

The $\rho^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma$ Decay Rate and Vector-Meson Dominance (*).

D. H. BOAL and R. TORGERSON

*Theoretical Physics Institute, Department of Physics
University of Alberta - Edmonton, Alta., Canada*

(ricevuto il 12 Gennaio 1976)

The recent measurement of the $\rho^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma$ decay width ⁽¹⁾ has caused much concern in that it is approximately three times smaller than anticipated using quark or higher-symmetry models ⁽²⁾. We note that this rate is in direct disagreement with simple vector-meson dominance (VMD) and the well-known $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ rate, without the use of higher symmetries or singlet-octet mixing ⁽³⁾. Using two methods, we estimate the corrections to simple VMD due to higher-mass vector mesons and find that they are insufficient to remove the disagreement.

The coupling constants $g_{\pi^0 \gamma \gamma}$ and $g_{\rho \pi \gamma}$ for the processes $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ and $\rho \rightarrow \pi \gamma$ are related through VDM by

$$(1) \quad g_{\pi^0 \gamma \gamma} = \frac{2eg_{\rho \pi \gamma}}{g_\rho},$$

where e is the electric charge and g_ρ is related to the direct ρ -photon coupling vertex $G_{\rho \gamma}$ via

$$(2) \quad G_{\rho \gamma} = e \frac{m_\rho^2}{g_\rho}.$$

Although g_ρ can be measured directly through the decays $\rho \rightarrow \bar{u} u$, the value so obtained has a rather large error associated with it. Fortunately, simple VMD provides the relation

$$(3) \quad g_\rho = g_{\rho \pi \pi},$$

(*) Work supported in part by the National Research Council of Canada.

(1) B. GOBBI, J. L. ROSEN, H. A. SCOTT, S. L. SHAPIRO, L. STRAWCZYNSKI and C. M. MELTZER: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **33**, 1450 (1974).

(2) B. T. FELD: *Models of Elementary Particles* (New York, N. Y., 1969) reviews the quark model. See for example ref. ^(13,14) for higher symmetry models.

(3) A. KOTLEWSKI, W. LEE, M. SUZUKI and J. THALER: *Phys. Rev. D*, **8**, 348 (1973).

where $g_{\rho\pi\pi}$ is the $\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi$ coupling constant. Since this decay rate is now known⁽⁴⁾ with greater accuracy, it is the one we shall choose for determining g_ρ . We wish to point out that eq. (1) follows from VDM and the isospin invariance of the strong interactions alone and does not depend on the imposition of a higher symmetry on meson-photon coupling constants. Neither does it depend on the spectrum of the isoscalar vector mesons that dominate the isoscalar component of the electromagnetic current.

From eq. (1) one computes

$$(4) \quad \frac{\Gamma(\rho^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma)}{\Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma)} = \frac{g_{\rho\pi\pi}^2/4\pi}{6\alpha} \left(\frac{m_\rho^2 - m_{\pi^-}^2}{m_{\pi^0} m_\rho} \right)^2.$$

The coupling constant $g_{\rho\pi\pi}$ is determined by using the ρ -meson mass and width found by Roos⁽⁴⁾, who was able to achieve consistent results from $\pi\pi$ phase shift and pion form factor data. We find

$$(5) \quad \frac{g_{\rho\pi\pi}^2}{4\pi} = 2.93 \pm 0.02.$$

For the $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ decay width we adopt⁽⁵⁾

$$(6) \quad \Gamma(\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = (7.89 \pm 0.38) \text{ eV}.$$

The resulting value for the $\rho \rightarrow \pi\gamma$ decay width

$$(7) \quad \Gamma(\rho^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma) = (91 \pm 4) \text{ keV}$$

is more than five standard deviations away from the experimental result⁽⁴⁾

$$(8) \quad \Gamma_{\text{exp}}(\rho^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma) = (35 \pm 10) \text{ keV}.$$

One would expect that the generalized vector-meson dominance model⁽⁶⁾ (GVMD) would yield corrections to eq. (1). The higher-mass resonances (predicted, for example, by the Veneziano model⁽⁷⁾) change eq. (1) into a series

$$(9) \quad g_{\pi^0\gamma\gamma} = 2e \sum_i \frac{g_{\rho_i\pi\gamma}}{g_{\rho_i}},$$

where the sum is over all the $I = 1$, $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$ mesons ρ_i . The quantity g_{ρ_i} is the generalization of g_ρ (cf. eq. (2)) for these mesons. Here, one no longer has the equality

(4) M. ROOS: Helsinki University Report No. ISBN 951-45-06-3-0 (1975), finds $m_\rho = (776.3 \pm 0.4) \text{ MeV}$ and $\Gamma(\rho \rightarrow \pi\pi) = (154.5 \pm 1.0) \text{ MeV}$.

(5) This is the weighted average of the recent determination of A. BROWMAN, J. DEWIRE, B. GITTELMAN, K. M. HANSON, D. LARSON, E. LOH and R. LEWIS: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **33**, 1400 (1974) and the tabulation given by the PARTICLE DATA GROUP: *Phys. Lett.*, **50 B**, 1 (1974).

(6) J. J. SAKURAI: *Proceedings of the Canadian Institute of Particle Physics Summer School* (Montreal, 1972), p. 437.

(7) See J. L. PETERSON: *Phys. Lett.*, **2 C**, 155 (1971), for a review.

$g_{\rho_i} = g_{\rho_i \pi \pi}$ but rather the sum rule

$$(10) \quad 1 = \sum_i \frac{g_{\rho_i \pi \pi}}{g_{\rho_i}}.$$

Again, eq. (9) is independent of the spectrum of $I = 0$, $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$ mesons.

Let us first examine eq. (9) from a theoretical standpoint. Triangle anomalies in the partially conserved axial vector current can be used to evaluate possible corrections to eq. (9). In such an approach⁽⁸⁾ the coupling constant $g_{\rho_i \pi \gamma}$ factorizes:

$$(11) \quad g_{\rho_i \pi \gamma} = g_{\rho_i \pi \pi} C_{\pi \gamma},$$

where $C_{\pi \gamma}$ is a constant independent of ρ_i . This result is obtained in fermion loop models⁽⁹⁾ as well, provided that F universality⁽¹⁰⁾ is maintained. This factorization is also independent of higher-symmetry arguments.

Combining eqs. (9)-(11), we obtain

$$(12) \quad g_{\pi^0 \gamma \gamma} = 2e C_{\pi \gamma} \sum_i \frac{g_{\rho_i \pi \pi}}{g_{\rho_i}} = 2e \frac{g_{\rho \pi \gamma}}{g_{\rho \pi \pi}},$$

a result identical to eq. (1). This rather model-dependent conclusion shows that GVMD does not change the VMD result.

We may estimate the correction in other ways. For example, the results of a duality analysis of the pion form factor data⁽¹¹⁾ indicate that the sum of the higher-order terms of eq. (10) is -11% of the first term $g_{\rho \pi \pi}/g_{\rho}$. Thus GVMD rate predictions could change VMD predictions by 22% , lowering our $\rho^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma$ result to 70 keV or raising it to 110 keV. This is still at least three standard deviations from the experimental value.

The analogous decay $\bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \gamma$ has also been measured recently⁽¹²⁾. Again, the width found is approximately three times smaller than expected from the quark model. If we assume that the $\bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \gamma$ decay width is related to that of $\rho \rightarrow \pi \gamma$ through SU_3 , we find that

$$(13) \quad \Gamma(\bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \gamma) = (206 \pm 9) \text{ keV},$$

again using $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ as input. This is more than three standard deviations away from the experimental value

$$(14) \quad \Gamma_{\text{exp}}(\bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow \bar{K}^0 \gamma) = (75 \pm 35) \text{ keV}.$$

(8) P. G. O. FREUND and S. NANDI: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **32**, 181 (1974); R. TORGERSON: *Phys. Rev. D*, **10**, 2951 (1974).

(9) References to very early work may be found in R. TORGERSON: *Phys. Rev. D*, **10**, 2951 (1974). For the baryon loop model, see, for example, R. ROCKMORE: *Phys. Rev. D*, **11**, 620 (1974) and references contained therein; see also B. EDWARDS and A. N. KAMAL: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (to be published), for its application to PV γ interactions without the imposition of F universality.

(10) J. J. SAKURAI: *Ann. of Phys.*, **11**, 1 (1960); M. GELL-MANN: Caltech Report No. CTSL-20 (1961) (published in M. GELL-MANN and Y. NE'EMANN: *The Eightfold Way* (New York, N. Y., 1964)).

(11) P. L. BRUNINI, F. RIMONDI and G. VENTURI: *Lett. Nuovo Cimento*, **10**, 693 (1974). We quote results derived from their model labelled 2a since it is in closest agreement with known meson decay data.

(12) W. C. CARITHERS, P. MÜHLEMAN, D. UNDERWOOD and D. G. RYAN: *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **35**, 349 (1975).

It is of interest to compare the value for the $\rho \rightarrow \pi\gamma$ decay width found here to that found in other calculations. In four recent approaches, nonet symmetry⁽¹³⁾, SU_3 with broken nonet symmetry⁽¹⁴⁾, nonet symmetry with broken SU_3 ⁽¹⁵⁾ and strong PCAC anomalies⁽¹⁶⁾, a $\rho \rightarrow \pi\gamma$ decay width close to 80 keV is found, in good agreement with what has been found here. It should also be noted that the broadest interpretation of the $\rho^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma$ experiment implies a range for $\Gamma(\rho^- \rightarrow \pi^- \gamma)$ from (30 ± 10) keV to (80 ± 10) keV. This upper limit is not in disagreement with VMD. The desirability of a new measurement of $\rho \rightarrow \pi\gamma$ is clearly indicated since it tests VMD alone. In addition, if VMD passes this test, more precise information on $K^* \rightarrow K\gamma$ rates will enable us to properly assess the assumption of SU_3 symmetry for pseudoscalar-vector-vector interactions.

* * *

The authors wish to thank B. EDWARDS, Drs. A. N. KAMAL and J. W. MOFFAT for stimulating discussions. One of us (D. H. B.) is indebted to the National Research Council of Canada for financial support in the form of an N.R.C. Post-doctoral Fellowship.

(13) A. BRAMON and M. GRECO: *Phys. Lett.*, **48 B**, 137 (1974).

(14) D. H. BOAL, R. H. GRAHAM and J. W. MOFFAT: University of Toronto Report (July 1975)

(15) B. EDWARDS and A. N. KAMAL: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (to be published).

(16) R. TORGERSON: *Phys. Rev. D*, **10**, 2951 (1974).

D. H. BOAL, *et al.*

20 Marzo 1976

Lettere al Nuovo Cimento

Serie 2, Vol. 15, pag. 417-420