# Studies of the relative phase between strong and electromagnetic decay amplitudes of psi(2S)

G ( **朱利奥** ) Mezzadri INFN Ferrara



Charmonium weekly meeting, Apr. 10

# Outline

• Introduction

• Data vs MC

• MC generator

• Results

#### Introduction



#### Relative phase of charmonia



Hadronic cross section around charmonia can be described with three diagrams

Experimental and theoretical agreement around EM contributions

Still questions around the strong  $(A_{3g})$  amplitude:

- pQCD predicts almost real

- experiments have different results for J/ $\psi$ , pointing towards 90° relative phase

# An additional motivation

From the experimental point of view, based on  $SU(3)_{F}$  and isospin breaking violation models:

- At J/ $\psi$ 
  - VP (1<sup>-</sup>0<sup>-</sup>) (e.g. J/ $\psi \rightarrow \rho\pi$ ) phase = 106° ± 10°
  - PP (0<sup>-</sup>0<sup>-</sup>) (e.g. J/ $\psi \rightarrow \pi\pi$ ) phase = 89.6° ± 9.9°
  - BB ( $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$ ) (e.g. J/ $\psi \rightarrow p\overline{p}$ ) phase = 89° ± 8°
- At ψ(2S)
  - VP (1<sup>-</sup>0<sup>-</sup>) phase = 159° ± 12°
  - PP (0<sup>-</sup>0<sup>-</sup>) phase = 95° ± 11°

Experiments points towards a non univocal phase for  $\psi(2S)$  (but highly model dependent)

# An additional motivation

From the experimental point of view, based on  $SU(3)_{F}$  and isospin breaking violation models:

- <u>At J/ψ</u>
  - VP (1<sup>-</sup>0<sup>-</sup>) (e.g. J/ $\psi \to \rho \pi$ ) phase = 106° ± 10°
  - PP (0<sup>-</sup>0<sup>-</sup>) (e.g. J/ $\psi \to \pi\pi$ ) phase = 89.6° ± 9.9°
  - BB ( $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}{2}$ ) (e.g. J/ $\psi \rightarrow p\overline{p}$ ) phase = 89° ± 8°
- <u>At ψ(2S)</u>

• VP (1<sup>-</sup>0<sup>-</sup>) phase = 159° ± 12°

• PP (0<sup>-</sup>0<sup>-</sup>) phase =  $95^{\circ} \pm 11^{\circ}$ 

Possible explaination of  $\rho\pi$  puzzle?

Experiments points towards a non univocal phase for  $\psi(2S)$  (but highly model dependent)

#### An(other) motivation

At Changsha workshop Rinaldo presented a model to explain the value of the relative phase in charmonium

The Sounds of Silence An attempt to explain the anomalous J/ $\psi$  strong decay phase  $\delta$ 



R. Baldini Ferroli et al., Phys. Rev. D95, 034038 (2017); R. Baldini Ferroli et al., Phys. Rev. C98, 045210 (2018).

#### An(other) motivation

At Changsha workshop Rinaldo presented a model to explain the value of the relative phase in charmonium

The Sounds of Silence An attempt to explain the anomalous J/ $\psi$  strong decay phase  $\delta$ 

A new attempt to explain the anomalous  $J/\psi$  strong decay phase Exploiting  $\alpha_s(s_{tl})$  Imaginary Part



R. Baldini Ferroli et al., Phys. Rev. D95, 034038 (2017); R. Baldini Ferroli et al., Phys. Rev. C98, 045210 (2018).



#### An(other) motivation

At Changsha workshop, Rinaldo presented a model to explain the value of the relative phase in charmonium

The Sounds of Silence An attempt to explain the anomalous J/ $\psi$  strong decay phase  $\delta$ 

This set of analysis can test this model

QQ <sub>bar</sub>	δ(M)  <sub>exp</sub>	$\mu^2 \thickapprox \Lambda^2$	$\mu^2 \approx M_{\oplus}^2$
Φ	163 ± 7 ⁰- δ <sub>ω</sub>	-170.	-170.
J/Ų	85 ± 4  <sup>0</sup>	-66.	- <u>84.</u>
ψ(3686)	(?)	-61.	-81.
Y(1S)	~  64 º	-44.	-68.

# Status of J/psi analyses

Several analyses are on-going:

- Yadi Wang's  $\mu^+\mu^-$  and  $5\pi$  study has been published
- Marco Destefanis pp study is in Memo stage, ready for a newer version of the memo: results are consistent with other BESIII measurements
- Francesca De Mori K+K- study is finalizing the memo after finding consistent results in psi(2S)  $\rightarrow \pi + \pi$  J/psi  $\rightarrow \pi + \pi$  K+K- study of the branching ratio
- I started once  $\overline{\Lambda\Lambda}$  analysis, it can be helpful to verify if some differences arise when hyperon are considered (but very little effort)

# Which channels?

- Plan to measure the relative phase in the largest number of channels possible to extract the relative phase in a "**inclusive approach**"
  - Unfortunately, our possibility are very limited by time and manpower constraints
- Golden channel:
  - ππJ/ψ
  - ρπ
  - μμ
  - pp
  - K\*Kº

#### Phase in $\tau^+\tau^-$ ?

It is also possible to use the  $\tau$  mass selection to extract the phase in another pure EM decay



#### Final tables of runs

Thanks to Zhang Jianyong and BEMS, precise measurements of the beam energies are available.

Requested Energy (MeV)	Requested Luminosity $(nb^{-1})$	Run number	Energy (MeV)	Spread (MeV)	Luminosity $(nb^{-1})$
3580	85	55375 - 55461	$3581.543 \pm 0.060$	$1.493\pm0.060$	85665.6
3670	85	55462 - 55541	$3670.158 \pm 0.063$	$1.410\pm0.053$	84719.7
3681	85	55542 - 55635	$3680.144 \pm 0.061$	$1.517\pm0.060$	84814.5
3683	55	55636 - 55662	$3682.752 \pm 0.115$	$1.710\pm0.104$	28668.3
-	-	55663-55690	$3684.224 \pm 0.119$	$1.547\pm0.122$	28651.6
3685.5	25	55691 - 55716	$3685.264 \pm 0.105$	$1.478\pm0.111$	25982.8
3686.6	25	55717 - 55737	$3686.496 \pm 0.120$	$1.594\pm0.117$	25055.1
3690	70	55738 - 55795	$3691.363 \pm 0.075$	$1.541\pm0.074$	69374.6
3710	70	55796 - 55859	$3709.755 \pm 0.074$	$1.460\pm0.075$	70326.7

Reconstructed data: /bes3fs/offline/data/704-1/psipscan1805/dst

All data also available in Torino servers /media/bespanda/dati\_bes/dati\_scan/phasepsipscan/ /home\_bes009/mdestefa/lists/psip\_phase



MC generators

# J/psi case

- For J/psi we can use Babayaga, a permille level ISR generator
- We have applied some modifications both on Babayaga and BOSS
  - It was quite a long process
  - But we are successfull
- Slow generation of ISR once
- Fast fitting routine
  - available in fortran and C++, results are compatible

#### **BESIII** generator

- KKMC + BesEvtGen
- ConExc
- Babayaga
- Phokhara
- Etim

#### **BESIII** generator

- KKMC + BesEvtGen
- ConExc
- Babaxaga
  Cannot reproduce all the interesting final states
  Photpara
- Etim

# Etim

- Created by Rinaldo
- Advantage:
  - We know exactly what is inside (if you can read fortran)
  - We have already tested at J/psi that the prediction are in good agreement
- Main disadvantage:
  - It is custom, not official, need lot of counterchecks from the review!

# ConExc

- Extract the ISR contribution from an iterative study of the lineshape of the cross section:
  - Start with flat lineshape
  - Iterate until variation of the i-1th and ith step is below a certain threshold (0.1 %), that is assumed also as systematic error
- It can be quite time-demanding
- But has all the final states already included
- Ping RongGang is always very willing to help
  - I haven't directly spoken with him about this yet



# KKMC + BesEvtGen

- Advantage: it is official
- A recent version allow to save the information for the ISR/FSR generation, set the maximum ISR energy
  - We need: weight + energy after ISR
  - Then we can repeat the same procedure as for Babayaga!
- Unfortunately it seems to work only around Y(4220)
  - I have spoken with Sun Zhentian in Changsha, he is very willing to collaborate!



# KKMC + BesEvtGen

• In the meantime, we shall start to generate some events to perform data quality validation, first cuts

- How to proceed? As suggested to me long-ago by
  - Copy KKMC in the working area



- Modify the share files by setting the mass of psi(2S) to the central value of the energy considered
- Modify the decay card accordingly
- Add "GenerateJpsi = true" option in the jobOptions of the simulation

#### Examples

#### #include "\$0FFLINEEVENTL00PMGRR00T/share/OfflineEventLoopMgr\_0ption.txt"

//\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*job options for EvtGen\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\* #include "\$BESEVTGENROOT/share/BesEvtGen.txt" EvtDecay.userDecayTableName = "pipijpsi.dec";

```
KKMC.ResParameterRh3 = {1.720e0, 250e-3, 0.0e-6};
/ Omega(783)
KKMC.ResParameterOme = {0.78265e0, 8.49e-3, 0.60e-6};
// Omega(1419) --> omega'
KKMC.ResParameterOm2 = {1.419e0, 174e-3, 0.00e-6};
// Omega(1649) --> omega"
KKMC.ResParameterOm3 = {1.649e0, 220e-3, 0.00e-6};
// Phi(1020)
KKMC.ResParameterPhi = {1.01942e0, 4.46e-3, 1.33e-6};
// Phi(1680) --> Phi'
KKMC.ResParameterPh2 = {1.680e0, 150e-3, 0.00e-6};
// J/Psi(3097)
KKMC.ResParameterPsi = {3.096916e0, 0.0929e-3, 5.55e-6};
// Psi(3686)
KKMC.ResParameterPs2 = {3.680144e0, 0.304e-3, 2.35e-6};
// Psi(3770)
KKMC.ResParameterPs3 = {3.77315e0, 27.2e-3, 0.262e-6};
```



 $e^+e^- \rightarrow \pi\pi J/\psi$  $J/\psi \rightarrow e^+e^-$ 

# MC and BOSS version

- BOSS version: 7.0.4
- 20000 events for each energy value to estimate the efficiency and extract the event selection
  - Both real energy and spread are used in the simulation

Energy (MeV)	Spread (MeV)
$3581.543 \pm 0.060$	$1.493 \pm 0.060$
$3670.158 \pm 0.063$	$1.410\pm0.053$
$3680.144 \pm 0.061$	$1.517\pm0.060$
$3682.752 \pm 0.115$	$1.710\pm0.104$
$3684.224 \pm 0.119$	$1.547\pm0.122$
$3685.264 \pm 0.105$	$1.478 \pm 0.111$
$3686.496 \pm 0.120$	$1.594 \pm 0.117$
$3691.363 \pm 0.075$	$1.541\pm0.074$
$3709.755 \pm 0.074$	$1.460 \pm 0.075$

- Selection based on PipiJpsialg on BOSS repository:
  - We will move to our algorithm soon

#### Data – MC comparison @ 3681 MeV



#### Data – MC comparison @ 3681 MeV



 $\mathbf{p}_{e}$ 

 $p_{\pi}$ 

# **Preliminary efficiencies**

Fit to the  $\pi\pi$  recoil mass



More complicated pattern due to ISR return

27

#### Energy above the peak – ISR effect



ISR contribution shifts the peak of about the same difference between the center of mass energy and the nominal peak of  $\psi(2S)$ 

#### Real data - Fit @ 3681 MeV



#### Real data @ 3710 MeV - Full recoil spectrum



Good agreement between MC and data! Possible to fit only the  $J/\psi$  region to search for the signal

#### Real data @ 3710 MeV – Fit to $J/\psi$ energy region



Voigtian + Chebychev

Final number of events will be determined by fitting both peaks at the same time

#### Next steps...

- Most urgent: define the proper generator
  - Final fitting routine will change based on this
- Refine the event selection (solve the ISR for events just above the peak) and finalize the cut for  $J/\psi \to ee$
- Add the J/ $\psi \rightarrow \mu\mu$  sample
- Analyse the background
- Final fit to extract the phase
- ..

