if m<sub>u</sub>=m<sub>d</sub>=m<sub>s</sub>.

$$\mathcal{L}_{QCD} = \sum_{q=u,d,s} \left[ i \bar{q}_L \mathcal{D} q_L + i \bar{q}_R \mathcal{D} q_R - m_q \left( \bar{q}_R q_L + \bar{q}_L q_R \right) \right] \,.$$

• If m<sub>q</sub>=0 left and right handed particles can be rotated into each other

## U(3)L x U(3)R Chiral Symmetry

- Symmetry is spontaneouly broken in real world
- Octet of pseudoscalar light mesons . Goldstone -Bosons

## Light pseudoscalar octet

- η is one of key mesons for our understanding of low-energy hadron dynamics and underlying QCD
- Eigenstate of P, C, CP, and G:

Study violations of discrete symmetries

 $I^G J^{PC} \!=\! 0^+ 0^{-\!+}$ 



Experiment WASA at COSY accelerator (at CELSIUS Storage Ring before 2006)

• Meson produced in pp $\rightarrow$ ppX or pd $\rightarrow$ <sup>3</sup>HeX reaction





 At low energy the strong interaction between pseudoscalar mesons can be described by an Effective Chiral Lagrangian based on symmetry requirements

### <u>but</u>

• The Langrangian depends on a number of coupling constants that are not determined by symmetries itselves

## Isospin violating $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ decay

- Strong interaction isospin violation connected to
   m<sub>u</sub> m<sub>d</sub>
- A unique source of information on the light quarks mass difference
   Calculations:

$$A(\eta \to 3\pi) \sim m_d - m_u \sim R^{-1} \sim Q^{-2} ,$$
  

$$R = \frac{m_s - m_{ud}}{m_d - m_u}, \quad Q^2 = \frac{m_s^2 - m_{ud}^2}{m_d^2 - m_u^2} ,$$
  

$$Q^2 = \left(1 + \frac{m_s}{m_{ud}}\right) R/2, \quad m_{ud} := (m_u + m_d)/2 .$$

Calculations:	$\overline{Q}$
LO [10]	15.6
NLO [10]	20.1
NNLO [10]	22.9
dispersive [13]	22.7(8)
dispersive [14]	22.4(9)
dispersive (PLM) [15]	23.1(7)
Lattice QCD av. [16]	22.6(7)(6)

 Electromagnetic contributions are small [Bell, Sutherland(1968), et al. (2009)]

## $\eta \rightarrow \pi + \pi - \pi^0$ decay

with



$$\begin{split} X &= \sqrt{3} \frac{T_{\pi^+} - T_{\pi^-}}{Q_{\eta}} \\ Y &= \frac{3T_{\pi^0}}{Q_{\eta}} - 1 \end{split}$$

$$Q_{\eta} = T_{\pi^+} + T_{\pi^-} + T_{\pi^0} = m_{\eta} - 2m_{\pi^+} - m_{\pi^0}.$$

#### The Amplitude can be parametised as:

$$A(X,Y)|^2 \simeq N(1 + aY + bY^2 + cX + dX^2 + eXY + fY^3 + gX^2Y + hXY^2 + lX^3 + ...).$$

## Dalitz plot parameters : experiment vs theory

#### G.Ecker (2015)

	- <i>a</i>	b	d
WASA/COSY 2014 [79]	1.144(18)	0.219(19)(47)	0.086(18)(15)
BESIII 2015 [80]	1.128(15)(8)	0.153(17)(4)	0.085(16)(9)
KLOE 2015 [81]	$1.095(3)(^{+3}_{-2})$	0.145(3)(5)	$0.081(3)(^{+6}_{-5})$
my averages	1.099(4)	0.147(6)	0.082(6)
PDG 2014 [54]			
NNLO CHPT [67]	1.271(75)	0.394(102)	0.055(57)
NREFT [75]	1.213(14)	0.308(23)	0.050(3)
KKNZ [76]			
JPAC [77]	1.116(32)	0.188(12)	0.063(4)

expected stat error  $\rightarrow$ WASA-at-COSY 10 KLOE 08 CBarrel 98 Layter 73 Gormley 70 **Dispersive 96** CHPT-2 07 CHPT-1 85 CA -1.2 -1.15 -1.3 -1.25 а WASA-at-COSY 10 KLOE 08 98 CBarrel 73 Layter Gormley 70 **Dispersive 96** CHPT-2 07 CHPT-1 85 CA 0.45 0 0.05 0.2 0.25 0.35 0.4 0.5 0.150.3 n

67-Bijnens (2007) 75-Schneider et al.(2011) 76-Kampf et al.(2011) 77-Guo et al.(2015)





**Table 7:** Successive orders in the chiral expansion for the decay rate  $\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0)$  and for the ratio  $r = \Gamma(\eta \rightarrow 3\pi^0)/\Gamma(\eta \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0)$  in comparison with experiment. For the numbers with an asterisk Q = 24.3

## $\pi^{0}$ production near threshold from pp $\rightarrow$ pp $\pi^{0}$



# Heavy meson exchange or off shell $\pi$ -p scattering amplitude?

- Which of these explanations, if either, is the correct one? [Cohen et al. Phys.Rev. C53 (1996)]
- Clearly both effects cannot simultaneously be as large as the authors of the papers suggested unless there are some compensating effects.
- For example, if the amplitude of the impulse term were added to the amplitude for both of these effects, the resulting cross section would be approximately 2– 2.5 times larger than the experimental cross section.

 According to Park & al. (1995), using systematic ChPT, the rescattering term interferes destructively with the Born-term → addition of the heavy meson exchange contribution is needed



Park & al. Phys.Rev C, Vol 53(4), 1995

#### Chiral Perturbation Theory Calculations For S-wave $\pi^0$

E.Gedalin<sup>\*</sup>, A.Moalem<sup>†</sup> and L.Razdolskaya<sup>†</sup>

FIG. 4. Predictions for the total cross section vs.  $\eta_{max}$ , the maximal available momentum of

pion in the center of mass system.



A.Bondar et al., Phys. Lett. **B356** (1995) 8.

H.O.Meyer et al., Nucl. Phys. A539 (1992) 683.

# Summary

- One can extract values for the quark mass ratio R and Q from  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi$  decays.
- The area of low energy tests of the SM via ChPT is an active and exciting one.
- With chiral SU(3) there is still room for improvements. ChPT seems unable to account for Dalitz plot for  $\eta \rightarrow 3\pi$ even at NNLO.
- Slow convergence.
- Leptonic and semileptonic η decays are studied by the WASA collaboration.

# Backup

The goldstone boson fields

$$\pi = rac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ egin{array}{cccc} \sqrt{rac{1}{2}} \, \pi^0 + \sqrt{rac{1}{6}} \, \eta & \pi^+ & K^+ \ \pi^- & -\sqrt{rac{1}{2}} \, \pi^0 + \sqrt{rac{1}{6}} \, \eta & K^0 \ K^- & \overline{K}^0 & -rac{2}{\sqrt{6}} \, \eta \end{array} 
ight],$$





```
Energy dependence of \eta N \rightarrow \eta N amplitude most sensitive to S_{11}
molecular component (Baru et al. (2004))
What do we know?
PDG 2004: Mass: 1520–1555 MeV (m_{\eta} + M_N =1486 MeV)
Width: 100–200 MeV
Hadronic decay channels:
```

$\pi N$	35 - 55%	
$\eta N$	30 - 55%	two pion channels neither well de- termined nor big
$\pi\pi N$	1 - 10%	
$\pi\Delta$	< 1%	1997 - 1929-1 10 10 <sup>11</sup> <del>-</del>
$\rho N$	< 4%	



The goldstone boson fields

\_\_\_\_\_

$$\pi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \pi^0 + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \eta & \pi^+ & K^+ \\ \pi^- & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \pi^0 + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} \eta & K^0 \\ K^- & \overline{K}^0 & -\frac{2}{\sqrt{6}} \eta \end{bmatrix},$$



#### A.B. Santra, B.K. Jain/Nuclear Physics A 634 (1998) 309-324

