



CHORUS

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Search for $\eta_{\{c\}}^{\{\prime\}}$ decays into vector meson pairs

M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration)

Phys. Rev. D **84**, 091102 — Published 29 November 2011

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevD.84.091102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.84.091102)

Search for η'_c decays into vector meson pairs

M. Ablikim¹, M. N. Achasov⁵, D. Alberto⁴⁰, F. F. An¹, Q. An³⁸, Z. H. An¹, J. Z. Bai¹, R. Baldini¹⁹, Y. Ban²⁵, J. Becker², N. Berger¹, M. Bertani¹⁹, J. M. Bian¹, E. Boger^{17a}, O. Bondarenko¹⁸, I. Boyko¹⁷, R. A. Briere³, V. Bytev¹⁷, X. Cai¹, A. C. Calcaterra¹⁹, G. F. Cao¹, J. F. Chang¹, G. Chelkov^{17a}, G. Chen¹, H. S. Chen¹, J. C. Chen¹, M. L. Chen¹, S. J. Chen²³, Y. Chen¹, Y. B. Chen¹, H. P. Cheng¹³, Y. P. Chu¹, D. Cronin-Hennessy³⁷, H. L. Dai¹, J. P. Dai¹, D. Dedovich¹⁷, Z. Y. Deng¹, I. Denysenko^{17b}, M. Destefanis⁴⁰, Y. Ding²¹, L. Y. Dong¹, M. Y. Dong¹, S. X. Du⁴³, J. Fang¹, S. S. Fang¹, C. Q. Feng³⁸, C. D. Fu¹, J. L. Fu²³, Y. Gao³⁴, C. Geng³⁸, K. Goetzen⁷, W. X. Gong¹, M. Greco⁴⁰, M. H. Gu¹, Y. T. Gu⁹, Y. H. Guan⁶, A. Q. Guo²⁴, L. B. Guo²², Y. P. Guo²⁴, Y. L. Han¹, X. Q. Hao¹, F. A. Harris³⁶, K. L. He¹, M. He¹, Z. Y. He²⁴, Y. K. Heng¹, Z. L. Hou¹, H. M. Hu¹, J. F. Hu⁶, T. Hu¹, B. Huang¹, G. M. Huang¹⁴, J. S. Huang¹¹, X. T. Huang²⁷, Y. P. Huang¹, T. Hussain³⁹, C. S. Ji³⁸, Q. Ji¹, X. B. Ji¹, X. L. Ji¹, L. K. Jia¹, L. L. Jiang¹, X. S. Jiang¹, J. B. Jiao²⁷, Z. Jiao¹³, D. P. Jin¹, S. Jin¹, F. F. Jing³⁴, N. Kalantar-Nayestanaki¹⁸, M. Kavatsyuk¹⁸, W. Kuehn³⁵, W. Lai¹, J. S. Lange³⁵, J. K. C. Leung³³, C. H. Li¹, Cheng Li³⁸, Cui Li³⁸, D. M. Li⁴³, F. Li¹, G. Li¹, H. B. Li¹, J. C. Li¹, K. Li¹⁰, Lei Li¹, N. B. Li²², Q. J. Li¹, S. L. Li¹, W. D. Li¹, W. G. Li¹, X. L. Li²⁷, X. N. Li¹, X. Q. Li²⁴, X. R. Li²⁶, Z. B. Li³¹, H. Liang³⁸, Y. F. Liang²⁹, Y. T. Liang³⁵, X. T. Liao¹, B. J. Liu³², C. L. Liu³, C. X. Liu¹, C. Y. Liu¹, F. H. Liu²⁸, Fang Liu¹, Feng Liu¹⁴, H. Liu¹, H. B. Liu⁶, H. H. Liu¹², H. M. Liu¹, H. W. Liu¹, J. P. Liu⁴¹, K. Liu²⁵, K. Liu⁶, K. Y. Liu²¹, Q. Liu³⁶, S. B. Liu³⁸, X. Liu²⁰, X. H. Liu¹, Y. B. Liu²⁴, Y. W. Liu³⁸, Yong Liu¹, Z. A. Liu¹, Zhiqiang Liu¹, Zhiqing Liu¹, H. Loehner¹⁸, G. R. Lu¹¹, H. J. Lu¹³, J. G. Lu¹, Q. W. Lu²⁸, X. R. Lu⁶, Y. P. Lu¹, C. L. Luo²², M. X. Luo⁴², T. Luo³⁶, X. L. Luo¹, M. Lv¹, C. L. Ma⁶, F. C. Ma²¹, H. L. Ma¹, Q. M. Ma¹, S. Ma¹, T. Ma¹, X. Ma¹, X. Y. Ma¹, M. Maggiora⁴⁰, Q. A. Malik³⁹, H. Mao¹, Y. J. Mao²⁵, Z. P. Mao¹, J. G. Messchendorp¹⁸, J. Min¹, T. J. Min¹, R. E. Mitchell¹⁶, X. H. Mo¹, N. Yu. Muchnoi⁵, Y. Nefedov¹⁷, I. B. Nikolaev⁵, Z. Ning¹, S. L. Olsen²⁶, Q. Ouyang¹, S. Pacetti¹⁹, J. W. Park²⁶, M. Pelizaeus³⁶, K. Peters⁷, J. L. Ping²², R. G. Ping¹, R. Poling³⁷, C. S. J. Pun³³, M. Qi²³, S. Qian¹, C. F. Qiao⁶, X. S. Qin¹, J. F. Qiu¹, K. H. Rashid³⁹, G. Rong¹, X. D. Ruan⁹, A. Sarantsev^{17c}, J. Schulze², M. Shao³⁸, C. P. Shen^{36d}, X. Y. Shen¹, H. Y. Sheng¹, M. R. Shepherd¹⁶, X. Y. Song¹, S. Spataro⁴⁰, B. Spruck³⁵, D. H. Sun¹, G. X. Sun¹, J. F. Sun¹¹, S. S. Sun¹, X. D. Sun¹, Y. J. Sun³⁸, Y. Z. Sun¹, Z. J. Sun¹, Z. T. Sun³⁸, C. J. Tang²⁹, X. Tang¹, H. L. Tian¹, D. Toth³⁷, G. S. Varner³⁶, B. Wang⁹, B. Q. Wang²⁵, K. Wang¹, L. L. Wang⁴, L. S. Wang¹, M. Wang²⁷, P. Wang¹, P. L. Wang¹, Q. Wang¹, Q. J. Wang¹, S. G. Wang²⁵, X. L. Wang³⁸, Y. D. Wang³⁸, Y. F. Wang¹, Y. Q. Wang²⁷, Z. Wang¹, Z. G. Wang¹, Z. Y. Wang¹, D. H. Wei⁸, Q. G. Wen³⁸, S. P. Wen¹, U. Wiedner², L. H. Wu¹, N. Wu¹, W. Wu²¹, Z. Wu¹, Z. J. Xiao²², Y. G. Xie¹, Q. L. Xiu¹, G. F. Xu¹, G. M. Xu²⁵, H. Xu¹, Q. J. Xu¹⁰, X. P. Xu³⁰, Y. Xu²⁴, Z. R. Xu³⁸, Z. Z. Xu³⁸, Z. Xue¹, L. Yan³⁸, W. B. Yan³⁸, Y. H. Yan¹⁵, H. X. Yang¹, T. Yang⁹, Y. Yang¹⁴, Y. X. Yang⁸, H. Ye¹, M. Ye¹, M. H. Ye⁴, B. X. Yu¹, C. X. Yu²⁴, S. P. Yu²⁷, C. Z. Yuan¹, W. L. Yuan²², Y. Yuan¹, A. A. Zafar³⁹, A. Zallo¹⁹, Y. Zeng¹⁵, B. X. Zhang¹, B. Y. Zhang¹, C. Zhang²³, C. C. Zhang¹, D. H. Zhang¹, H. H. Zhang³¹, H. Y. Zhang¹, J. Zhang²², J. Q. Zhang¹, J. W. Zhang¹, J. Y. Zhang¹, J. Z. Zhang¹, L. Zhang²³, S. H. Zhang¹, T. R. Zhang²², X. J. Zhang¹, X. Y. Zhang²⁷, Y. Zhang¹, Y. H. Zhang¹, Y. S. Zhang⁹, Z. P. Zhang³⁸, Z. Y. Zhang⁴¹, G. Zhao¹, H. S. Zhao¹, Jiawei Zhao³⁸, Jingwei Zhao¹, Lei Zhao³⁸, Ling Zhao¹, M. G. Zhao²⁴, Q. Zhao¹, S. J. Zhao⁴³, T. C. Zhao¹, X. H. Zhao²³, Y. B. Zhao¹, Z. G. Zhao³⁸, Z. L. Zhao⁹, A. Zhemchugov^{17a}, B. Zheng¹, J. P. Zheng¹, Y. H. Zheng⁶, Z. P. Zheng¹, B. Zhong¹, J. Zhong², L. Zhong³⁴, L. Zhou¹, X. K. Zhou⁶, X. R. Zhou³⁸, C. Zhu¹, K. Zhu¹, K. J. Zhu¹, S. H. Zhu¹, X. L. Zhu³⁴, X. W. Zhu¹, Y. S. Zhu¹, Z. A. Zhu¹, J. Zhuang¹, B. S. Zou¹, J. H. Zou¹, J. X. Zuo¹

(BESIII Collaboration)

¹ *Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing 100049, P. R. China*

² *Bochum Ruhr-University, 44780 Bochum, Germany*

³ *Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA*

⁴ *China Center of Advanced Science and Technology, Beijing 100190, P. R. China*

⁵ *G.I. Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics SB RAS (BINP), Novosibirsk 630090, Russia*

⁶ *Graduate University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, P. R. China*

⁷ *GSI Helmholtzcentre for Heavy Ion Research GmbH, D-64291 Darmstadt, Germany*

⁸ *Guangxi Normal University, Guilin 541004, P. R. China*

⁹ *Guangxi University, Nanning 530004, P. R. China*

¹⁰ *Hangzhou Normal University, XueLin Jie 16, Xiasha Higher Education Zone, Hangzhou, 310036*

¹¹ *Henan Normal University, Xinxiang 453007, P. R. China*

¹² *Henan University of Science and Technology,*

- ¹³ Huangshan College, Huangshan 245000, P. R. China
¹⁴ Huazhong Normal University, Wuhan 430079, P. R. China
¹⁵ Hunan University, Changsha 410082, P. R. China
¹⁶ Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA
¹⁷ Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia
¹⁸ KVI/University of Groningen, 9747 AA Groningen, The Netherlands
¹⁹ Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati - INFN, 00044 Frascati, Italy
²⁰ Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, P. R. China
²¹ Liaoning University, Shenyang 110036, P. R. China
²² Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210046, P. R. China
²³ Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, P. R. China
²⁴ Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P. R. China
²⁵ Peking University, Beijing 100871, P. R. China
²⁶ Seoul National University, Seoul, 151-747 Korea
²⁷ Shandong University, Jinan 250100, P. R. China
²⁸ Shanxi University, Taiyuan 030006, P. R. China
²⁹ Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, P. R. China
³⁰ Soochow University, Suzhou 215006, China
³¹ Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou 510275, P. R. China
³² The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong.
³³ The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong
³⁴ Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P. R. China
³⁵ Universitaet Giessen, 35392 Giessen, Germany
³⁶ University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, USA
³⁷ University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455, USA
³⁸ University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, P. R. China
³⁹ University of the Punjab, Lahore-54590, Pakistan
⁴⁰ University of Turin and INFN, Turin, Italy
⁴¹ Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, P. R. China
⁴² Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, P. R. China
⁴³ Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou 450001, P. R. China
- ^a also at the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia
^b on leave from the Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kiev, Ukraine
^c also at the PNPI, Gatchina, Russia
^d now at Nagoya University, Nagoya, Japan

The processes $\eta'_c \rightarrow \rho^0 \rho^0$, $K^{*0} \bar{K}^{*0}$, and $\phi\phi$ are searched for using a sample of 1.06×10^8 ψ' events collected with the BESIII detector at the BEPCII collider. No signals are observed in any of the three final states. The upper limits on the decay branching fractions are determined to be $\mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow \rho^0 \rho^0) < 3.1 \times 10^{-3}$, $\mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow K^{*0} \bar{K}^{*0}) < 5.4 \times 10^{-3}$, and $\mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow \phi\phi) < 2.0 \times 10^{-3}$ at the 90% confidence level. The upper limits are lower than the existing theoretical predictions.

PACS numbers: 14.40.Pq, 12.38.Qk, 13.20.Gd, 13.25.Gv

The radially ($n=2$) excited S -wave spin-singlet charmonium state, η'_c , labelled $\eta_c(2S)$, was observed in $B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm \eta'_c$, $\eta'_c \rightarrow K_S^0 K^\pm \pi^\mp$ by the Belle Collaboration [1] and was confirmed by the CLEO and BaBar Collaborations [2]. In addition to the $K\bar{K}\pi$ final state, $\eta'_c \rightarrow 3(\pi^+\pi^-)$, $K^+K^-2(\pi^+\pi^-)$, $K_S^0 K^\pm \pi^\mp \pi^+\pi^-$, and $\pi^+\pi^-K^+K^-\pi^0$ are also reported [3]. The production of η'_c is also expected from the radiative magnetic dipole ($M1$) transition of ψ' . The decay $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c$, $\eta'_c \rightarrow K_S^0 K^+\pi^- + c.c.$ was observed at BESIII [4] with a branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c) = (4.7 \pm 0.9 \pm 3.0) \times 10^{-4}$,

confirming the possibility to study η'_c properties in ψ' transitions. In this analysis, we search for the η'_c decay into vector meson pairs.

The decay modes $\eta'_c \rightarrow VV$, where V stands for a light vector meson, are supposed to be highly suppressed by the helicity selection rule (HSR) [5]. But in Ref. [6], a higher production rate of $\eta'_c \rightarrow VV$ is predicted, taking into consideration significant contributions from intermediate charmed meson loops, which provide a mechanism to evade HSR [7]. The intermediate charmed meson loops can also significantly suppress $\psi' \rightarrow VP$ (where P stands

for a pseudoscalar meson) strong decay amplitudes [8], which may help to explain the “ $\rho\pi$ puzzle” in charmium decays [9]. The measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$ may help in understanding the role played by charmed meson loops in $\eta_c \rightarrow VV$.

In this study, an e^+e^- annihilation data sample with $(1.06 \pm 0.04) \times 10^8$ ψ' events [10] is analyzed. Another data sample of 923 pb^{-1} at $\sqrt{s} = 3.773 \text{ GeV}$ is used to estimate non- ψ' background. The data were collected with the BESIII detector which is described in detail elsewhere [11]. A charged-particle tracking system (MDC) is immersed in a 1 T magnetic field. A Time-of-flight system (TOF) and an electromagnetic calorimeter (EMC) surrounding the tracking system are used to identify charged particles and to measure neutral particle energies, respectively. Located outside the EMC, a muon chamber (MUC) is used to detect muon tracks.

A Monte Carlo (MC) simulation is used to determine the mass resolution and detection efficiency, as well as to study backgrounds. The simulation of the BESIII detector is based on GEANT4 [12], where the interactions of particles with the detector material are simulated. We use the program LUNDCRM [13] to generate inclusive MC events for the background study, where the branching fractions for known decay channels are taken from the Particle Data Group (PDG) [14]. For the signal channel $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c$, the photon is generated with the polar angle distribution $1 + \cos^2\theta$. To generate the correct decay angle distributions, the $\eta'_c \rightarrow VV$ decays are modeled with SVV model [15], and V decays are generated by the VSS model [16], which is used to describe decays of a vector particle into two scalars.

We search for the η'_c in three exclusive decay channels: $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\rho^0\rho^0 \rightarrow \gamma 2(\pi^+\pi^-)$, $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma K^{*0}\bar{K}^{*0} \rightarrow \gamma\pi^+\pi^-K^+K^-$, and $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\phi\phi \rightarrow \gamma 2(K^+K^-)$. These final states, denoted as $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma X$ hereafter, contain one radiative photon and four charged tracks. The charged tracks are required to pass within 1 cm of the e^+e^- annihilation interaction point (IP) transverse to the beam line and within 10 cm of the IP along the beam axis. Each track should have good quality in track fitting and satisfy $|\cos\theta| < 0.93$, where θ is the polar angle with respect to the e^+ beam direction. Reconstructed events are required to have four charged tracks and zero net charge. Information from dE/dx and TOF is used for charged particle identification (PID), and $\chi^2_{PID}(i)$ is calculated for each charged track, where i is the corresponding charged-particle hypothesis including pion, kaon, and proton. For a specific decay channel, the total χ^2_{PID} is obtained by summing $\chi^2_{PID}(i)$ over the charged tracks. There is a loop to match the charged tracks to the final state particles in the decay channel, and the matching with the minimum χ^2_{PID} is adopted. The decay channel for a reconstructed event is selected as the one with the minimum χ^2_{PID} among possible decay channels. Photons are reconstructed by clustering EMC crystal energies with a minimum energy of 25 MeV. The photon candidates are required to be detected in the ac-

tive area of the EMC ($|\cos\theta_\gamma| < 0.8$ for the barrel and $0.86 < |\cos\theta_\gamma| < 0.92$ for the endcaps). Timing requirements are used in the EMC to suppress electronic noise and energy deposits unrelated to the event.

In order to reduce background from non- VV production, the invariant masses of the final decay particles are required to satisfy $0.67 \text{ GeV}/c^2 < M_{\pi^+\pi^-} < 0.87 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, $0.85 \text{ GeV}/c^2 < M_{\pi^\pm K^\mp} < 0.95 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, and $1.01 \text{ GeV}/c^2 < M_{K^+K^-} < 1.03 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, for ρ^0 , K^{*0} and ϕ candidates, respectively, which are determined by fitting their mass distributions in the χ_{cJ} mass region. Here the background level has been considered in the choice of the selection criterion for each channel. The ratios of signal over non- V background are near 1 at the edges of the mass selection region for ρ^0 and K^{*0} .

A kinematic fit is performed to improve the mass resolution and reject backgrounds. The four-momenta of the charged tracks and the photon candidate are constrained to the initial ψ' four-momentum (4C fit). When there is more than one photon, the photon with the minimum χ^2 from the 4C fit, χ^2_{4C} , is taken as the radiative photon, and χ^2 is required to be less than 40.

Background from $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-J/\psi$ with J/ψ decaying into a lepton pair is removed by requiring the recoil mass [17] of any $\pi^+\pi^-$ pair to be below the J/ψ mass ($m_{\pi^+\pi^-}^{\text{recoil}} < 3.05 \text{ GeV}/c^2$). Events from $\psi' \rightarrow \eta J/\psi$, with $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ (γ) and J/ψ decays into lepton pairs, are also removed by this requirement.

The background remaining can be separated into three categories: events with no radiative photon ($\psi' \rightarrow X$); events with an extra photon in the final state ($\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$, $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$); and events with the same final state as the signal ($\psi' \rightarrow \gamma X$), but where the photon comes from initial state radiation (ISR) or final state radiation (FSR).

The background from $\psi' \rightarrow X$ with no radiative photon comes from events where the charged tracks plus a fake photon satisfy the 4C kinematic fit. In the X mass spectrum from a 4C kinematic fit, this background contributes a peak close to the η'_c mass, around $3.656 \text{ GeV}/c^2$, and decreases sharply at high mass due to the 25 MeV requirement on the photon energy. If the measured energy of the candidate photon is not used in the kinematic fit, thus becoming a 3C fit, this background lies around the ψ' mass region ($3.66 \text{ GeV}/c^2 \sim 3.70 \text{ GeV}/c^2$) in the mass spectrum, as the photon energy from the fit tends to be close to zero energy (see Fig. 1). There is little change in the η'_c mass resolution due to one less constraint in the kinematic fit, but the separation of the η'_c signal from the background is much improved. Therefore, the result from the 3C fit (M_X^{3C}) is taken as the final mass spectrum.

The background from $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$ is measured from data by reconstructing the π^0 from its decay into two photons. If there are more than two photons, the π^0 candidate is selected as the one with the minimum χ^2 from a 5C fit (4C plus a π^0 mass constraint). $\chi^2_{5C} < 30$ is required to veto backgrounds. A MC sample of $\psi' \rightarrow$




FIG. 1: Comparison between 3C and 4C kinematic fits (un-normalized). Shown in the plot are the signal with the 3C fit (filled circles), signal with the 4C fit (open circles), $\psi' \rightarrow X$ background with the 3C fit (solid line), and $\psi' \rightarrow X$ background with the 4C fit (dashed line).

$\pi^0 X$ is used to determine the efficiency ratio between events passing the $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma X$ and $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$ selections. Finally, the efficiency ratio is used to scale the $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$ sample selected from data to obtain the background contamination from $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$ as a function of the X invariant mass. This background, which is described with a Novosibirsk function [18] as shown in Fig. 2, contributes a smooth component in the χ_{cJ} ($J = 0, 1, 2$) mass region ($3.35 \text{ GeV}/c^2 \sim 3.60 \text{ GeV}/c^2$), and is almost negligible above $3.60 \text{ GeV}/c^2$.

The background shape from $\psi' \rightarrow (\gamma_{FSR})X$ is obtained from MC simulation, where the FSR photon is simulated with PHOTOS [19]. The fraction of events with FSR is defined as $R_{FSR} = \frac{N_{\gamma_{FSR}X}}{N_X}$, where $N_{\gamma_{FSR}X}$ (N_X) is the number of events containing an (no) FSR photon that survive selection. This fraction is obtained from measuring the FSR contribution in $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma \chi_{c0}$, $\chi_{c0} \rightarrow (\gamma_{FSR})X$. The event selection of this FSR sample is very similar to that of the signal mode, except that the reconstructed final state contains two photons, where the softer photon is regarded as the FSR photon. The energy of the FSR photon is not used when performing the 3C kinematic fit for this sample. Events from $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$ are the main background for the FSR sample and are excluded by requiring the invariant mass of the two photons to be outside of the π^0 signal region. Fig. 3 shows the two-dimensional distribution of M_X^{3C} versus $M_{\gamma_{FSR}X}^{3C}$. If we add the four-momenta of the FSR photon and X to calculate the invariant mass for events with M_X^{3C} below the χ_{c0} mass in the PDG ($M_{\chi_{c0}}^{PDG}$), $M_{\gamma_{FSR}X}^{3C}$ peaks at $M_{\chi_{c0}}^{PDG}$ indicating the photon is indeed from FSR . As a result, events from $\chi_{c0} \rightarrow X$ are in the dashed-line box in Fig. 3, while events from $\chi_{c0} \rightarrow \gamma_{FSR}X$ are in the solid-line box in Fig. 3. In this way, we can obtain R_{FSR} for MC simulation and data. The factor f_{FSR} is defined as the ratio of

R_{FSR} measured in data to that determined in MC simulation. This FSR measurement is performed for two final states; $f_{FSR} = 1.70 \pm 0.10$ and 1.39 ± 0.08 are determined for $X = 2(\pi^+ \pi^-)$ and $X = \pi^+ \pi^- K^+ K^-$, respectively. The errors are the statistical errors of the sample and the uncertainties of the background estimation. These factors are used to scale fractions of FSR background events ($\psi' \rightarrow (\gamma_{FSR})X$) in the MC samples to estimate the background in data.

Data taken at $\sqrt{s} = 3.773 \text{ GeV}$ are used to estimate backgrounds from the continuum ($e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow (\gamma_{FSR})X$) and ISR ($e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma_{ISR}X$). MC simulation indicates that ψ'' decays contribute negligible background in the modes under study. Using the luminosity normalization and energy dependence of the cross section, there are 46 ± 3 and 8 ± 2 background events expected for $V = \rho^0$ and $V = K^{*0}$, respectively. For $V = \phi$, no events survive the selection.

The signal yields are extracted from an unbinned maximum likelihood fit to the M_V^{3C} distribution. The signal shape is obtained from MC simulation, following $BW(m_0, \Gamma) \times E_\gamma^3 \times \text{damping}$, where m_0 and Γ are the mass and width of the Breit-Wigner for signal and χ_{cJ} , E_γ^3 is the cube of the radiative photon energy, which is necessary in an $E1/M1$ radiative transition, and damping stands for a damping function used to damp the diverging tail caused by the E_γ^3 at lower mass region (corresponding to a higher energy radiative photon). One damping function used by KEDR [20] is defined as $\frac{E_0^2}{E_\gamma E_0 + (E_\gamma - E_0)^2}$, where E_0 is the most probable energy of the transition photon. It is also necessary to convolute this with a Gaussian function $G(\mu, \sigma)$ to take the mass resolution difference between MC simulation and data into account. The mean (μ) and standard deviation (σ) are free parameters for the χ_{cJ} signals. For η'_c , they are fixed to the values extrapolated from χ_{cJ} with a linear assumption. In the fit, the estimated backgrounds from $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$ and the continuum are fixed. The shape of the $\psi' \rightarrow (\gamma_{FSR})X$ background comes from the MC simulation. The fraction of MC data with an FSR photon is scaled by the factor f_{FSR} to estimate the fraction of data with FSR background. Fig. 4 shows the final fitting results to the 3C mass spectrum. The values of χ^2/ndf are 0.68 and 0.72 for $\rho^0 \rho^0$ and $K^{*0} \bar{K}^{*0}$, respectively, indicating good fits. The numbers of η'_c events obtained are 6.5 ± 6.4 and 6.9 ± 4.8 for $V = \rho^0$ and K^{*0} , respectively. No fit is performed for $\phi\phi$, since there is only one $\eta'_c \rightarrow \phi\phi$ candidate event in the signal region.

The systematic uncertainties related to tracking, photon reconstruction, PID and the kinematic fit are estimated with specially selected control samples [21]. An efficiency can be defined as the ratio of χ_{cJ} yield for VV with the V mass requirement to that without this requirement. The exact same method is applied to MC and the difference in the efficiency between MC simulation and data is taken as the corresponding systematic uncertainty caused by the V mass requirement, with the statistical er-




FIG. 2: The measured background from $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$ events (dots with error bars) for the modes: (a) $\gamma\rho^0\rho^0$ and (b) $\gamma K^{*0}\bar{K}^{*0}$. The curves show the best fit with Novosibirsk functions.




FIG. 3: The two-dimensional plots of M_X^{3C} versus $M_{\gamma FSR X}^{3C}$ for events passing the $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\gamma FSR X$ selection with $X = 2(\pi^+\pi^-)$. From left to right they are: (a) MC simulated χ_{c0} signal, (b) inclusive MC and (c) data. In each plot the dashed-line and the solid-line boxes contain events without and with a FSR photon, respectively. MC simulations reproduce the shape well but not the amount of FSR events.

ror included. An alternative damping function was used by CLEO [22], $\exp(-E_\gamma^2/(8\beta^2))$, which is inspired by the overlap of wave functions, with $\beta = 65.0 \pm 2.5$ MeV from fitting the $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$ photon spectrum. The difference caused by the two damping functions is taken as a systematic uncertainty. The main backgrounds that may affect our fit result in the η'_c mass region are the contributions from FSR in $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma FSR X$ and from the continuum. Therefore, the systematic uncertainty from the background shape is estimated by changing the FSR and continuum contributions by 1σ . There are also systematic uncertainties related to the mass and width of the η'_c , which are estimated by comparing the η'_c yields with the mass and width fixed to the center values or randomly selected values according to a Gaussian distribution. Table I shows a summary of all the systematic uncertainties.

As there is no significant η'_c signal in any of the three final states, we determine upper limits on the $\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c \rightarrow \gamma VV$ production rates. We assume all the signal events from the fit are due to $\eta'_c \rightarrow VV$, neglecting possible interference between the signal and non-resonant contri-

TABLE I: The systematic uncertainties in the measured product branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c) \times \mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$.

Source	ρ^0	K^{*0}	ϕ
Background (%)	14.9	9.9	0.0
Tracking (%)	8.0	8.0	8.0
Photon reconstruction (%)	1.0	1.0	1.0
Particle ID (%)	8.0	8.0	8.0
4C fit (χ^2 selection) (%)	4.0	4.0	4.0
V mass selection requirement (%)	2.6	1.1	1.6
damping function (%)	40.5	10.0	0.0
Mass and width of η'_c (%)	6.6	5.8	0.0
Number of ψ' (%)	4.0	4.0	4.0
Total (%)	45.6	19.9	12.8

butions. The probability density function (PDF) for the expected number of signal events is smeared with the systematic uncertainties (by convolution). For $V = \rho^0$ and K^{*0} , the PDF is taken to be the likelihood distribution




FIG. 4: Invariant mass distributions of the vector meson pairs after a 3C kinematic fit for the modes: (a) $\rho^0\rho^0$, (b) $K^{*0}\bar{K}^{*0}$ and (c) $\phi\phi$. Dots with error bars are data, and the solid curves in (a) and (b) are from the best fit to the mass spectra. No fit is performed for (c) due to low statistics. In (a) and (b), the η'_c signals are shown as short-dashed lines, $\psi' \rightarrow \pi^0 X$ backgrounds are in dotted lines, continuum in long-dashed lines, and $\psi' \rightarrow (\gamma_{FSR})X$ in short-dash-dot-dotted lines.

in fitting the invariant mass distributions in Fig. 4 by setting the number of η'_c signal events from zero up to a very large number. For $V = \phi$, the one event in the η'_c mass region is taken as signal for simplicity, and the PDF is assumed to be a Poisson distribution.

The upper limit on the number of events at the 90% confidence level (C.L.), $N_{\gamma VV}^{up}$, corresponds to $\int_0^{N_{\gamma VV}^{up}} \text{PDF}(x)dx / \int_0^\infty \text{PDF}(x)dx = 0.90$ on the smeared PDF. The left half of Table II shows N^{up} , the efficiencies from MC simulation, and the upper limits on the product branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c) \times \mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$. Using $\mathcal{B}(\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c) = (4.7 \pm 0.9 \pm 3.0) \times 10^{-4}$ [4], the corresponding upper limits on $\mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$ are listed in the right half of Table II. In calculating $\mathcal{B}^{up}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$, the error on $\mathcal{B}(\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c)$ is taken as a systematic uncertainty to smear the PDF. The theoretical predictions [6] on branching fractions for $\eta'_c \rightarrow VV$, which are calculated with $\Gamma_{\eta'_c} = 10.4 \pm 4.2$ MeV [23], are also listed in Table II.

TABLE II: From left to right, they are efficiency, upper limits at the 90% C.L. on the yield, product branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c) \times \mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$, η'_c decay branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$, and theoretical predictions from Ref. [6].

V	ε	$N_{\gamma VV}^{up}$	$\mathcal{B}^{up}(\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c \rightarrow \gamma VV)$	$\mathcal{B}^{up}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$	$\mathcal{B}^{theory}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$
	(%)		(10^{-7})	(10^{-3})	(10^{-3})
ρ^0	14.3	19.2	12.7	3.1	6.4 to 28.9
K^{*0}	16.5	15.2	19.6	5.4	7.9 to 35.8
ϕ	19.9	3.9	7.8	2.0	2.1 to 9.8

In conclusion, no obvious η'_c signal was observed in decays into vector meson pairs: $\rho^0\rho^0$, $K^{*0}\bar{K}^{*0}$, and $\phi\phi$. The upper limits on the product branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\psi' \rightarrow \gamma\eta'_c) \times \mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$ and η'_c decay branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(\eta'_c \rightarrow VV)$ are determined. These upper limits are smaller than the lower bounds of the theoretical predictions [6], although the difference is very small for $\eta'_c \rightarrow \phi\phi$.

The BESIII collaboration thanks the staff of BEPCII and the computing center for their hard efforts. This work is supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Technology of China under Contract No. 2009CB825200; National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Contracts Nos. 10625524, 10821063, 10825524,

10835001, 10935007; the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) Large-Scale Scientific Facility Program; CAS under Contracts Nos. KJCX2-YW-N29, KJCX2-YW-N45; 100 Talents Program of CAS; Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Italy; Siberian Branch of Russian Academy of Science, joint project No. 32 with CAS; U. S. Department of Energy under Contracts Nos. DE-FG02-04ER41291, DE-FG02-91ER40682, DE-FG02-94ER40823; University of Groningen (RuG) and the Helmholtzzentrum fuer Schwerionenforschung GmbH (GSI), Darmstadt; WCU Program of National Research Foundation of Korea under Contract No. R32-2008-000-10155-0.

-
- [1] S. K. Choi *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 102001 (2002).
- [2] D. M. Asner *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 142001 (2004); B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 142002 (2004); B. Aubert *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **72**, 031101 (2005).
- [3] A. Vinokurova *et al.* (Belle Collaboration), arXiv:1105.0978v2; P. del Amo Sanchez *et al.* (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **84**, 012004 (2011); H. Nakazawa (Belle Collaboration), in Proc. Sci. ICHEP2010 (2010) 162.
- [4] L. L. Wang (for the BESIII Collaboration), arXiv:1110.2560 [hep-ex], talk at the “XIV International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy”, 13-17 June, 2011, Munchen, Germany.
- [5] S. J. Brodsky and G. P. Lepage, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 2848 (1981); V. L. Chernyak and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Nucl. Phys. B **201**, 492 (1982); V. L. Chernyak and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rept. **112**, 173 (1984).
- [6] Q. Wang, X. H. Liu and Q. Zhao, arXiv:1010.1343.
- [7] X. H. Liu and Q. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 014017 (2010); X. H. Liu and Q. Zhao, arXiv:1004.0496.
- [8] Q. Zhao *et al.*, Chinese Phys. C **34**, 299 (2010); Q. Zhao, arXiv:1012.2887.
- [9] X. H. Mo, C. Z. Yuan, P. Wang, arXiv:hep-ph/0611214.
- [10] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **81**, 052005 (2010).
- [11] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **614**, 345 (2010).
- [12] S. Agostinelli *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. Sect. A, **506**, 250 (2003).
- [13] J. C. Chen, G. S. Huang, X. R. Qi, D. H. Zhang and Y. S. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 034003 (2000).
- [14] K. Nakamura *et al.* (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. G **37**, 075021 (2010).
- [15] The amplitudes and phases for H+, H0, and H- are 1.0, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, -1.0, 0.0, which are calculated by requiring of P -parity conservation for the allowed components of helicity amplitudes.
- [16] D. J. Lange, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A **462**, 152 (2001).
- [17] The $\pi^+\pi^-$ recoil mass is defined as $M_{\pi^+\pi^-}^{\text{recoil}} = \sqrt{(E_{\psi'} - E_{\pi^+} - E_{\pi^-})^2 - (\vec{p}_{\psi'} - \vec{p}_{\pi^+} - \vec{p}_{\pi^-})^2}$, where E and \vec{p} are energy and momentum for a particle.
- [18] The Novosibirsk function is defined as $f(m_{ES}) = A_S \exp(-0.5 \ln^2[1 + \Lambda \tau \cdot (m_{ES} - m_0)] / \tau^2 + \tau^2)$, where $\Lambda = \sinh(\tau \sqrt{\ln 4}) / (\sigma \tau \sqrt{\ln 4})$, the peak position is m_0 , the width is σ , and τ is the tail parameter.
- [19] E. Barberio and Z. Was, Comput. Phys. Commun. **79**, 291 (1994).
- [20] V. V. Anashin *et al.*, arXiv:1012.1694.
- [21] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **83**, 112005 (2011); M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 092001 (2011).
- [22] R. E. Mitchell *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 011801 (2009); R. E. Mitchell *et al.* (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 159903 (2011).
- [23] By averaging measurements listed by the PDG [14] and recent results from BaBar and Belle, we determine the mass $M_{\eta'_c} = 3637.7 \pm 1.3 \text{ MeV}/c^2$, and the width $\Gamma_{\eta'_c} = 10.4 \pm 4.2 \text{ MeV}$.