



**Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory**

**FERMILAB-Pub-92/05**

## The width of the $J/\psi$ resonance

**S. Hsueh**

*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory  
P.O. Box 500, Batavia, Illinois 60510*

**S. Palestini**

*I.N.F.N., sez Torino  
Torino, 10125, Italy*

**January 1992**

Submitted to *Phys. Rev. D.*

## **Disclaimer**

*This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.*

# The width of the $J/\psi$ resonance

Shao Yuan Hsueh

*Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, Illinois 60510*

Sandro Palestini

*I.N.F.N., sez. Torino, Torino, 10125, Italy*

Measurements of the  $J/\psi$  total width and branching ratios for decays to lepton pairs and hadronic final states are reviewed. New values for the overall best fits are provided.

PACS numbers:14.40.Gx

A new measurement[1] of the branching ratio for the decay of  $J/\psi$  into lepton pairs has been recently published. While this measurement is based on the reconstruction of decay channels in a sample of identified  $J/\psi$ 's, previous measurements[2-5] were obtained from the comparison of the processes:

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi \rightarrow l^+l^- \quad (1)$$

$$e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi \rightarrow \text{hadrons} \quad (2)$$

where  $l^\pm = e^\pm$  or  $\mu^\pm$ . The cross sections for processes (1) and (2), integrated across the resonance, are proportional to the expressions:

$$A_l = \Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(l^+l^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}} \quad (3)$$

$$A_h = \Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\text{hadrons})/\Gamma_{\text{total}} \quad (4)$$

respectively. Under the assumptions:

$$\Gamma(l^+l^-) \equiv \Gamma(e^+e^-) = \Gamma(\mu^+\mu^-) \quad (5)$$

$$\Gamma_{\text{total}} = 2 \times \Gamma(l^+l^-) + \Gamma(\text{hadrons}) \quad (6)$$

the branching ratio for lepton pairs ( $\text{BR}(l^+l^-) \equiv \Gamma(l^+l^-)/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ ) was extracted together with  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ . Therefore the new measurement requires a new combined fit of  $\text{BR}(l^+l^-)$  together with  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ , or, equivalently, with one of the partial widths  $\Gamma(l^+l^-)$ ,  $\Gamma(\text{hadrons})$ . We have performed a fit to the existing data and obtained new values for the overall best fits to the  $J/\psi$  total width and branching ratios for decays to the lepton pairs and hadronic final states.

Table I shows the values used in our fit. In particular, the authors of Ref. 2 provided values and experimental errors for the quantities  $A_l$  and  $A_h$ , and we have inferred the value of the correlation coefficient between them ( $\rho$ ) from the quoted

errors in  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$  and  $\Gamma(\text{hadrons})$ . Ref. 3 quotes values of total width, partial widths and branching fractions, separating the  $e^+e^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states. We have averaged the two lepton final states, extracting the value of the correlation coefficient from the quoted error in  $\Gamma(\mu^+\mu^-)/\Gamma(e^+e^-)$ . The remaining measurements and errors have been used to compute the values of the quantities  $A_l$  and  $A_h$ , and of the corresponding covariance matrix. Values of  $\rho$  in the range 0.25–0.4 are compatible with the published results, and we have chosen the lower limit, which is favored by the quoted  $\pm 3\%$  normalization error. The authors of Ref. 4 published results for line-shape integrals, separating the  $e^+e^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  final states. We have averaged the leptonic cases with the same procedure applied to Ref. 3. Compatibility with the quoted errors requires the value of  $\rho$  to be in the range 0–0.2, and we have chosen the value 0.1. In Ref. 5 values of  $\Gamma(l^+l^-)$  and  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$  are quoted, and we have computed the corresponding values for the variables  $A_l$  and  $A_h$ . The value of  $\rho$  must be larger than 0.4 for compatibility with the published uncertainties, and we have set it to 0.6, as suggested by the quoted  $\pm 5\%$  normalization error.

All the values of the line-shape integrals were corrected for radiative effects in the initial state [2–5]. We have followed a recent revision of the radiative corrections[6], modifying the quantities  $A_l$  and  $A_h$  in Table I by factors in the range 0.0–4.5%.

In order to fit the data, a  $\chi^2$  minimization has been performed. Notice that in analogy with previous analyses [3, 5, 7], all the quoted errors are treated as Gaussian standard errors, and no distinctions between statistical and systematic contributions are made.

Table II shows the results of the fit. For completeness, the best fit values are given for three quantities, despite the fact that only two are independent. The results are highly correlated (correlation coefficients equal to  $-0.68$  between  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$  and  $\text{BR}(l^+l^-)$ , and  $+0.90$  between  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$  and  $\Gamma(l^+l^-)$ ). The minimum  $\chi^2$  is equal to 13.0 with 7

degrees of freedom. This suggests that some of the input errors may have been underestimated, or that the treatment of systematic errors may not be adequate. A safer error estimate[7] may be obtained by rescaling the errors by the factor  $\sqrt{12.6/7} = 1.4$ .

If the revision in the radiative corrections[6] is ignored, the best value of  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$  is reduced by 2.0 keV.

Our results are scarcely affected by the uncertainty in the error assignment to the input data. Allowing the values of  $\rho$  for Ref. 3, 4, 5 to change within the ranges discussed above, the best fit to  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$  varies by  $\pm 0.6$  keV at most. The reason for this stability is that the main experimental uncertainty in measuring line-shape integrals was in the detection efficiency for hadronic final states, affecting the quantity  $A_h$  only. A different choice of input variables would result in a larger sensitivity of our fit to uncertainties in the error assignment to the input data.

The mechanism by which the fit provides a value of  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$  significantly larger than the previous one[7] can be understood intuitively. The new  $\text{BR}(l^+l^-)$  measurement[1] is significantly smaller, and more accurate than the other ones, so that the new average is  $\simeq 10\%$  smaller than the previous accepted value[7]. Table I shows that the quantity  $A_l$  was measured better than  $A_h$ . Therefore the fit mostly corrects the value of the latter, maintaining the former. Since  $A_l$  is equivalent to  $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \text{BR}(e^+e^-) \equiv \Gamma_{\text{total}} \times (\text{BR}(e^+e^-))^2$ , the correction to  $\text{BR}(e^+e^-)$  implies an approximately +10% correction to  $\Gamma(e^+e^-)$  and +20% to  $\Gamma_{\text{total}}$ .

Finally, it should be noticed that changing the best value for  $\Gamma(e^+e^-)$  will require updating the value of branching ratios other than  $\text{BR}(l^+l^-)$  and  $\text{BR}(\text{hadrons})$ . In fact the branching ratio to the exclusive final state  $f$ , different from  $l^+l^-$ , has been typically obtained[7] by comparing  $\Gamma(e^+e^-)$  to the integral of the line-shape for the process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi \rightarrow f$ , which is indeed proportional to  $\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \text{BR}(f)$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract No. DE-AC02-76CHO3000.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Coffman *et al.*, to be published in *Phys. Rev. Lett.*
- [2] R. Baldini-Celio *et al.*, *Phys. Lett.* **58B**, 471 (1975).
- [3] A. M. Boyarski *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 1357 (1975).
- [4] B. Esposito *et al.*, *Lett. Nuovo Cimento* **14**, 73 (1975).
- [5] R. Brandelik *et al.*, *Z. Phys.* **C1**, 233 (1979).
- [6] J. P. Alexander *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B320**,45 (1989).
- [7] Particle Data Group, *Review of Particle Properties*, *Phys. Lett.* **B239**, 1 (1990),  
and references therein.

## TABLES

TABLE I. Experimental measurements used in the fit

Ref. 1	$\text{BR}(l^+l^-) = (5.91 \pm 0.23)\%$		
Ref.	$\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(l^+l^-) / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$	$\Gamma(e^+e^-) \times \Gamma(\text{hadrons}) / \Gamma_{\text{total}}$	$\rho$
2	$0.320 \pm 0.070 \text{ keV}$	$4.00 \pm 0.80 \text{ keV}$	0.0
3	$0.330 \pm 0.035 \text{ keV}$	$4.11 \pm 0.62 \text{ keV}$	0.25
4	$0.400 \pm 0.037 \text{ keV}$	$3.84 \pm 0.79 \text{ keV}$	0.1
5	$0.334 \pm 0.031 \text{ keV}$	$3.73 \pm 0.56 \text{ keV}$	0.6

TABLE II. Results of the fit

$\Gamma_{\text{total}}$	$85.5^{+6.1}_{-5.8} \text{ keV}$
$\text{BR}(e^+e^-)$	$6.27^{+0.20}_{-0.19} \%$
$\Gamma(e^+e^-)$	$5.36^{+0.29}_{-0.28} \text{ keV}$