## UC Irvine

## UC Irvine Previously Published Works

## Title

Evidence for a spin-1 resonance in the reaction $\gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow K 0 K \pm \pi \pm$

## Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1c32p1wk

## Journal

Physical Review Letters, 59(18)
ISSN
0031-9007

## Authors

Gidal, G
Boyer, J
Butler, F
et al.

## Publication Date

1987-11-02

DOI
10.1103/physrevlett.59.2016

## Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

Peer reviewed

## Evidence for a Spin-1 Resonance in the Reaction $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{*}} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{K}^{\mathbf{0}} \boldsymbol{K}^{ \pm} \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mp}$
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#### Abstract

We confirm the observation of a spin-1 resonance at 1423 MeV in the $K_{S}^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}$ system produced in single-tagged two-photon interactions. The Dalitz plot indicates that this resonance decays primarily via a $K^{*} K$ intermediate state. We measure a radiative width times branching ratio $B_{K \bar{K} x}\left(M^{2} / Q^{2}\right) \Gamma_{\gamma \gamma^{*}}$ $=3.2 \pm 1.4 \pm 0.6 \mathrm{keV}$ on the assumption of a $\rho$-pole form factor.

PACS numbers: 14.40.Cs, $13.40 . \mathrm{Hq}, 13.65 .+\mathrm{i}$


Two mesons, the $\eta(1440)$ and $f_{1}(1420)$, appear at nearly the same mass in a wide variety of experiments. Different experiments obtain different spin and parity assignments for mesons in this mass region, although most radiative $J / \psi$ decay experiments obtain $J^{P}=0^{-}$and a mass near $1450 \mathrm{MeV},{ }^{1}$ while hadrorproduction experiments find $J^{P}=1^{+}$or $0^{-}$and a mass near $1420 \mathrm{MeV} .^{2}$

The $K^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}$ final state is a major decay mode of the $\eta(1440)$ and $f_{1}(1420)$ and so can be used to study their production in photon-photon interactions. Although rather stringent limits ${ }^{3}$ have been placed on $\Gamma(\eta(1440) \rightarrow \gamma \gamma)$, where the photons are on the mass shell, the TPC/Two-Gamma Collaboration has recently reported ${ }^{4}$ evidence for a state near 1420 MeV in the $K^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}$ system produced in tagged $\gamma \gamma^{*}$ interactions. We report on a similar study with $220 \mathrm{pb}^{-1}$ of data taken with the Mark II detector at the SLAC $e^{+} e^{-}$storage ring PEP and confirm this observation. ${ }^{5}$ The production at only larger $Q^{2}$, indications of a dominant $K^{*} K$ decay mode, and our failure to observe it in $\eta \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$lead us to identify this state tentatively with the $J^{P C}=1^{++}$ $f_{1}(1420)$.

The major features of the Mark II detector have been well described elsewhere. ${ }^{6,7}$ The small-angle tagging system (SAT) and shower counter identify and measure scattered electrons at polar angles between 21 and 83 mrad from the incident $e^{+}$or $e^{-}$direction. Events with one SAT track having energy greater than 7 GeV are accepted in this analysis. To study the reaction

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow e^{+} e^{-} K^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

we further select events with four charged tracks of net charge zero in the central detector. We then require that two of these tracks reconstruct to a $K_{S}^{0}$ which decays at
least 2.0 mm from the primary vertex. The projection of these two tracks to the secondary vertex, and cuts that require a positive flight path and $480<m_{\pi^{+} \pi^{-}}<520$ MeV , define the $K_{S}^{0}$ sample. The distribution in $m_{\pi^{+} \pi^{-}}$ before the last cut is shown in Fig. 1 and indicates very little background. To eliminate a possible $f^{\prime}(1520)$ $\rightarrow K_{S}^{0} \bar{K}_{S}^{0}$ background, we remove events in which the $\pi^{+} \pi^{-}$pair opposite the identified $K_{S}^{0}$ has an invariant mass between 480 and 520 MeV . Most tracks produced by Reaction (1) have momenta below $1 \mathrm{GeV} / c$ and therefore, whenever possible, time-of-flight information is used to identify the charged $K$ and $\pi$ tracks. Each candidate event is then examined in detail for such things as untracked $K^{ \pm}$decays, poorly measured tracks,


FIG. 1. Invariant mass of $\pi^{+} \pi^{-}$pairs used to define the $K_{S}$ sample.




$$
\mathrm{M}\left(\mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{S}}^{0} \mathrm{~K}^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}\right) \quad(\mathrm{GeV})
$$

FIG. 2. $K_{S}^{8} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}$ invariant mass for (a) the acceptedevent sample and (b) the events with extra $\gamma$ 's. Scatter plot of this invariant mass vs $Q^{2}$ for the accepted events. (d) The relevant region of $K_{S}^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}$ invariant mass for untagged events.
and especially extra $\gamma$ 's detected in the liquid-argon barrel calorimeters or the proportional-chamber end caps, that are not associated with charged tracks. The events with extra gammas are primarily "feed-down" from higher-multiplicity $\gamma \gamma^{*}$ interactions and form a sample that can be used to study potential backgrounds to Reaction (1).

The net transverse momentum with respect to the $e^{+} e^{-}$axis, $\Sigma \mathbf{p}_{T}$, including the measured outgoing beam electron or positron, is required to be less than 150 $\mathrm{MeV} / c$. There remain 27 events attributed to Reaction (1). All but one of these have only one combination of tracks consistent with the $K^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}$ hypothesis, and we plot their invariant masses in Fig. 2(a). Note the dominant peak between 1400 and 1500 MeV . A fit in 20MeV bins by a Gaussian distribution gives $M=1423 \pm 4$ MeV and $\sigma=14 \pm 2 \mathrm{MeV}$, consistent with the detector resolution determined with Monte Carlo simulations. The invariant mass of the background events with extra $\gamma$ 's is shown in Fig. 2(b). These events show no peaking. Figure 2(c) shows the scatter plot of the invariant fourmomentum transfer $Q^{2}$ vs $M\left(K^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}\right)$. The peak events are clearly produced at relatively large $Q^{2}$ confirming the observations of Ref. 4. Monte Carlo studies (described below) show that the detector acceptance also increases from $1 \%$ to $5 \%$ as $Q^{2}$ increases from threshold to $1.0(\mathrm{GeV} / c)^{2}$.

In Fig. 3(a) we show the Dalitz plot for the thirteen events with masses between 1.4 and 1.5 GeV . Although the statistics are limited, the events appear to be grouped in the $K^{*}(890)$ bands. The Dalitz plot for the sidebands ( $1.3<M<1.4$ and $1.5<M<1.6 \mathrm{GeV}$ ) together with the corresponding $(1.3<M<1.6 \mathrm{GeV})$ background "extra photon" events is shown in Fig. 3(b) and shows no clustering in the $K^{*}$ bands. Alternatively, a decay via the $a_{0}(980) \pi$ intermediate state would have resulted in a clear signal in the $\eta^{0} \pi^{+} \pi^{-}$final state, since the $a_{0}(980)$ decays predominantly into $\eta \pi$. No such signal was seen. ${ }^{7}$

To measure the detection efficiency, we generate Monte Carlo events for a $1425-\mathrm{MeV}$ spin-1 resonance, $R$, with helicity 1 , and with an equal mixture of $K^{* 0} K^{0}$ and $K^{*-} K^{+}$decays. The same careful scanning procedure is applied to these Monte Carlo events to obtain the final detection efficiently. The eleven events above background in Fig. 2(a) then correspond to a cross section $\sigma\left(e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow e^{+} e^{-} R\right)=10.3 \pm 4.0 \pm 1.5 \mathrm{pb}$ over the $Q^{2}$ interval $0.2-1.1(\mathrm{GeV} / c)^{2}$. For a spin-0 resonance, with a $Q^{2}$ dependence dominated by a $\rho$-pole form factor, this would correspond ${ }^{7}$ to an expected

$$
\Gamma(R \rightarrow \gamma \gamma) B(R \rightarrow K \bar{K} \pi)=2.2 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.3 \mathrm{keV}
$$

The absence of such a resonance in $\gamma \gamma$ interactions at $Q^{2} \simeq 0$ has already been noted. ${ }^{3}$ To derive such a limit for this experiment we select events as above, but with no SAT energy and with a $\Sigma \mathbf{p}_{T}$ less than $100 \mathrm{MeV} / c$. Fig-
ure 2(d) shows the relevant region of invariant mass for these untagged events. The dotted histogram represents the Monte Carlo expectation for 7.5 events of a spin- 0 resonance at a mass of 1425 MeV with a $\Gamma$ of 20 MeV , leading to the limit $\Gamma(R \rightarrow \gamma \gamma) B(R \rightarrow K \bar{K} \pi)<0.5 \mathrm{keV}$ [95\% confidence level (C.L.)], well below the above ex-
pectation. Since real photon-photon collisions cannot produce a spin-1 particle, ${ }^{8}$ while a spin- 0 particle would be produced even more copiously than observed, we assume the observed peak to be spin 1 .

Following Cahn, ${ }^{9}$ we parametrize the observed tagged cross section as
$\sigma\left(e^{+} e^{-} \rightarrow e^{+} e^{-} R\right)$

$$
\begin{gather*}
=2\left(\frac{\alpha^{2}}{\pi^{2}}\right)\left(\frac{24 \pi^{2}}{M^{3}}\right) \tilde{\Gamma}_{R \gamma \gamma^{*}} \int \frac{d Q^{2}}{M^{2}} F^{2}\left(Q^{2}\right)\left\{\ln \left(\frac{Q_{\mathrm{cut}}^{2}}{m_{e}^{2}}\right)\left(\ln \frac{1}{\tau^{\prime}}-\frac{7}{4}\right)+\left(\ln \frac{1}{\tau^{\prime}}\right)^{2}-3 \ln \frac{1}{\tau^{\prime}}-\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}+\frac{23}{8}\right. \\
\left.+\frac{1}{2} \frac{Q^{2}}{M^{2}}\left[\left(\ln \frac{Q_{\mathrm{cut}}^{2}}{m_{e}^{2}}\right)\left(\ln \frac{1}{\tau^{\prime}}-\frac{3}{2}\right)+\left(\ln \frac{1}{\tau^{\prime}}\right)^{2}-\frac{5}{2} \ln \frac{1}{\tau^{\prime}}-\frac{\pi^{2}}{6}+\frac{19}{8}\right]\right\} \tag{2}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma}_{R \gamma \gamma^{*}}=\left(M^{2} / Q^{2}\right) \Gamma_{R \gamma \gamma^{*}}$ in the low- $Q^{2}$ limit, $\tau^{\prime} \equiv\left(M^{2}+Q^{2}\right) / s, Q_{\text {cut }}^{2}=0.1$ is the antitagging cutoff, and the residual $Q^{2}$ dependence is contained in the form factor, for which we assume the form $F\left(Q^{2}\right)=(1$ $\left.+Q^{2} / m_{\rho}^{2}\right)^{-1}$. From Eq. (2) evaluated at $\sqrt{s}=29 \mathrm{GeV}$, $M=1.425 \mathrm{GeV}$, and $m_{\rho}=0.76 \mathrm{GeV}$ we obtain from our cross-section measurement, over the $Q^{2}$ interval 0.2-1.1 $(\mathrm{GeV} / c)^{2}, \quad B(R \rightarrow K \bar{K} \pi) \tilde{\Gamma}_{R \gamma \gamma^{*}}=3.2 \pm 1.4 \pm 0.6 \mathrm{keV}$,


FIG. 3. Dalitz plot for (a) accepted events and (b) background sample.
lower than the Ref. 4 value of $12 \pm 4 \pm 4 \mathrm{keV}$. It is important to note that this result is sensitive to the assumed $Q^{2}$ dependence. For example, an $F\left(Q^{2}\right)=\left(1+Q^{2} /\right.$ $\left.m_{\phi}^{2}\right)^{-1}$, which might be more appropriate for a resonance with quark composition $s \bar{s}$, would yield

$$
B(R \rightarrow K \bar{K} \pi) \tilde{\Gamma}\left(R \rightarrow \gamma \gamma^{*}\right)=2.1 \pm 1.0 \pm 0.4 \mathrm{keV}
$$

The axial-vector nonet is usually taken to consist of the $a_{1}(1270), K_{1 A}(1340), f_{1}(1285)$, and $f_{1}(1420)$ with ideal mixing, i.e., with quark composition $f_{1}(1285)$ $\simeq(u \bar{u}+d \bar{d}) / \sqrt{2}$ and $f_{1}(1420) \simeq s \bar{s}$. A nonrelativisitc quark model with these assumptions predicts ${ }^{10,11}$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\Gamma}\left(f_{1}(1420) \rightarrow \gamma \gamma^{*}\right) \\
& \quad=\frac{2}{15}\left(M_{f_{1}} / M_{f_{2}}\right) \Gamma\left(f_{2}(1270) \rightarrow \gamma \gamma\right) \cong 0.4 \mathrm{keV}
\end{aligned}
$$

almost an order of magnitude smaller than our measurement with the assumption that $B(R \rightarrow K \bar{K} \pi)=1$. The


FIG. 4. Measured distribution in $|\cos \theta|$ for the events with $1.4<M\left(K_{S}^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}\right)<1.5 \mathrm{GeV}$. The solid (dashed) histogram is the result of Monte Carlo simulation of the distribution expected for $J^{P C}=1^{++}\left(J^{P C}=1^{-+}\right)$.
model also predicts that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\Gamma}\left(f_{1}(1285) \rightarrow \gamma \gamma^{*}\right) / \tilde{\Gamma}\left(f_{1}(1420)\right. & \left.\rightarrow \gamma \gamma^{*}\right) \\
& \cong \frac{25}{2} M_{f_{1}(1285)} / M_{f_{1}(1420)}
\end{aligned}
$$

larger than our measured ratio ${ }^{7}$ of $2.9 \pm 1.5$. A small deviation from ideal mixing can, however, accommodate these measurements. ${ }^{7}$

Although the $f_{1}(1285)$ can also decay into $K \bar{K} \pi$, no significant signal is seen at this mass in Fig. 2(a). From the three events below 1.35 GeV , we can calculate a limit

$$
B\left(f_{1}(1285) \rightarrow K \bar{K} \pi\right) \tilde{\Gamma}\left(f_{1}(1285) \rightarrow \gamma \gamma^{*}\right)<1.12 \mathrm{keV}
$$

(95\% C.L.). Our measurement ${ }^{7}$ of $\tilde{\Gamma}\left(f_{1}(1285) \rightarrow \underline{\gamma} \gamma^{*}\right)$ $=9.4 \pm 2.5 \pm 1.7 \mathrm{keV}$ and a branching ratio ${ }^{12}$ to $K \bar{K} \pi$ of $0.11 \pm 0.03$ are consistent with this limit.

On the basis of the relatively large $f_{1}(1420)$ radiative width and recent observations in hadronic $J / \psi$ decays, Chanowitz ${ }^{11}$ has suggested that the observed state is a candidate for an exotic $J^{P C}=1^{-+}$hybrid $q \bar{q} g$ state (or meikton). A direct test of the spin and parity is obtained from the folded distribution in the cosine of the angle $\theta$ between the normal to the decay plane and the incident photon, in the rest frame of the $f_{1}(1420)$. Cahn ${ }^{9}$ has pointed out that at small $Q^{2}$ the distribution is $1+\cos ^{2} \theta$ for a $J^{P C}=1^{++}$particle and $1-\cos ^{2} \theta$ for a $J^{P C}=1^{-+}$ particle. Figure 4 shows the resultant measured folded distribution, normalized to the Monte Carlo simulation, for the thirteen events between 1.4 and 1.5 GeV , together with the expectations ${ }^{13}$ from those predictions. No definite conclusion is possible for so few events.

In summary, we have observed a peak near 1425 MeV in $\gamma \gamma^{*} \rightarrow K^{0} K^{ \pm} \pi^{\mp}$ with a $Q^{2}$ distribution characteristic of a spin-1 resonance. We tentatively identify it with the $J^{P C}=1^{++} f_{1}(1420)$, although a departure from ideal mixing is required to accommodate the measured $f_{1}(1285)$ and $f_{1}(1420)$ radiative widths in the naive quark model. A more definitive identification awaits a higher-statistics spin and parity determination.
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