Two Surprising New Charmed Strange Mesons

John Bartelt SLAC & *B*_A*B*_A*R* September, 2003 — DESY

Two Surprising New Charmed Strange Mesons

I am reporting on work by **Antimo Palano** & other BaBarians. Plus comparisons to other experiments' results.

Outline

- Historical and Theoretical Background
- B_{ABAR} 's discovery of the $D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+$
- The Second State
- Conclusions

Charmed Mesons: Some History

- 1974: Charm (J/ψ) discovered
- 1976: Open Charm observed: D^+ , D^0
- 1976: De Rújula, Georgi, Glashow: light-degrees decouple
- 1989: "Heavy Quark Symmetry"
 - Systems with One Heavy Quark:
 - Light Degrees of Freedom Decouple from Heavy
 - $j_{\ell} = L \otimes s_{\ell}$ is conserved in limit $m_h \to \infty$

Charmed Mesons: Lab for Heavy Quark Studies Mass of the Charm Quark $\sim 1500~{\rm MeV}/c^2 \gg \Lambda_{QCD}$

- Should make it a good testing ground for HQS, "Heavy Quark Effective Theory", etc.
- What is learned in Charm can be applied to the Bottom system
- First, some background on Charm Spectroscopy

Heavy-Light Spectroscopy

It's like the hydrogen atom.

For $m_h \to \infty$, $s_h = j_h$ is fixed.

So $j_{\ell} = s_{\ell} \otimes L$ is separately conserved.

For L = 1 states this means:

 $\Rightarrow j_{\ell} = 3/2$ states decay via *D*-wave

 $\Rightarrow j_{\ell} = 1/2$ states decay via S-wave.

 $\implies j_{\ell} = 3/2$ states should be narrow

 $\implies j_{\ell} = 1/2$ states should be broad.

HQ Potential Model Schematic



Spin-Orbit Tensor



Heavy-Light Spectrscopy (2)

L = 0: one doublet:

$${}^{1/2}S_0: D_s(1968)^+ (0^-)$$

 ${}^{1/2}S_1: D_s^*(2112)^+ (1^-)$

L = 1: two doublets

Di Pierro & Eichten's notation: ${}^{j_{\ell}}L_{J}$

Heavy-Light Spectroscopy (3)

By c.1994, the six $j_{\ell} = 3/2$ narrow P-wave charmed mesons had been found.

 J^P of the states are not rigorously established, but not subject to serious doubt.

"Natural" (or "Normal") Spin-Parity:

True if $P = (-1)^J [0^+, 1^-, 2^+ \dots]$.

Flavored natural states get a *.

Charmed Meson Spectroscopy c.1995



Predictions for L = 1 $j_{\ell} = 1/2$ Charmed Mesons

Many potential model calculations for masses and widths.

I mention only two examples here: Godfrey & Kokoski PRD **43**, 1679 (1991) Di Pierro & Eichten PRD **64**, 114004 (2001)

$L=1$ $j_\ell=1/2$ (MeV/ c^2)								
	$^{1/2}D_{0}$		$^{1/2}D_{1}$		$^{1/2}D_{s0}$		$^{1/2}D_{s1}$	
	m	Γ	m	Γ	m	Γ	m	Γ
G&K	2400	290	2470	250	2480	310	2560	140
DP&E	2377	110	2490	110	2487	140	2605	130

Predictions for L = 1 $j_{\ell} = 1/2$ Charmed Mesons



B_AB_{AR}

 $B_{A}B_{AR}$: General purpose solenoidal spectrometer with silicon vertex tracker, CsI calorimeter, DIRC particle ID, and instrumented flux return for muon and K_L detection.

Operates at PEP-II asymmetric *B*-Factory: $E_{e^-}=9.0 \text{ GeV}, E_{e^+}=3.1 \text{ GeV}$ $\sqrt{S} = m(\Upsilon(4S)) \text{ or just below}$ Best luminosity: $6.582 \times 10^{33} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ sec}^{-1}$

 $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow c\overline{c}) \approx 1.3 \text{ nb}$ For 91 fb⁻¹for this analysis; ~120 million charm events Or roughly 1.2 million $D^0 \rightarrow K^- \pi^+$ John Bartelt, SLAC

September, 2003 — DESY

PEP-II and $B_A B_{AR}$



John Bartelt, SLAC

September, 2003 — DESY

United Kingdom

Brunel University Queen Mary, U. London Imperial College, London Royal Holloway U. London Rutherford Appleton Lab. U. Birmingham U. Bristol U. Edinburgh U. Liverpool U. Manchester

Russia Budker Institute, Novosibirsk

China

Inst. of High Energy Physics, Beijing

Italy

Lab. Nazionali di Frascati dell' INFN INFN and U. Bari INFN and U. Ferrara INFN and U. Ferrara INFN and U. Perugia INFN and U. Perugia INFN and U. Milano INFN and U. Napoli INFN and U. Padova INFN and U. Pavia INFN and U. Pavia INFN and U. Poma La Sapienza INFN and U. Torino INFN and U. Trieste

The BaBar Collaboration

10 countries 77 Institutions ~580 Physicists



TM & © Nelvana

50% Outside U.S.A.

Canada McGill U. U. British Columbia U.Victoria U. Montreal

France

LAPP, Annecy Ecole Polytechnique LAL, Orsay DAPNIA, CEN-Saclay LPHNE and U. Paris VI–VII Norway U. Bergen

Germany

Ruhr U. Bochum Tech. U. Dresden U. Rostock Heidelberg

The Netherlands NIKHEF, Amsterdam

USA Caltech Colorado State Florida A&M Harvard Iowa State U. LBNL LLNL MIT Mount Holyoke College Ohio State U. Prairie View A&M U. Princeton U. SLAC Stanford U. SUNY Albany U.C. Irvine U.C. Los Angeles U.C. San Diego U.C. Santa Barbara U.C. Santa Cruz U. Cincinnati U. Colorado U. Iowa U. Louisville U. Maryland U. Massachusetts U. Mississippi U. Notre Dame U. Oregon U. Pennsylvania U. South Carolina U. Tennessee U. Texas Austin U. Texas Dallas U. Wisconsin (3&4) Vanderbilt U. Yale U.

An Unexpected Signal

Early 2003: Antimo Palano was studying $D_s^+\pi^0$. To everyone's surprise, he found a new, huge signal. New



Analysis Details

See also PRL, **90**, 242001 (2003)

Used 91 fb⁻¹ collected on $\Upsilon(4S)$ and just below. Studying $e^+e^- \rightarrow c\overline{c}$, not *B* decay (so far).

Reconstruct $D_s^+ \to K^+ K^- \pi^+$.

- Kaons selected by Čerenkov (DIRC) & dE/dx
- Pion: any charged track that fails Kaon criteria
- $K^+K^-\pi^+$ fit to common vertex, P > 0.1%.
- $\phi \pi^+$: $\pm 10 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ around $m(\phi)$; $|\cos \theta_v| > 0.5$
- $\overline{K^{*0}}K^+$: $\pm 50 \text{ MeV}/c^2 \text{ around } m(\overline{K^{*0}}); |\cos \theta_v| > 0.5$



Analysis Details (2)

Reconstruct $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$

- $E(\gamma) > 100 \text{ MeV}$
- One-constraint fit to π^0 mass (P > 1%)
- Only use π^0 if no other π^0 candidate uses either γ

•
$$p^*(K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^0) > 2.5 \text{ GeV}/c.$$

 π^0 signal region: 122 MeV/ $c^2 < m(\gamma\gamma) <$ 148 MeV/ c^2 sidebands: 90—110 MeV and 160—180 MeV

 D_s^+ signal region: 1955 MeV/ $c^2 < m(K^+K^-\pi^+) <$ 1979 MeV/ c^2 sidebands: 1912—1934 MeV/ c^2 and 1998—2020 MeV/ c^2

Combining D_s^+ and π^0 Candidates





Note: these $\gamma\gamma$ pairs do not have same cuts as π^0 candidates.

Some More Checks

- Signal only appears in $D_s^+\pi^0$, not sidebands
- Signal in $D^+_s \to \phi \pi^+$ and $D^+_s \to \overline{K^{*0}} K^+$ as expected
- \bullet Try vetoing D_s^+ from $D_s^*(2112)^+ \to D_s^+ \gamma$
- Nothing similar in $D^+\pi^0$
- Check for particle mis-ID (K/π)
- Nothing in Monte Carlo that makes a peak here
- p^* spectrum looks OK





22

Fit the Combined Data

 $p^* > 3.5 \text{ GeV}/c$



 1267 ± 53 events $M = 2316.8 \pm 0.4 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ $\sigma = 8.6 \pm 0.4 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ [Detector Resolution] Statistical errors only!

Cross Check: use $D_s^+ \rightarrow K^+ K^- \pi^+ \pi^0$ $p^* > 3.5 \text{ GeV}/c$



 273 ± 33 events $M = 2317.6 \pm 1.3 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ $\sigma = 8.8 \pm 1.1 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ [Detector Resolution]

Statistical errors only!

Initial Conclusions

- Signal width consistent with detector resolution, as estimated by Monte Carlo. $\Rightarrow \Gamma \stackrel{<}{{}_\sim} 10~{\rm MeV}/c^2$
- Decay to 2 pseudoscalars implies natural spin-parity
- If it is a $c\overline{s}$ state, decay violates isospin conserveration.
- \bullet If it is the missing $0^+,$ it is ${\sim}170~{\rm MeV}/c^2$ lighter than expected
- Below D^0K^+ decay threshold forces this decay mode
- Isospin violating decay implies very narrow.

Call it $D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+$. What else can we learn about it?





Consistent with J = 0 particle, or unaligned J > 0 state.



Nothing seen at 2317 MeV/ c^2 in

 $D_s^+\gamma$





BABAR PRL 90, 242001 (2003)

What is that at \sim 2460 MeV/ c^2 ?

Could $X(2460) \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0 \gamma$ be the real source of the peak at 2317 MeV/ c^2 , if we have missed the γ ?

No!

- Relative rate is too small.
- Would not produce a gaussian signal shape
- Mass is not quite right.

But, if real, can produce some background under the peak at 2317 MeV/c^2 . [More on this later.]

Why the peak near 2460 MeV/c^2 is Tricky

Monte Carlo



 $\begin{array}{l} D^*_s(2112)^+ + \pi^0_{random} \ {\rm crosses} \ D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+ + \gamma_{random} \\ {\rm at} \quad m(D^+_s\pi^0\gamma) \approx 2460 \ {\rm MeV}/c^2. \end{array}$

B_AB_{AR} **PRL 90, 242001 (2003)**

"Although we rule out the decay of a state of mass 2.46 GeV/ c^2 as the sole source of the $D_s^+\pi^0$ mass peak corresponding to the $D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+$, such a state may be produced in addition to the $D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+$. However, the complexity of the overlapping kinematics of the $D_s^*(2112)^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\gamma$ and $D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^0$ decays requires more detailed study, currently underway, in order to arrive at a definitive conclusion."





CDF (preliminary): no signal for $D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+ \rightarrow D_s^+\pi^+\pi^-$ [0⁺ \rightarrow 0⁻0⁻0⁻ is forbidden]

The $D_{sJ}(2463)^+$

CLEO's paper (submitted to PRD) is entitled:

Observation of a Narrow Resonance of Mass 2.46 GeV/ c^2 Decaying to $D_s^{*+}\pi^0$ and Confirmation of the $D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+$ State

Belle has also seen two states.

What does B_{ABAR} now have to say about the second peak?



A 3-D View

Data

MC



A prominent peak appears in data, not in Monte Carlo, which includes the $D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+$. Preliminary

$D_s^+ \gamma \pi^0$: Sideband Subtraction

Change variables:

 $D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+$ +random γ



 $\Delta m(D_s^{*+}\pi^0) \equiv m(D_s^+\gamma\pi^0) - m(D_s^+\gamma)$



Channel Likelihood Method

Assign likelihoods to each event for:

- 1. $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+\gamma$
- 2. $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D_s^*(2112)^+ \pi^0$
- 3. background $D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+$ plus random γ
- 4. background $D^*_s(2112)^+$ plus random π^0
- 5. combinatorial background

Assume the three-body decay $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0 \gamma$ is absent. Ignore any possible interference term (resolution would smear).



Preliminary Results

- 174 ± 22 events, $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D_s^*(2112)^+ \pi^0$
- 0 ± 19 events, $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+ \gamma$
- $m(D_{sJ}(2458)^+) = 2458.0 \pm 1.0 \pm 1.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$
- Gaussian $\sigma = 8.5 \pm 1.0 \text{ MeV}/c^2$: Detector Resolution

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+ \gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D_s^*(2112)^+ \pi^0)} < 0.2 \ (95\% \text{C.L.})$$

Refit $D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+ \to D_s^+ \pi^0$ (account for $D_{sJ}(2458)^+$ bkgd):

 $m(D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+) = 2317.3 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.8 \text{ MeV}/c^2$

Decay Mode

Solid Hists: $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \rightarrow D_s^*(2112)^+ \pi^0$ Monte Carlo Dashed Hists: $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \rightarrow D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+ \gamma$ Monte Carlo



Data agree with Solid histograms. *Preliminary*

Spin-Parity of $D_{sJ}(2458)^+$?

- Decay to $D_s^{*+}\pi^0$ (1⁻⁰⁻) rules out 0⁺
- Decay mode also makes other natural J^P (1⁻, 2⁺, ...) highly unlikely (decay to D^0K^+ , D^+K^0 available)
- That leaves unnatural: $0^-, 1^+, 2^-$

Helicity Angle

 ϑ_h : angle between γ and $D_s^*(2112)^+$ in $D_s^*(2112)^+$ rest frame.



 $J^P = 0^- \Rightarrow \sin^2 \vartheta_h$ solid histogram disfavored

$$J^P = 1^-, 2^+ \dots$$

 $\Rightarrow 1 + \cos^2 \vartheta_h$
dashed histogram
OK (but unlikely)

 $J^P = 1^+, 2^-, \ldots$: depends on alignment: no conclusion.

Relative Production Rate

Preliminary

$$\mathcal{P} \equiv \frac{\sigma(D_{sJ}(2458)^+)\mathcal{B}(D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D_s^*(2112)^+\pi^0)}{\sigma(D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+)\mathcal{B}(D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0)}$$

$$= 0.23 \pm 0.03 \text{ (stat.)} \pm 0.03 \text{ (syst.)}$$

for $p^* > 3.5 \text{ GeV}/c$ for both states

Comparisons with CLEO and Belle

 $D_{sJ}^{*}(2317)^{+}$ mass:

my average: $2317.4 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.6 \text{ MeV}/c^2 [\chi^2 = 1.2]$ first error: stat&syst; second error from D_s^+ mass (common)

- Width is less than resolution. ($\Gamma < 7 \text{ MeV}/c^2$: CLEO)
- No other decay modes seen.
- Everything consistent with $J^P = 0^+$.

Comparisons with CLEO and Belle (2)

 $D_{sJ}(2458)^+$ mass (from $D_s^*(2112)^+\pi^0$)

my average: $2458.6 \pm 0.8 \pm 0.7 \text{ MeV}/c^2 [\chi^2 = 6.4]$

first error: stat&syst; second error from D_s^{*+} mass (common)

Comparisons with CLEO and Belle (3)

 \mathcal{P} , the $D_{sJ}(2458)^+/D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+$ production ratio

- $B_{ABAR} = 0.23 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.03$ $p^* > 3.5 \text{ GeV}/c \text{ [prelim.]}$
- Belle $0.26 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.06$ $p^* > 3.5 \text{ GeV}/c$ [prelim]
- CLEO $0.44 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.03(?) \ p^* > 3.5 \ \text{GeV}/c$

BABAR agrees with Belle, not so well with CLEO

Belle also sees the decay $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \rightarrow D_s(1968)^+\gamma$ in both *B* decays and continuum events.

 $\frac{\mathcal{B}(D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D_s^+ \gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D_s^*(2112)^+ \pi^0)} = 0.38 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.04 \{B\}$ $= 0.63 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.15 \{c\overline{c}\}[prelim]$

Belle: Exclusive *B* **Decay**



Belle: Helicity Angle



 $B \to \overline{D}D_{sJ}(2458)^+,$ $D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \to D_s^+\gamma$

Solid line: J = 1Dotted line: J = 2

J = 1 clearly favored

Charm Spectroscopy Now



Observations of Non-Strange $j_{\ell} = 1/2$ **States**

To see broad $j_{\ell} = 1/2$ states, need to look in B decay.

CLEO CONF 99-6 (1999): observe $B^- \rightarrow D_1^0 \pi^-$, $D_1^0 \rightarrow D^{*+} \pi^-$: $m = 2461^{+41}_{-34} \pm 10 \pm 32 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ and $\Gamma = 290^{+101}_{-79} \pm 26 \pm 36 \text{ MeV}/c^2$

BELLE CONF-0235 (2002): observe $B^- \to D_1^0 \pi^-$, $D_1^0 \to D^{*+} \pi^-$: $m = 2400 \pm 30 \pm 20 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ and $\Gamma = 380 \pm 100 \pm 100 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ and observe $B^- \to D_0^{*0} \pi^-$, $D_0^{*0} \to D^+ \pi^-$: $m = 2290 \pm 22 \pm 20 \text{ MeV}/c^2$ and $\Gamma = 305 \pm 30 \pm 25 \text{ MeV}/c^2$





$$----D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+$$

Theoretical Discussion

- Cho & Wise (1994) Predicted rate for isopsin-violating decay $D_s^*(2112)^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \pi^0$. Described as occuring through η/π^0 mixing
- Cho & Trivedi (1994) predicted rate for $D_{s1}^+ \rightarrow D_s^*(2112)^+\pi^0$, if its mass were as low as 2480 MeV/ c^2 . (Dismiss the possibility of D_{s0}^{*+} being below DK threshold.) $\Gamma(D_{sJ}(2458)^+ \rightarrow D_s^{*+}\pi^0) \approx 20 \text{ keV}/c^2$
- Cahn & Jackson can get potential model to give right masses: but the mixing comes out wrong
- If Belle/CLEO results for non-strange states are right, $m(c\overline{s}) m(c\overline{d}) \sim 50 \text{ MeV}/c^2$, not $\sim 100 \text{ MeV}/c^2$

Theoretical Discussion (2)

- Chiral models seem to do fairly well at predicting masses: $m(D_s^{*+}) m(D_s^{+}) = m(D_{sJ}(2458)^+) m(D_{sJ}^*(2317)^+)$
- Bardeen, Eichten & Hill (2003) also predicts rates
- Many other ideas floated when $D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+$ first reported
- Four-quark state?
- Di-meson moelcule? (Lipkin & Isgur, 1981)
- However, all data is consistent with the two states being $c\overline{s}$ mesons, with J = 0, 1 (in my opinion)

Summary and Conclusions

- B_{ABAR} discovered the surprising $D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+$
- B_{ABAR} has also observed the $D_{sJ}(2458)^+$
- CLEO and Belle have also provided import observations which help define the identity of these states
- B_{ABAR} is continuing its studies of these new states, in both $c\overline{c}$ events and in B decays, and hopes to publish more results soon.

John Bartelt, SLAC

Extra Foils

Compare: Charmonium Spectroscopy

$$S = s_1 \otimes s_2 = 0, \ 1$$
$$J = S \otimes L$$
$$P = -1^{L+1}$$

notation:
$${}^{2S+1}L_J$$

Appropriate for two equal mass constituents.

Charmonium Spectroscopy (cont.)

L = 0: two singlets

$${}^{1}S_{0}: \quad \eta_{c} \qquad (0^{-}) \\ {}^{3}S_{1}: \quad J/\psi \quad (1^{-})$$

L = 1: singlet and triplet ${}^{1}P_{1}: \quad h_{c} \qquad (1^{+}) \ (C = -)$ ${}^{3}P_{0}: \quad \chi_{c0} \qquad (0^{+})$ ${}^{3}P_{1}: \quad \chi_{c1} \qquad (1^{+}) \ (C = +)$ ${}^{3}P_{2}: \qquad \chi_{c2} \qquad (2^{+})$

The two 1^+ states cannot mix.

Charmed Meson Spectroscopy (2)







 p^* Spectrum for $D^*_{sJ}(2317)^+$



2460 with missed γ



 $D_s^*(2112)^+ \rightarrow D_s^+ \gamma$ Background?



Search for $D_{sJ}^{*}(2317)^{+} \to D_{s}^{+}\pi^{0}\pi^{0}$

