

η-η^{′} mixing: From electromagnetic transitions to weak decays of charm and beauty hadrons

C. Di Donato, G. Ricciardi, and I. I. Bigi

Phys. Rev. D **85**, 013016 — Published 20 January 2012

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.85.013016

UND-HEP-11-BIG03
DSF-6-2011

Prepared for submission to JHEP

$\eta - \eta'$ Mixing – From electromagnetic transitions to weak decays of charm and beauty hadrons

C. Di Donato,[a] **G. Ricciardi,**[a,b] **I.I. Bigi**[c]

[a] *I.N.F.N. Sezione di Napoli,*
Complesso Universitario di Monte Sant'Angelo — via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy
[b] *Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Universitá di Napoli Federico II,*
Complesso Universitario di Monte Sant'Angelo — via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy
[c] *Department of Physics, University of Notre Dame du Lac,*
Notre Dame, IN 46556, USA

E-mail: camilla.didonato@na.infn.it, giulia.ricciardi@na.infn.it, ibigi@nd.edu

Abstract: It has been realized for a long time that knowing the η and η' wave functions in terms of quark and gluon components probes our understanding of non-perturbative QCD dynamics. Great effort has been given to this challenge – yet no clear picture has emerged even with the most recent KLOE data. We point out which measurements would be most helpful in arriving at a more definite conclusion. A better knowledge of these wave functions will significantly help to disentangle the weight of different decay subprocesses in semi-leptonic decays of D^+, D_s^+ and B^+ mesons. The resulting insights will be instrumental in treating even non-leptonic B transitions involving η and η' and their **CP** asymmetries; thus they can sharpen the case for or against New Physics intervening there.

Keywords: Standard Model, Kaon Physics, B Physics, QCD

The question of $\eta - \eta'$ mixing [1] — i.e., how their wave functions are composed of $SU(3)_{fl}$ singlet and octet $\bar{q}q$ components — goes back to the beginning of the quark model era [1–9]. With the advent of QCD it became even more involved, since QCD brought with it more dynamical degrees of freedom, namely gluons, which can form a second class of $SU(3)_{fl}$ singlets. Determining $\eta - \eta'$ mixing is thus an intriguing element in understanding QCD's non-perturbative dynamics. Lattice QCD's attempts to establish theoretical control over this mixing are still in their infancy [10, 11]. Showing that there is a purely gluonic component in the η and/or η' wave functions would establish for the first time that gluons, which have been introduced to mediate the strong interactions and whose presence as independent degrees of freedom has been demonstrated as progenitors of jets in 'hard' collisions, play an independent role also in hadronic spectroscopy. In section 1 we introduce basic notions relevant for $\eta - \eta'$ mixing, while in section 2 we review the somewhat ambivalent findings from several phenomenological studies. Armed with this knowledge we discuss weak D and B decays producing η and η' mesons in section 3 and what the observed rates can tell us about the underlying quark level transitions; we comment briefly on how the structure of the η and η' wave functions affect **CP** asymmetries in the channels $B_d \to \eta' K_S$ and $B_d \to \eta K_S$. Finally in section 4 we present a summary and outlook.

1 $\eta - \eta'$ Mixing

Based on approximate QCD flavour $SU(3)_{fl}$ symmetry, the mixing of the η and η' mesons can be described in two different bases:

1. the $SU(3)_{fl}$ singlet and octet components $|\eta_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} + s\bar{s}\rangle$ and $|\eta_8\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} - 2s\bar{s}\rangle$, respectively:

$$\begin{pmatrix} |\eta\rangle \\ |\eta'\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta_P & -\sin\theta_P \\ \sin\theta_P & \cos\theta_P \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\eta_8\rangle \\ |\eta_0\rangle \end{pmatrix} \; ; \tag{1.1}$$

2. the quark-flavor basis with $|\eta_q\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d}\rangle$ and $|\eta_s\rangle = |s\bar{s}\rangle$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} |\eta\rangle \\ |\eta'\rangle \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\phi_P & -\sin\phi_P \\ \sin\phi_P & \cos\phi_P \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |\eta_q\rangle \\ |\eta_s\rangle \end{pmatrix} \; . \tag{1.2}$$

As long as state mixing is regarded, one may freely transform from one basis to the other; the two parametrizations are related through

$$\theta_P = \phi_P - \arctan\sqrt{2} \simeq \phi_P - 54.7^\circ \tag{1.3}$$

In the $SU(3)_{fl}$ symmetry limit, $\theta_P = 0$, and ϕ_P takes the so-called 'ideal' value $\phi_P = \arctan\sqrt{2} \simeq 54.7^\circ$.

[1] The term 'mixing' is often used when oscillations — like for $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ — are involved; however with oscillations one has a non-trivial time evolution — but not for η and η' mixing.

Just for orientation: the quadratic [linear] Gell-Mann Okubo (GMO) mass formula points to $\theta_P \simeq -10°$, $\phi_P \simeq 44.7°$ [$\theta_P \simeq -23°$, $\phi_P \simeq 31.7°$].

The mixing schemes have been analyzed in the contest of chiral perturbation theory. On lattice, it is not an easy task to study η and η', as experienced in the last decade of attempts. The RBC-UKQCD collaboration has reported a pioneering calculation of the η and η' masses and mixing angle of $\theta_P = -14.1(2.8)°$ using $N_f = 2 + 1$ flavor domain wall ensembles on an Iwasaki gauge action [10]. Their results show small octet-singlet mixing, consistent with the quadratic GMO within the large statistical errors. Masses and mixing angle of the η and η' have also been calculated by the Hadron Spectrum collaboration [11], using lattice QCD with unphysically heavy light (up, down) quarks and a single lattice spacing: their estimate value is $\phi_P = 42(1)°$. The large value of the mixing angle ϕ_P in the pseudoscalar sector, with respect to other ones (e.g. the vector mesons $|\omega >\simeq |\eta_q >$ and $\phi \simeq |\eta_s >$, with a mixing angle $\phi_V = (3.4 \pm 0.2)°$ [12]) is expected, because of the additional mixing induced by the axial $U(1)$ anomaly ([13] and Refs. therein).

In the nineties the possibility of a single angle description being inadequate started to be considered. Several papers [13–21], based on theoretical studies as well as on comparison with data, pointed out that the pattern of $SU(3)_{fl}$ breaking requires a description in terms of two angles. Phenomenological analyses have often involved weak decay constants $f^a_{\eta^{(\prime)}}$, defined by the relation $< 0|A^a_\mu|\eta^{(\prime)}(p) >= i f^a_{\eta^{(\prime)}}\, p_\mu$. In the octet-singlet basis $a = 8, 0$ and $A^{8,0}_\mu$ are the octet and singlet axial-vector currents; in the quark-flavour basis, $a = q, s$ and $A^{q,s}_\mu$ are the non-strange and strange axial-vector currents. Due to $SU(3)_{fl}$ breaking, the mixing of the decay constants does not necessarily follow the same pattern as the state mixing (see e.g. [20, 21]). For completeness, we report here the most general parametrizations involving two independent axial-vector currents and two different physical states:

1.
$$\begin{pmatrix} f^8_\eta & f^0_\eta \\ f^8_{\eta'} & f^0_{\eta'} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_8 \cos\theta_8 & -f_0 \sin\theta_0 \\ f_8 \sin\theta_8 & f_0 \cos\theta_0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.4}$$

2.
$$\begin{pmatrix} f^q_\eta & f^s_\eta \\ f^q_{\eta'} & f^s_{\eta'} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f_q \cos\phi_q & -f_s \sin\phi_s \\ f_q \sin\phi_q & f_s \cos\phi_s \end{pmatrix} \tag{1.5}$$

We observe that in Eq. (1.4) as in Eq. (1.1) the angles are chosen in such a way that $\theta_P = \theta_8 = \theta_0 = 0$ corresponds to the $SU(3)_{fl}$ symmetric world. As before any expression in one scheme can be translated into the other one in a straightforward mathematical way. However different dynamical implementations of $SU(3)_{fl}$ breaking suggest a different ansatz; for example it has been suggested that attributing $SU(3)_{fl}$ breaking to Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka (OZI) violating contributions leads to $\phi_q \simeq \phi_s$, recovering a description in terms effectively of a single angle in the quark-flavour basis [13, 19]. As it is well known, the OZI rule leads to a

suppression of strong interaction processes where the final states can only be reached through quark anti-quark annihilation. In the octet-singlet basis, instead, the differences in θ may be sizable, and most analysis find the range $\theta_8 - \theta_0 \approx [-19^\circ, -12^\circ]$ ([13, 16, 18, 19, 21] and references therein). In this respect, the quark-flavor basis plays a privileged role; we will use such basis in the following, assuming a single mixing angle $\phi_P = \phi_q = \phi_s$, that correspond to Eq. (1.2). We can see from Eq. (1.5) that under this assumption the decay constants follow the same pattern of particle state mixing.

The plot thickens further still in QCD, for one can form an $SU(3)_{fl}$ singlet not only from quark-antiquark combinations, but also from pure gluon configurations with the simplest one being a gg combination. Since in general all components compatible with the quantum numbers of a state can appear in that state's wave function, there is no a priori reason why the η and η' wave functions could not contain such configurations. On general grounds they will contain also $c\bar{c}$ (or $b\bar{b}$) components, but probably on a significantly smaller level, since the mass scale for gluonic excitations is presumably lower than the J/ψ mass; therefore we will ignore $c\bar{c}$ (and $b\bar{b}$) admixtures in our subsequent analysis. Using the quark-flavor basis, we write down [5]:

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta'\rangle &\simeq X_{\eta'}|\eta_q\rangle + Y_{\eta'}|\eta_s\rangle + Z_{\eta'}|gg\rangle \\ |\eta\rangle &\simeq X_{\eta}|\eta_q\rangle + Y_{\eta}|\eta_s\rangle + Z_{\eta}|gg\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

One would expect the heavier η' to contain a higher dose of gluonic components than the η, which is also mainly an $SU(3)_{fl}$ octet. Setting Z_η to zero is presumably a pragmatically sound approximation. In [22] the authors use a number of parameterization schemes to analyze J/ψ and ψ' decays into vector and pseudoscalar mesons; in most cases they find a value for the gluonic content of η compatible with zero, with an exact numeric value of $Z_\eta^2/Z_{\eta'}^2$ that is strongly model dependent and ranges from 10^{-11} to 0.08. In [22] it is also presented a framework, based on old perturbation theory, that allows a much higher gluonic content in η, that is $Z_\eta^2/Z_{\eta'}^2 \approx 1$. This result is inconsistent with the analysis of the same data made in [23], where $Z_\eta = 0$ is assumed.

In the following, we use the approximation $Z_\eta = 0$, $Z_{\eta'} \neq 0$ and we parameterize the two orthonormal states in terms of ϕ_P plus an additional mixing angle ϕ_G:

$$\begin{aligned} |\eta'\rangle &\simeq \cos\phi_G \sin\phi_P|\eta_q\rangle + \cos\phi_G \cos\phi_P|\eta_s\rangle + \sin\phi_G|gg\rangle \\ |\eta\rangle &\simeq \cos\phi_P|\eta_q\rangle - \sin\phi_P|\eta_s\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

As already mentioned it is unlikely that lattice simulations of QCD will determine the η and η' wave functions in the *near* future. Phenomenological studies are thus our only recourse. Several such analyses have been undertaken recently: while their findings are not inconsistent, their messages are ambivalent, as we will discuss in the next section.

2 Phenomenological Studies of $\eta - \eta'$ Mixing

There are three classes of electromagnetic and strong transitions that can provide information on the mixing angles and the gluonic content:

- Radiative vector and pseudoscalar meson decays:

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi', \psi, \phi \to \gamma\eta' \;\; vs. \;\; \gamma\eta \\ &\rho, \omega \to \gamma\eta \\ &\eta' \to \gamma\omega, \gamma\rho \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

- Decays into two photons or production in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions:

$$\eta' \to \gamma\gamma \quad vs. \quad \eta \to \gamma\gamma \tag{2.2}$$

$$\gamma\gamma \to \eta \quad vs. \quad \gamma\gamma \to \eta' \tag{2.3}$$

- Decays of ψ into PV final states with the vector meson acting as a 'flavour filter':

$$\psi \to \rho/\omega/\phi + \eta \;\; vs. \;\; \eta' \tag{2.4}$$

2.1 Present Status

Recent papers on the glue content of the η' by KLOE [24] and Li et al. [22] have motivated other studies of a range of different processes [23, 25, 26]. Escribano, Nadal [25, 27] and Thomas [23] have analyzed all processes (2.1–2.4). The old and new analysis from KLOE [24, 26] and Escribano-Nadal [25] refer to those processes of Eq. (2.1) whose dynamical scale is below 1.02 GeV (that is, including ϕ, but excluding ψ and ψ' decays), while Li et al. [22] have analyzed the ones above 1.02 GeV. In Table 1 we have summarized the results of [23–25], based on radiative decays of vector/pseudoscalar mesons below 1.02 GeV. KLOE analysis also includes constraints from $\pi^0/\eta' \to \gamma\gamma$, according to the prescription of Ref. [28]. These results are obtained by including vector-pseudoscalar wave function overlaps, assuming the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ to be a pure $q\bar{q}$ state, i.e. $Z^2_{\eta^{(\prime)}} = 0$, and the dependence of the decay widths on the mixing angle as in [25]. We see that the different analyses yield very consistent values for the mixing angle – namely $\phi_P \simeq 42^\circ$ – which happens to be close to the value suggested by the *quadratic* GMO mass formula. Including the latest data from $KLOE$ [24] and SND [29] does not cause a significant shift.

In Table 2 results from the same studies are listed, yet now allowing for a gluonic component in η', i.e. $Z^2_{\eta'} \neq 0$. The different analyses again yield consistent values for the mixing angle with $\phi_P \simeq 42^\circ$ with only KLOE finding a somewhat smaller number. As before the latest data from KLOE and SND do not cause a significant shift. Yet while the numbers given for the size of a gluonic component are not truly inconsistent considering the stated uncertainties, they seem to carry an ambivalent message: while the first and last studies – listed

Analysis	ϕ_P (Ansatz $Z^2_{\eta'} \equiv 0$)
KLOE	$(41.3 \pm 0.3_{stat} \pm 0.7_{sys})^\circ$
Escribano I	$(41.5 \pm 1.2)^\circ$
Escribano II	$(42.7 \pm 0.7)^\circ$
Thomas I	$(41.3 \pm 0.8)^\circ$
Thomas II	$(41.7 \pm 0.5)^\circ$
Thomas I with form factors	$(41.9 \pm 1.1)^\circ$
Thomas II with form factors	$(42.8 \pm 0.8)^\circ$

Table 1. *Fit values for the $\eta - \eta'$ mixing angle as inferred by different authors from radiative decays of vector/pseudoscalar mesons below 1.02 GeV, assuming $Z^2_{\eta'} = 0$. Only the KLOE analysis include also constraints from $\eta' \to \gamma\gamma$. "I" labels the results from the analysis without including the latest data on $\phi \to \eta'\gamma$ (KLOE) and $(\rho, \omega, \phi) \to \eta\gamma$ (SND), while "II" indicates the same analyses performed including them.*

Analysis	ϕ_P	$Z^2_{\eta'}$
KLOE	$(39.7 \pm 0.7)^\circ$	0.14 ± 0.04
Escribano I	$(41.4 \pm 1.3)^\circ$	0.04 ± 0.09
Escribano II	$(42.6 \pm 1.1)^\circ$	0.01 ± 0.07
Thomas I	$(41.3 \pm 0.9)^\circ$	0.04 ± 0.06
Thomas II	$(41.7 \pm 0.5)^\circ$	0.04 ± 0.04
Thomas I with form factors	$(41.9 \pm 1.1)^\circ$	0.10 ± 0.06
Thomas II with form factors	$(41.9 \pm 0.7)^\circ$	0.10 ± 0.04

Table 2. *Fits allowing for a gluonium component using radiative decays of vector/pseudoscalar mesons below 1.02 GeV. Only KLOE analysis include also constraints from $\eta' \to \gamma\gamma$. "I" again labels the results from analyses without including the latest data on $\phi \to \eta'\gamma$ (KLOE) and $(\rho, \omega, \phi) \to \eta\gamma$ (SND), while "II" indicates the same analysis performed including them.*

as "KLOE" and "Thomas with form factors" – point to a significant gluonic component, the others do not. We can understand some of the differences. As explained around Eqs. (1.4, 1.5) we think that assuming the mixing of the decay constants to follow the same pattern as state mixing is an oversimplification. Only Thomas has gone beyond this assumption, and when he includes the form factors he finds some intriguing evidence for a gluonic contribution.

The form factors included in "Thomas" are phenomenological gaussians, whose aim is to introduce a momentum dependence for exclusive processes. In order to understand why the findings from "KLOE" and "Escribano/Thomas I-II" for the gluonic content in Table 2 are as different as they appear (for neither analysis allows for different form factors), we can offer one comment, though: only"KLOE" includes $\eta' \to \gamma\gamma$, and that observable pushes up the value of Z^2_η, as pointed out by Thomas.

In fact, the above theoretical discussion has prompted the KLOE collaboration to perform

another fit [26], updated by using the branching ratio values from PDG 2008 [30], the more recent KLOE results on the ω meson [31] and using a larger number of free parameters, as suggested by [23, 25]. The fit has been performed in the two cases: imposing the gluonium content to be zero, that resulted in $\phi_P = (41.4 \pm 0.5)^\circ$, or allowing it free, giving $\phi_P = (40.4 \pm 0.6)^\circ$. KLOE new results confirm the gluonium content of η' at 3σ level with $Z^2_{\eta'} = 0.115 \pm 0.036$, in contrast with "Escribano/Thomas I-II" values in Table 1. Therefore, the actual difference between "Escribano/Thomas I-II" and KLOE values appears due to the inclusion in the latter of $\eta' \to \gamma\gamma$.

The comparison presented above has pointed out that decays into two photons can play a key role in the mixing parameters determination. They can be exploited also looking at the inverse processes, namely the production in $\gamma\gamma$ collisions.

The L3 Collab. at LEP has published [32] the measurement of the radiative width $\Gamma(\eta' \to \gamma\gamma)$ produced via the collision of virtual photons, in the reaction $e^+e^- \to e^+e^-\gamma^\star\gamma^\star$, $\gamma^\star\gamma^\star \to \eta'$, $\eta' \to \pi^+\pi^-\gamma$, using data collected at centre-of-mass energies $\sqrt{s} \simeq 91$ GeV. They compare the photon-meson transition form factor with a model by Anisovich et al. [33], that allows a variable admixture of gluonic content, from zero to 15%. The central values of L3 data points favour a low gluonium content, but the whole interval is allowed within the large errors.

Before L3, the same $e^+e^- \to e^+e^-\eta'$ reaction had been performed at lower energy e^+e^- colliders, by using various η' decay channels (see Refs. in [32]). Let us review some old measurements of the radiative widths $\Gamma(\eta^{(\prime)} \to \gamma\gamma)$ used to evaluate the mixing angles. These estimates did not consider the possibility of gluonic content and refer to the octet-singlet basis and the single angle approximation, whose limits have been discussed in Sect. 1. To facilitate the comparison, we have quoted the results in the flavour basis, using the relation (1.3). The observation of η meson production from $\gamma\gamma$ fusion has been reported in a 1983 Rapid Communication by the Crystal Ball Collab.; the given mixing angle reads $\phi_P = 37.1^\circ \pm 3.6^\circ$ [34]. In 1988 they published the radiative widths for π^0, η and η' and determined mixing angles from the experimental averages, finding $\phi_P = 32.3^\circ \pm 1.2^\circ$ [35]. Two years later both the MD-1 [36] and the ASP Collab. [37] presented the measurement of the $\eta, \eta' \to \gamma\gamma$ widths, with results in agreement within the errors. The ASP Collab. calculated the pseudoscalar mixing angle $\phi_P = 34.9^\circ \pm 2.2^\circ$ [37]. While these values are compatible among them, they appear to fall significantly below those in Tables 1 and 2.

A new surge of experimental data and updated analyses is strongly needed. BaBar has led the way presenting recent studies on the $\gamma\gamma^\star \to \eta^{(\prime)}$ transition form factors in the momentum transfer range from 4 to 40 GeV^2 [38]. They compare measured values of the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ form factors with theoretical predictions and data for the π^0 form factor by using the description of $\eta - \eta'$ mixing in the quark-flavour basis (1.2). They assume no gluonic admixture and a mixing angle $\phi_P = 41^\circ$. The dependence on the transfer momentum of the form factor for the $|\eta_s\rangle$ state is different from the QCD prediction [39] of the asymptotic distribution amplitudes; data points are systematically below the theoretical curve. Due to the strong sensitivity of the result for the $|\eta_s\rangle$ state to mixing parameters, an admixture of the two-gluon component

in the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ meson cannot be excluded as a possible origin of this discrepancy.
A new investigation is being performed by KLOE, from the analysis of off-peak data, with integrated luminosity $L = 240$ pb^{-1}, already on tape, devoted to the measurement of the $\gamma\gamma \to \eta$ rate. The off peak analysis, at $\sqrt{s} = 1$ GeV instead of $\sqrt{s} = 1.02$ GeV, allows to reduce the main background, coming from resonant contributions $\phi \to \eta\gamma$. After the full selection, the data set consists of 600 $\gamma\gamma \to \eta$ with $\eta \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ and 900 $\gamma\gamma \to \eta$ with $\eta \to \pi^0\pi^0\pi^0$; the cross section $\sigma(\gamma\gamma \to \eta)$ at 1 GeV is under evaluation [40]. The upgraded KLOE detector (KLOE-2) will be suited for taking data also at energies away from the ϕ mass. Taggers designed to detect the outcoming e^+e^- are being inserted into the KLOE detector, to provide a better background rejection without going off peak and allow precision measurements of the $\gamma\gamma$ cross section. There is a proposal to increase the DAΦNE energy up to $\sqrt{s} \simeq 2.5$ GeV; however, a run at $\sqrt{s} \simeq 1.4$ GeV is already enough to measure the η' decay width [41].
Starting from September 2009, the Crystal Ball at MAMI has undertaken a huge upgrade, with an increase of the MAMI beam energy and the construction and assemblage of a new tagging device; one reason of the upgrade is a measure of $\eta' \to \gamma\gamma$ branching ratio [42].

The quoted measurements of the width are obtained with QED process $e^+e^- \to e^+e^-\gamma^\star\gamma^\star \to e^+e^-\eta$. The 2010 PDG average is taken from such experiments and gives $\Gamma(\eta \to \gamma\gamma) = 0.510 \pm 0.026$ KeV. The error on the average is 5%, while the errors in individual experiments range from 8% to 25%. There is a different type of measurement of $\Gamma(\eta \to \gamma\gamma)$, not included in the 2010 PDG average, based on the Primakoff effect, where η's are produced by the interaction of a real photon with a virtual photon in the Coulomb field of the nucleus. In 1974 at Cornell a measurement based on the Primakoff effect gave $\Gamma(\eta \to \gamma\gamma) = 0.324 \pm 0.046$ KeV, a value 4σ away from the QED results [43]. Recently, a reanalysis of the Primakoff experiment, with a different modelling of the nuclear background, has brought the value of the width in line with direct measurements, precisely to $\Gamma(\eta \to \gamma\gamma) = 0.476 \pm 0.062$ KeV [44]. Extraction of the Primakoff amplitude from the data is very delicate, because this amplitude interferes with hadronic amplitudes due to vector meson (ρ and ω) and axial vector meson b_1 exchanges. Increasing the energy may help, since at very high energies the growth of the Coulomb peak must dominate over the Regge behavior of the strong amplitude. After more than thirty years from the Cornell experiment, a new experiment to measure the $\Gamma(\eta \to \gamma\gamma)$ decay width via the Primakoff effect has been proposed and approved at Jefferson Lab, using a 11.5 GeV tagged photon beam on two light targets, proton and ^{4}He [45]. The targets have been chosen with the aim of minimizing the nuclear incoherent background and enabling a good separation of the Primakoff production mechanism from the nuclear coherent background. They estimate to reach a 3% accuracy in the measurement of the η width, that would yield less than 1 degree of uncertainty on the $\eta - \eta'$ mixing angle.

As it is well known, all η meson possible strong decays are forbidden in lowest order by C, CP invariance and G-parity conservation. First order electromagnetic η decays are forbidden as well, or occur at a suppressed rate because involving an anomaly. The first allowed decay is therefore the second-order electromagnetic transition $\eta \to \gamma\gamma$. The decay $\eta \to 3\pi$ violates



Figure 1. *(a) SOZI, (b) DOZI diagrams contributing to $\psi \to PV$ decays*

isospin symmetry and it is mainly due to the isospin breaking part of the QCD Lagrangian, since contributions from the electromagnetic interaction are strongly suppressed by chiral symmetry [46]. The main interest of this decay resides in the fact that, in principle, it offers a way to determine the mass difference of the up-down quarks. The absolute value of the partial decay width for $\eta \to 3\pi$ is experimentally obtained via normalization to $\eta \to \gamma\gamma$; therefore, a change in one decay width has influence in the other [30].

A few comments are in order for the analysis of $\psi \to PV$. It was pioneered by Mark III in 1985, when they inferred from their data $Z^2_{\eta'} = 0.35 \pm 0.18$ [47]. They assumed that such decays proceed via singly disconnected diagrams (SOZI) with their strong quark line correlations and ignored doubly disconnected diagrams (DOZI). In Fig. 1.(a) and in Fig. 1.(b) we show examples of SOZI and DOZI diagrams. Motivated by the measurement of $\psi \to \gamma\omega\phi$, which showed the relevance of DOZI-suppressed processes in ψ decays, they performed a new analysis [48], including DOZI contributions and any additional component as gluonium or radial excitation. The new analysis did not show evidence for non-$\bar{q}q$ components in the η and η' wave functions.

In 2007 Thomas [23] – following the approach of Seiden et al. [49] – investigated the strong $\psi \to PV$ transitions; he concluded that DOZI contributions are significant, and that any gluonium components should play a role similar to that of DOZI contributions. From such an analysis he finds that the fit favors a small gluonic component in the η', with no great significance. Without form factors, Thomas finds $\phi_P = (45 \pm 4)^\circ$ and $\phi_G = (33 \pm 13)^\circ$ (i.e. $Z^2_{\eta'} = (0.30 \pm 0.21)$), whereas with form factors $\phi_P = (46^{+4}_{-5})^\circ$ and $\phi_G = (44 \pm 9)^\circ$, (i.e. $Z^2_{\eta'} = (0.48 \pm 0.16)$). Another phenomenological analysis of $\psi \to PV$, without form factors, by Escribano [27], finds $\phi_P = (40.7 \pm 2.3)^\circ$ in the hypothesis of no gluonium and, allowing for it, $\phi_P = (44.6 \pm 4.4)^\circ$ with $Z^2_{\eta'} = (0.29^{+0.28}_{-0.26})$.

The remaining decays of the list (2.1-2.3-2.4) are charmonium decays into $\gamma\eta^{(\prime)}$. BESII data have better precision than previous measurements; according to the hypothesis of no gluonic contribution, SU(3) flavour symmetry and exact OZI rule, they extract an angle in the octet-singlet scheme. Their value, translated in the flavour scheme according to the relation (1.3), reads $\phi_P = (32.62 \pm 0.81)^\circ$ [50], a quite low value compared to other determinations. The extraction of the mixing angle in [50] has been performed in a very symmetric –and therefore

simplified–scheme; we observe that just by introducing a dependence on a strange/nonstrange factor, the author in [23] finds for the same processes and PDG averaged data (including BESII results) values of the mixing angle in line with determinations from other processes. If there is any charmonium component in the $\eta^{(\prime)}$, we expect the decays of ψ and ψ' into $\gamma\eta^{(\prime)}$ to be dominated by the magnetic dipole transition of charmonium. In that case, it is possible to estimate that the amplitudes of the charmonium components of the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ are negligible, being less that 5% [23].
More recent measurements of $\gamma\eta^{(\prime)}$ branching fractions have been reported by CLEO-c [51]. The last update of the $\psi \to \gamma\eta'$ branching fraction has been given by BESIII [52] and reads $\mathcal{B}(\psi \to \gamma\eta^{(\prime)}) = (4.84 \pm 0.03(stat) \pm 0.24(sys))\,\mathrm{x}\,10^{-3}$, which is consistent with the BESII value within 1.5σ and with the CLEO value within 1.4σ. The $\psi' \to \gamma\eta^{(\prime)}$ decays have also been observed by BESIII [53], but no new mixing angle estimate has been reported by the Collaboration. As far as $\Upsilon(1S) \to \gamma\eta^{(\prime)}$ is concerned, only upper limits are available for the branching ratios from CLEO III [54].

Since all extractions of the mixing angle involve some non-trivial theory assumptions, it is not totally surprising to find different compositions of the wave functions; yet it is still frustrating. The best short- or mid-term prospects for improvement lie in obtaining constraints from more data of even greater variety.

Let us now provide some estimates of how much future data can reduce most of the uncertainties discussed here.

2.2 On Improving the Constraints of the $\eta - \eta'$ Wave Functions

The determination of mixing angles and gluonium content is based on measurements. The significance of such constraints depends on the experimental uncertainties. Therefore we analyze which experimental inputs will best improve our knowledge of the $\eta - \eta'$ wave functions. We start from the PDG 2010 values [55]:

- The stated $\phi \to \eta'\gamma$ partial width is mainly due to the KLOE measurement in [24]; the error is dominated by systematics due to the secondary η' branching ratio. The $\phi \to \eta\gamma$ branching ratio has been accurately measured by CMD-2 and SND [55].

- The $\eta' \to \omega\gamma$ partial width of (0.0053 ± 0.0005) MeV with a relative error of 9% comes from the overall PDG 2010 fit. The relevant experiment has been performed in 1977 and was based on 68 events [56]. The KLOE-2 Collab. [41] could measure the branching ratio $\mathcal{B}(\eta' \to \omega\gamma)$ more accurately by collecting at least 20 fb^{-1} of data; the limiting factor then comes from the uncertainty in the total η' width, $\Gamma_{\eta'}$, since it is the partial width that matters.

- The $\eta' \to \rho\gamma$ partial width inferred from the PDG 2010 fit is (0.0568 ± 0.0030) MeV; the absolute branching ratio measurement has been performed in 1969 by Rittenberg [57] based on 298 events. The PDG fit value is slightly lower than the directly measured one. Again the error is dominated by the uncertainty in $\Gamma_{\eta'}$.

- The latest values on $\rho \to \eta\gamma$ and $\omega \to \eta\gamma$ partial widths are obtained in [58], based on SND data on $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$: their accuracy is quite comparable to that of the PDG 2010 fit values.

In Table 3 we sketch different experimental scenarios. Starting from the present status as given by PDG 2010 we analyze the impact various conceivable improvements in the experimental constraints would have on the determination of the mixing angle ϕ_P and the size of $Z^2_{\eta'}$, the gluonic component in the η' wave function. We have chosen the radiative processes that are common to analyses [23–25] discussed in Sect. 2.1.

In column "I" we list the uncertainties in the experimental input values as stated in PDG 2010. In column "II" we indicate the improvement that could be achieved by studying $\eta' \to \omega\gamma$ with a sample of 20 fb^{-1} of $e^+e^- \to \phi$ events, that KLOE-2 anticipates to acquire in the next few years [41]. We assume a selection efficiency of order 20% in the analysis of $\phi \to \eta'\gamma$ with $\eta' \to \omega\gamma$ and neglect background subtraction. We observe that the limiting factor is provided from the uncertainty in the total η' width. In column "III" we indicate the improvement that could be achieved by reducing the uncertainty on $\eta' \to \rho\gamma$ of one half respect to the present scenario; such improvement is also possible after a few years of running of KLOE-2 [41]. In column "IV" and "V" we indicate the sensitivity to an improvement in the determination of the partial widths for $\phi \to \eta^{(\prime)}\gamma$ and for all the partial widths, respectively. Among possible secondary decays of $\phi \to \eta'\gamma$, there are both decays $\eta' \to \rho\gamma$ and $\eta' \to \omega\gamma$, whose errors are dominated by the uncertainty on $\Gamma_{\eta'}$. However, the former is more convenient to measure, e.g. at KLOE, since it has a branching ratio of almost an order of magnitude larger; also the total ρ decay width Γ_ρ is much larger, partially including and obscuring, from an experimental point of view, the total ω decay width Γ_ω. Since the partial widths of processes containing η' and the total width $\Gamma_{\eta'}$ are correlated, in column "VI" we evaluate the impact of the reduction of the uncertainty on $\Gamma_{\eta'}$. We assume a future $\Gamma_{\eta'}$ measurement with 1.4% uncertainty, which is within the possibility of KLOE-2 [26]. Such measurement would allow a determination of a non-zero gluonium content at 5σ, as shown in column "VI". The crucial quantities to consider are not the central values for ϕ_P and $Z^2_{\eta'}$, since they are likely to shift, but their uncertainties. *We conclude it is most important to reduce the uncertainty in the partial width for $\eta' \to \rho\gamma$; i.e., one has to measure both $\mathcal{B}(\eta' \to \rho\gamma)$ and $\Gamma_{\eta'}$ more accurately.*

The situation concerning the η' full width is somewhat curious at present: PDG 2010 lists as its best value $\Gamma_{\eta'} = (0.194 \pm 0.009)$ MeV – with the error including a scale factor of 1.2 – resulting from an overall fit. *Direct* measurements from 1979 [59] and 1996 [60] on the other hand yield the average $\Gamma_{\eta'} = (0.30 \pm 0.09)$ MeV, which would lead to $\phi_P = (42.7^{+1.0}_{-1.7})^\circ$ and $Z^2_{\eta'} = (0.00 \pm 0.13)$. Recently a new measurement has been performed at the COSY-11 facility: $\Gamma_{\eta'} = 0.226 \pm 0.017(stat) \pm 0.014(syst)$ MeV; the value of the width was established directly from the measurement of the mass distribution of the η' meson, determined with a very high resolution [61]. The present average world value (2011 PDG partial update) contain this last measurement and gives $\Gamma_{\eta'} = (0.199 \pm 0.009)$; in the global fit to the η' partial widths

Processes	$(\delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_I$	$(\delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_{II}$	$(\delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_{III}$	$(\delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_{IV}$	$(\delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_V$	$(\delta\Gamma/\Gamma)_{VI}$
$\phi \to \eta'\gamma$	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	1.7%	1.7%	1%
$\phi \to \eta\gamma$	2%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%
$\eta' \to \omega\gamma$	9%	4.5%	9%	9%	4.5%	1.7%
$\eta' \to \rho\gamma$	5%	5%	2.5%	5%	2.5%	1.7%
$\rho \to \eta\gamma$	7%	7%	7%	7%	3.4%	7%
$\omega \to \eta\gamma$	9%	9%	9%	9%	4.5%	9%
ϕ_P	$(40.6 \pm 0.9)^\circ$	$(40.1^{+0.8}_{-1.0})^\circ$	$(40.7 \pm 0.7)^\circ$	$(40.6^{+0.5}_{-0.6})^\circ$	$(40.4 \pm 0.5)^\circ$	$(40.1 \pm 0.3)^\circ$
$Z^2_{\eta'}$	(0.09 ± 0.05)	(0.13 ± 0.05)	(0.08 ± 0.04)	(0.09 ± 0.03)	(0.10 ± 0.03)	(0.13 ± 0.02)

Table 3. *"I": widths from PDG 2010 fits; "II": errors on $\eta' \to \omega\gamma$ reduced; "III": errors on $\eta' \to \rho\gamma$ reduced; "IV": errors on $\phi \to \eta^{(\prime)}\gamma$ reduced; "V": reducing the uncertainties for all the partial widths; "VI" all recalculated in the hypothesis of* 1.4% *for the η' full width.*

the correlations among the partial widths do not change significantly.

Let us observe that the total width $\Gamma_{\eta'}$ extracted by PDG and the value of the partial width $\Gamma(\eta' \to \gamma\gamma)$ are strongly correlated, which may create difficulties when the total and the partial width are used at the same time, as in the present case of the mixing angle extraction. Moreover, the branching ratios of the η' meson decay channels are generally known with a relative precision of more than an order of magnitude better than the present accuracy with which $\Gamma_{\eta'}$ is extracted.

3 Weak Decays of Charm and Beauty Hadrons

After many years of strenuous efforts to obtain the η and η' wave functions with non-trivial bounds why should one not declare 'victory' and go on to something else. There are three reasons:

- Professional pride – not to be belittled in Italy and Bavaria;
- lattice QCD simulations have just entered the adult period.
- Yet there is the most topical reason, namely that knowing reliably the η and η' wave functions is an important input for our understanding of several *weak* decays of beauty and charm hadrons. Most crucially we need it for predicting CP asymmetries involving η and η' in the final states – and to understand whether a deviation from SM predictions can be seen as a signal of physics beyond the SM [62–65].

  The SuperB and Super KEK B factories approved in Italy and in Japan, respectively, will produce crucial statistics needed for $B_{(s)} \to \eta/\eta' X$ and $D_{(s)} \to \eta/\eta' X$. There is a good chance that LHCb will likewise – and much sooner!



Figure 2. *Spectator diagrams for* $D_{(s)} \to \eta^{(\prime)} l\nu$ *and* $B^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} l\nu$ *decays.*

3.1 Semileptonic Modes

Since one expects semi-leptonic transitions to be driven by SM dynamics only (or at least to a high degree of accuracy), their detailed studies teach us lessons on how non-perturbative hadronization transforms quark level transitions. We will analyze here what semileptonic D and B decays can tell us about the η and η' wave functions and maybe more importantly, how our knowledge of those can help us to better understand the decay mechanisms.

Before going into a more detailed discussion, a few general points should be mentioned. The transitions $D_s^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} l^+\nu$, $D^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} l^+\nu$ and $B^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} l^+\nu$ proceed on greatly different time scales, since they are driven by weak interactions on the Cabibbo-allowed, Cabibbo-suppressed and KM-suppressed levels, respectively. Yet they can provide us with highly complementary information in the sense that they produce the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ via their $s\bar{s}$, $d\bar{d}$ and $u\bar{u}$ components, respectively. In addition, as explained below, $\eta^{(\prime)}$ could be excited via a gg component.

3.1.1 $D_{(s)} \to \eta^{(\prime)} l\nu$

According to the heavy quark expansion the so-called spectator diagrams (see e.g. Fig.2) provides the leading contribution to semileptonic as well as nonleptonic charm decays [66].

Data on semileptonic decays need to improve greatly before they can constrain the physics related to the mixing with the gluonic component. In 1995 CLEO has extracted the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} e^+\nu)$ from ratios to hadronic decays of the D_s^+ [67]. In 2009 CLEO-c has presented the first absolute measurement of the branching fraction of $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} e^+\nu)$ [68]; the ratio

$$\left.\frac{\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta' e^+\nu)}{\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta e^+\nu)}\right|_{\text{CLEO-c}} = 0.36 \pm 0.14 \tag{3.1}$$

is in agreement with the previous CLEO results [67]. In semileptonic D_s decays the final state hadron has to be produced off an $s\bar{s}$ configuration; if η and η' are pure $q\bar{q}$ states, i.e.

$Z^2_{\eta'} = Z^2_{\eta} = 0$, then one finds in the quark flavour basis

$$\frac{\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu)}{\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu)} = R_D \cot^2 \phi \tag{3.2}$$

with the quantity R_D given by the relative phase space and the ratio of the η and η' form factors integrated over the appropriate range in q^2. To calculate the explicit form of R_D one has to model the q^2 dependence of the form factors, but the factorization of the mixing angle dependence can help to devise tests of the mixing angle itself (see e.g. [69]). From the previous CLEO results [67], using η and η' as pure $q\bar{q}$ states and a pole ansatz for the form factors Feldmann, Kroll and Stech had inferred $\phi_P = (41.3 \pm 5.3)^\circ$ [14]; it agrees even better than one might have expected with the values given above as extracted from weak and electromagnetic transitions. Their value is consistent with the new CLEO data within the errors.

Gronau and Rosner in a very recent paper [70] gave a similar number for $\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu)/\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta l^+ \nu)$ (among other predictions) applying a very simple model, where R_D is inferred from kinematic factors in the quark level; again, η and η' are described as pure $q\bar{q}$ states.

The transition form factors encode complex hadronic dynamics and momentum dependence: in [71] they have been expressed through the light-cone wave functions of the initial and final mesons. An allowed range for $Z^2_{\eta}/Z^2_{\eta'}$ is given; at the point $Z^2_{\eta} = 0$, the angle ϕ_P is estimated to be $\phi_P = (37.7 \pm 2.6)^\circ$ and the simple factorized relation holds [71]

$$\frac{\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu)}{\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu)} = R_D \cot^2 \phi_P \cos^2 \phi_G \tag{3.3}$$

where ϕ_G has been defined in Eq. (1.7). In [71] the value $R_D = 0.28$ is estimated by neglecting the nontrivial dependence on the constituent quark transition form factor, that is a conventional approximation in literature, while $R_D = 0.23$ is estimated by assuming a simple monopole q^2 dependence. We observe that the mixing angle extracted from (3.3) is strongly dependent on the value of R_D; in order to provide a rough estimation of the theoretical error we consider an averaged R_D, that is $R_D = 0.255 \pm 0.050$. By using the experimental ratio of branching fractions (3.1), we estimate $Z^2_{\eta'} = 0.16 \pm 0.33_{exp} \pm 0.23_{th}$, that is $\phi_G = (23.3 \pm 25.8_{exp} \pm 18.0_{th})^\circ$, where the theoretical error refers to the errors on R_D and ϕ_P added in quadrature. The experimental error dominates over the rough estimate of the theoretical error and it prevents any conclusion on the gluonic content of the $\eta - \eta'$ system.

For the Cabibbo suppressed transitions one finds in the same framework:

$$\frac{\Gamma(D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu)} = \tilde{R}_D \tan^2 \phi_P \tag{3.4}$$

In 2008 CLEO-c has reported its first measurement of $\Gamma(D^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu)$ and an upper bound on $\Gamma(D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu)$ [72]. Two years later, the same collaboration has presented the first

observation of $D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu$, with branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu) = (2.16 \pm 0.53 \pm 0.07)$ x 10^{-4}, and an improved $\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu) = (11.4 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.4)$ x 10^{-4} [73]. By using the above data and the reasonable assumption $R_D \simeq \tilde{R}_D$, we estimate from Eq. (3.4) the value $\phi_P = (41 \pm 4_{exp} \pm 3_{th})^\circ$.

By including a non-zero gluon contribution, we can parameterize the D^+ ratio as in (3.3). However, with the available recent data, the estimate of the angle ϕ_P can be made independently of ϕ_G by taking the ratio

$$\frac{\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu)/\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu)}{\Gamma(D^+ \to \eta' e^+ \nu)/\Gamma(D^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu)} \simeq \cot^4 \phi_P \tag{3.5}$$

The left side is given by the recent experimental data quoted before, and we get $\phi_P = (40 \pm 3)^\circ$.

Yet this is not the final word on the experimental or theoretical side. A few years down the line we can expect BESIII to obtain an even larger sample allowing a more accurate measurement with errors on the angle ϕ_P going down to about 2%.

The theoretical situation is more complex. While the spectator diagram generates the leading contribution, for a precision study we cannot ignore non-leading ones. The so-called 'Weak Annihilation' (WA) process contributes even to semileptonic meson decays [66, 74], as can be illustrated most directly for D_s^+ and D_s; see Fig. 3. An analysis based on inclusive semileptonic D decays, which considers both the widths and the lepton energy moments, shows no clear evidence of WA effects [75]. While WA might affect the corresponding inclusive semileptonic width only moderately, it should impact the exclusive channels $D_s^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu$ and $D^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu$ on the Cabibbo-favoured and suppressed levels via the η''s gluonic component. The strength of the effect depends on two factors, namely the size of the gg component in the η' wave function and on how much gg radiation one can expect in semileptonic D_s^+, D^+ and B^+ decays. Lastly, since the main effect might come from the interference with the spectator amplitude, it can a priori enhance or reduce those rates. Simple relations like (3.2) do not necessarily hold any longer.

3.1.2 $B^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} l \nu$

In $B^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} l \nu$ decays one encounters a situation analogous to that for $D^+ \to \eta^{(\prime)} l \nu$ except that their rates are suppressed by $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|^2$ rather than $|V_{cd}/V_{cs}|^2$ and that the range in q^2 is much larger. In passing we just want to mention that one needs to understand their rates to determine $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|^2$ from $\Gamma(B \to X_u l \nu)/\Gamma(B \to X_c l \nu)$ with the hoped-for accuracy of about 5% [76].

In the spectator ansatz one finds using the quark flavour basis

$$\frac{\Gamma(B^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu)}{\Gamma(B^+ \to \eta l^+ \nu)} = \tilde{R}_B \tan^2 \phi \tag{3.6}$$

with the factor $\tilde{R}_B$ again describing the relative phase space (much more abundant than for D mesons) and the ratio of the integrated form factors. The semi-leptonic form factors $B \to \eta^{(\prime)}$ have been calculated in [77] from QCD sum rules on the light-cone, to NLO in QCD.



Figure 3. *Valence quarks $c/\bar{s}/\bar{d}$ (as well as $\bar{b}/u$) emitting two gluons which generate η/η' via the gluonic component of the wave functions.*

In frameworks based on QCD factorization the mesons Fock-state wave functions enter in the form of light-cone distribution amplitudes. Eqs. (3.6) keeps robust under the dynamical assumptions in [77]. Data on the ratio (3.6) have started to appear since a few years. The errors are still quite large, comparable in percentage to the ones analyzed in the previous section, and prevent definite conclusions on the glue mixing to be drawn.

In 2007 CLEO has found first evidence for $B^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu$ decay, with branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu) = (2.66 \pm 0.80 \pm 0.56) \times 10^{-4}$. This year, also the BaBar collaboration has measured for the first time $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu) = (0.24 \pm 0.08_{stat} \pm 0.03_{syst}) \times 10^{-4}$ [78], superseding the 2008 upper limit [79]. The BaBar value has a significance of 3.0σ and it is an order of magnitude smaller than the CLEO result.

The same 2007 CLEO analysis has also reported a new value of the branching fraction $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \eta l^+ \nu) = (0.44 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.11) \times 10^{-4}$ [80], improving previous 2003 values [81]. The result is similar to the newest one by BaBar: $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \eta l^+ \nu) = (0.36 \pm 0.05_{stat} \pm 0.04_{syst}) \times 10^{-4}$ [78]. By using Babar data [78], the ratio (3.6) reads

$$\left.\frac{\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \eta' l^+ \nu)}{\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \eta l^+ \nu)}\right|_{\rm BaBar} = 0.67 \pm 0.24_{stat} \pm 0.11_{syst} \tag{3.7}$$

It is evident that the experimental situation is not yet satisfying, although the previous value does not exclude a large gluonic singlet contribution to the η' form factor.

The corresponding ratio involving the B_s mesons, that is $\mathcal{B}(B_s \to \eta' l^+ l^-)/\mathcal{B}(B_s \to \eta l^+ l^-)$, is also potentially informative on the $\eta^{(\prime)}$ gluonic content, although experimentally much more challenging. The results for the branching fractions of modes with two charged



Figure 4. *$\eta^{(\prime)}$ produced via its gluonic component with the gluons being radiated off different quark lines. The transition $b \to s$ is penguin mediated.*

leptons in the standard model are of order $10^{-7} - 10^{-8}$ [82], suggesting that they are within the reach of SuperB and Super KEK B factories.

3.2 Non-leptonic D and Charmless B Decays

Although estimates of the mixing angles may come from $b \to c$ dominated processes, such as $B_s^0 \to J/\psi\eta^{(\prime)}$ (see e.g. [23, 69, 83]), within the SM many charmless non-leptonic B decays receive significant or even leading contributions from loop processes, which represent quantum corrections. Thus they provide fertile hunting grounds for New Physics, in particular in their **CP** asymmetries. Yet to make a convincing case that an observed **CP** asymmetry is such that it could not be generated by SM forces alone, one has to be able to evaluate hadronic matrix elements. Such an undertaking is greatly helped by knowing the wave functions of the relevant particles.

Modes like $B \to \eta^{(\prime)}K$ and $B_s \to \eta^{(\prime)}\phi$ seem particularly well-suited in this respect. It should be noted that the branching ratio observed for $B \to \eta' K$ exceeds the original predictions considerably for reasons that have not been established yet. Those predictions had been based (among other assumptions) on identifying η' as a pure $q\bar{q}$ state. Allowing for a gluonic component opens the door to diverse decay mechanisms. For example, Kou and Sanda [84] suggested producing the η' meson via its gluonic component with the gluons being radiated off *different* quark lines, see Fig. 4. Having the gluon radiation being emitted from a single quark line might be a more favorable dynamical scenario (see e.g. [85, 86]).

Recent branching ratios values are $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to K^0\eta) = (1.1 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-6}$ and $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to K^0\eta') = (6.6 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-5}$ [55]. The $B \to \eta^{(\prime)}K$ decays may proceed through tree diagrams $\bar{b} \to \bar{u}u\bar{s}$, but such contributions are colour and CKM suppressed, and by one-loop $b \to s$ penguins. Although the same basic penguin mechanism is expected to drive both $B \to \eta^{(\prime)}K$ and $B \to \pi K$, the rate of the former is measured to be much larger. A possible distinctive contribution are flavour singlet amplitudes that are not allowed, if the final state contains only flavor non-singlet states such as pions and kaons. In flavour singlet penguins two gluons couple to the η' violating the OZI rule and the amplitude can get contributions from the pure

gluonic component of the η'.

The cases where two gluons are emitted by a single line ($b \to s\,g\,g$) together with spectator scattering and singlet weak annihilation have been explored in the context of QCDF [87]. In this approach the constructive interference between non-flavour singlet penguins seems already sufficient to enhance the $B \to \eta' K$ branching ratio, without the recourse to flavour singlet contributions; however, due to large hadronic uncertainties, a sizable gluonic contribution (up to 40%) to the $B \to \eta'$ form factor cannot be excluded.

In the pQCD approach the impact of the gluonic component on the branching ratio - potentially important since it increases the branching ratios $B \to \eta' K$, while decreasing the $B \to K\,\eta$ one - has been estimated to be numerically very small [88]. The phenomenological importance of the η' gluonic content was instead emphasized in the contest of SCET [89].

Let us note that the previous exclusive analyses have been performed not later than 2006, when relevant new data – such as semileptonic $B \to \eta\,l\,\nu$ branching ratios – were not yet available. In semileptonic decays there is no enhancement in the B decay into η' mesons. The enhancement is also not observed in $D_s^+ \to K^+\eta'$ relative to $D_s^+ \to K^+\pi^0$. Recent data from BaBar for decays into $K^\star$ [90] favor an opposite pattern with respect to K, namely $\Gamma(B \to K^\star\eta') < \Gamma(B \to K^\star\eta)$. It would be interesting to check the impact of all recent experimental values on the different approaches. For instance in [89], the effort to fix the size for the gluonic contribution to the $B \to \eta'$ form factor – in a more constrained way with respect to [87] – partly depends on fitting non-perturbative parameters to experimental data. We have to admit that a quantitative comparison with data is hampered by the theoretical uncertainties in non-leptonic decays.

The large measured branching ratio for $B^0 \to K_S\eta'$ by the BaBar and Belle collaborations [91, 92] greatly improves the usefulness of the decay mode for measuring CP asymmetry and to produce significant deviation from the SM prediction. The projected SuperB and Super KEK B factories will probe highly non-trivial ranges for New Dynamics.

While it is true that the size of the time-dependent **CP** asymmetry established in $B_d \to \eta' K_S$ conforms well with the SM expectation, one cannot count on an intervention of New Physics being numerically large there. Having a smallish deviation being significant implies good theoretical control over the SM prediction – which in turn requires good knowledge of the η' as well as η wave functions.

Finding **CP** asymmetries in $D \to \eta^{(\prime)}\pi$, $\eta^{(\prime)}\eta$, $\eta\phi$ and interpreting them as signals of New Dynamics has two experimental and theoretical advantages:

- The branching ratios are not very small.

- The SM can produce only very tiny **CP** asymmetries. Even small asymmetries produce clear signatures for New Physics – as long one can control systematic uncertainties.

4 Summary

In this paper we have described the status of on-going investigations, starting from a review of the knowledgement on the η and η' wavefunctions in terms of quark and gluon components as has been inferred mainly from radiative ϕ and ψ decays. The different determinations of the $\eta-\eta'$ mixing are generally consistent, but the message concerning the gluon content in the η' remains ambivalent. The semileptonic D^+, D_S^+ and B^+ decays can give other constraints to check η' gluonium role. Moreover a sizeable gluonium content could help to understand the unexpected high value of the branching ratio for $B \to \eta' K_S$ decay.

In conclusion: after many and hard efforts to understand the $\eta-\eta'$ wave functions it might be seen as 'smart' to call it a 'victory' and move to another problem. We want to emphasize that it is a 'noble' goal to improve our understanding of non-perturbative effects in QCD, in particular when more 'allies' from lattice QCD come to the battle line. Furthermore – and maybe even more important – it will help significantly to identify the footprints of New Physics in CP asymmetries in B and D decays.

5 Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the NSF under the Grant No. PHY-0807959. C.D.D. thanks Prof. M. Wayne, Director of the Department of Physics, for the warm hospitality during her stay at the University of Notre Dame du Lac. We also thank Jonathan Rosner for comments on the manuscript.

References

[1] H. Fritzsch and J.D. Jackson, *Mixing of pseudoscalar mesons and M1 radiative decays, Phys. Lett.* **B66** (1977) 365.

[2] N. Isgur, *Mass formula for nonets, Phys. Rev.* **D13** (1976) 122.

[3] A. Kazi, G. Kramer and D. H. Schiller, *Decay of the $\psi(3.1)$ in broken $SU(4)$, Lettere al Nuovo Cimento* **15**, 120 (1976).

[4] D. Diakonov and M. I. Eides, *Massless ghost pole in chromodynamics and the solution of the U(1) Problem, Sov. Phys. JETP* **54** (1981) 232, [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **81**, 434 (1981)].

[5] J.L. Rosner, *Quark content of neutral mesons, Phys. Rev.* **D27** (1983) 1101.

[6] J. F. Donoghue, B. R. Holstein and Y. C. R. Lin, *Chiral Loops in $\pi^0, \eta^0 \to \gamma\gamma$ and $\eta - \eta'$ Mixing, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** (1985) 2766.

[7] F. J. Gilman and R. Kauffman, *$\eta - \eta'$ mixing angle, Phys. Rev.* **D36** (1987) 2761 [Erratum-ibid. **D37** (1987) 3348].

[8] R. Akhoury, J. M. Frere, *η, η' mixing and anomalies, Phys. Lett.* **B220** (1989) 258.

[9] V. Dmitrasinovic, *Effective quark operator models of $U(1)_A$ symmetry breaking, Phys. Rev.* **D56** (1997) 247.

[10] N. H. Christ, C. Dawson, T. Izubuchi, C. Jung, Q. Liu, R. D. Mawhinney, C. T. Sachrajda, A. Soni et al., *The η and η' mesons from Lattice QCD, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 241601.

[11] J. J. Dudek, R. G. Edwards, B. Joo, M. J. Peardon, D. G. Richards, C. E. Thomas, *Isoscalar meson spectroscopy from lattice QCD, Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 111502.

[12] A. Bramon, R. Escribano, M. D. Scadron, *Radiative $V P \gamma$ transitions and η-η' mixing, Phys. Lett.* **B503** (2001) 271.

[13] T. Feldmann, *Quark structure of pseudoscalar mesons, Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A15** (2000) 159.

[14] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll and B. Stech, *Mixing and decay constants of pseudoscalar mesons, Phys. Rev.* **D58** (1998) 114006; *Mixing and decay constants of pseudoscalar mesons: The Sequel, Phys. Lett.* **B449** (1999) 339.

[15] J. Schechter, A. Subbaraman, H. Weigel, *Effective hadron dynamics: From meson masses to the proton spin puzzle, Phys. Rev.* **D48** (1993) 339.

[16] P. Ball, J. M. Frere, M. Tytgat, *Phenomenological evidence for the gluon content of η and η', Phys. Lett.* **B365** (1996) 367.

[17] T. Feldmann and P. Kroll, *Flavor symmetry breaking and mixing effects in the $\eta\gamma$ and $\eta'\gamma$ transition form factors, Eur. Phys. J.* **C5** (1998) 327.

[18] H. Leutwyler, *Pseudoscalar decay constants at large N_c, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **64** (1998) 223.

[19] R. Kaiser, H. Leutwyler, *Pseudoscalar decay constants at large N_c*, in *Proceedings Workshop, Nonperturbative Methods in Quantum Field Theory*, NITP/CSSM, University of Adelaide, Australia, Feb. 1998, Edited by A.W. Schreiber, A.G. Williams, A.W. Thomas. Singapore, World Scientific, 1998.

[20] T. Feldmann, P. Kroll, *Mixing of pseudoscalar mesons, Phys. Scripta* **T99** (2002) 13.

[21] R. Escribano, J. M. Frere, *Study of the η-η' system in the two mixing angle scheme, JHEP* **0506**, 029 (2005).

[22] G. Li, Q. Zhao and C.-H. Chang, *Decays of J/ψ and ψ' into vector and pseudoscalar meson and the pseudoscalar glueball-q anti-q mixing, J. Phys.* **G35** (2008) 055002.

[23] C. E. Thomas, *Composition of the pseudoscalar η and η' mesons, JHEP* **0710** (2007) 026.

[24] F. Ambrosino et al., *Measurement of the pseudoscalar mixing angle and η' gluonium content with KLOE detector, Phys. Lett.* **B648** (2007) 267.

[25] R. Escribano and J. Nadal, *On the gluon content of the η and η' mesons, JHEP* **05** (2007) 006.

[26] F. Ambrosino et al., *A global fit to determine the pseudoscalar mixing angle and the gluonium content of the η' meson, JHEP* **0907** (2009) 105.

[27] R. Escribano, *$J/\psi \to VP$ decays and the quark and gluon content of the η and η'*, Eur. Phys. J. **C65** (2010) 467.

[28] E. Kou, *On the η' gluonic admixture, Phys. Rev.* **D63** (2001) 054027.

[29] M. N. Achasov et al., *Study of $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$ process with Spherical Neutral Detector at the VEPP-2M e^+e^- collider, Phys. Rev.* **D 74** (2006) 014016.

[30] C. Amsler et al. (Particle Data Group), *Review of Particle Physics, Phys. Lett.* **B667** (2008) 1.

[31] F. Ambrosino et al., *Study of the process $e^+e^- \to \omega\pi^0$ in the ϕ-meson mass region with the KLOE detector, Phys. Lett.* **B669** (2008) 223.

[32] M. Acciarri et al., *Measurement of $\eta'(958)$ formation in two-photon collisions at LEP1, Phys. Lett.* **B418** (1998) 399.

[33] V. V. Anisovich et al., *Photon-meson transition form factors $\gamma\pi^0$, $\gamma\eta$ and $\gamma\eta'$ at low and moderately high Q^2, Phys. Rev.* **D55** (1997) 2918.

[34] A. Weinstein, D. Antreasyan, Y. F. Gu, W. S. Kollmann, M. Richardson, K. Strauch, K. Wacker, C. Edwards et al., *Observation Of The Production Of η Mesons In Two Photon Collisions, Phys. Rev.* **D28** (1983) 2896.

[35] D. A. Williams et al., *Formation of the pseudoscalar π^0, η and η' in the reaction $\gamma\gamma \to \gamma\gamma$, Phys. Rev.* **D38** (1988) 1365.

[36] S. E. Baru, A. E. Blinov, V. E. Blinov, A. E. Bondar, A. D. Bukin, Y. I. Eidenman, V. R. Groshev, V. A. Kiselev et al., *Measurement of two photon widths of the a_2, η', η, Z. Phys.* **C48** (1990) 581.

[37] N. A. Roe et al., *Measurement of the two-photon width of the η and η' mesons, Phys. Rev.* **D41** (1990) 17.

[38] P. del Amo Sanchez et al., *Measurement of the $\gamma\gamma^* \to \eta$ and $\gamma\gamma* \to \eta'$ transition form factors, Phys. Rev.* **D84** (2011) 052001.

[39] A. P. Bakulev, S. V. Mikhailov, N. G. Stefanis, *QCD based pion distribution amplitudes confronting experimental data, Phys. Lett.* **B508** (2001) 279.[Erratum-ibid. **B590**, 309 (2004)].

[40] F. Archilli et al. *$\gamma\gamma$ physics with the KLOE Experiment* arXiv:1107.3782 [hep-ex].

[41] G. Amelino-Camelia et al., *Physics with the KLOE-2 experiment at the upgraded DAΦNE, Eur. Phys. Jour.* **C68** (2010) 619.

[42] A. Starostin, *η and η' Physics at MAMI, Eur. Phys. J. ST* **198** (2011) 117.

[43] A. Browman, J. DeWire, B. Gittelman, K. M. Hanson, E. Loh, R. Lewis, *The radiative width of the η Meson, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32** (1974) 1067.

[44] T. E. Rodrigues, J. D. T. Arruda-Neto, J. Mesa, C. Garcia, K. Shtejer, D. Dale, I. Nakagawa, P. L. Cole, *$\eta \to \gamma\gamma$ decay width via the Primakoff cross section, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 012301.

[45] A. Gasparian et al., *A precision measurement of the η radiative decay width via the Primakoff effect*, JLAB experiment E12-10-011, PrimEx note n. 57 at http://wwwold.jlab.org/primex

[46] D. G. Sutherland, *Current algebra and the decay $\eta \to 3\,\pi$, Phys.Lett.* **23** (1966) 384.

[47] R. M. Baltrusaitis et al., *J/Ψ decays into a vector and a pseudoscalar meson and the quark content of the η and η', Phys. Rev.* **D32** (1985) 2883.

[48] D. Coffman et al., *Measurement of J/Ψ decays into a vector and a pseudoscalar meson, Phys. Rev.* **D38** (1988) 2695.

[49] A. Seiden, H. F. W. Sadrozinski, H. E. Haber, *Doubly OZI violating effects in J/Ψ decays, Phys. Rev.* **D38** (1988) 824.

[50] M. Ablikim et al., *Measurement of the branching fractions for $J/\Psi \to \gamma\pi^0$, $\gamma\eta$ and $\gamma\eta'$, Phys.*

Rev. **D73** (2006) 052008.

[51] T. K. Pedlar et al., *Charmonium decays to $\gamma\pi^0$, $\gamma\eta$, and $\gamma\eta'$, Phys. Rev.* **D79** (2009) 111101.

[52] M. Ablikim et al., *Measurement of the Matrix Element for the Decay $\eta' \to \eta\pi^+\pi^-$, Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 012003.

[53] M. Ablikim, M. N. Achasov, L. An, Q. An, Z. H. An, J. Z. Bai, R. Baldini, Y. Ban et al., *Evidence for Ψ' decays into $\gamma\pi^0$ and $\gamma\eta$, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 261801.

[54] S. B. Athar et al., *Search for radiative decays of Υ(1S) into η and η', Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) 072003.

[55] K. Nakamura et al. (Particle Data Group), *Review of Particle Physics, J. Phys.* **G37** (2010) 075021.

[56] C. J. Zanfino, P. Brockman, J. A. Dankowych, K. W. Edwards, J. Gandsman, D. Legacey, J. F. Martin, P. M. Patel et al., *Observation of the Radiative Decay $\eta' \to \omega\gamma$ in the reaction $\pi^- p \to \pi^+\pi^- 3\gamma n$, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38** (1977) 930.

[57] A. Rittenberg, Thesis UCRL 18863.

[58] M. N. Achasov et al., *Reanalysis of the $e^+e^- \to \eta\gamma$ reaction cross section, Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) 077101.

[59] D. M. Binnie, J. Carr, N. C. Debenham, W. G. Jones, H. Karami, J. Keyne, N. H. Sarma, *First measurement of the total width of the η'(958) meson, Phys. Lett.* **B83** (1979) 141.

[60] R. Wurzinger, R. Siebert, R. Jahn, A. Kozela, T. von Oepen, F. Roudot, J. Bisplinghoff, M. A. Duval et al., *Observation of η' and ϕ meson production very close to threshold in the p d $\to$ He-3 X reaction, Phys. Lett.* **B374** (1996) 283.

[61] E. Czerwinski et al., *Determination of the Total Width of η' Meson, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 122001.

[62] J. M. Gerard and E. Kou, *$\eta - \eta'$ masses and mixing: a large N_c reappraisal, Phys. Lett.* **B616** (2005) 85.

[63] M. Gronau, Y. Grossman, G. Raz, J. L. Rosner, *Suppression of flavor symmetry breaking in B decay sum rules, Phys. Lett.* **B635** (2006) 207.

[64] H. Fritzsch, Y. F. Zhou, *The Gluonic B and J/Ψ decays into the η' meson, Phys. Rev.* **D68** (2003) 034015.

[65] D. Atwood, A. Soni, *$B \to \eta' + X$ and the QCD anomaly, Phys. Lett.* **B405** (1997) 150

[66] S. Bianco, F. L. Fabbri, D. Benson and I. Bigi, *A Cicerone for the physics of charm, Rivista del Nuovo Cimento*, Vol.**265** N.7-8.

[67] G. Brandenburg et al., *Measurement of the $D_s^+ \to \eta l^+\nu$ and $D_s^+ \to \eta' l^+\nu$ branching ratios, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 3804.

[68] J. Yelton et al., *Absolute branching fraction measurements for exclusive D_s semileptonic decays, Phys. Rev.* **D80** (2009) 052007.

[69] A. Datta, H. Lipkin, P.J. O'Donnell, *Simple relations for two body B decays to charmonium and tests for $\eta - \eta'$ mixing, Phys. Lett.* **B529** (2002) 93.

[70] M. Gronau, J.L. Rosner, *Ratios of heavy hadron semileptonic decay rates, Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 034025.

[71] V. V. Anisovich, D. V. Bugg, D. I. Melikhov, V. A. Nikonov, $\eta - \eta'$ *glueball mixing from photon-meson transition form factors and decay ratio* $D_s \to \eta l\nu/\eta' l\nu$, *Phys. Lett.* **B404** (1997) 166.

[72] R. E. Mitchell et al., *Observation of* $D^+ \to \eta e^+ \nu_e$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102** (2009) 081801.

[73] J. Yelton et al., *Studies of* $D^+ \to \{\eta', \eta, \phi\}\ e^+\nu_e$, *Phys. Rev.* **D 84** (2011) 032001.

[74] I. I. Bigi and N. G. Uraltsev, *Weak annihilation and the end-point spectrum in semileptonic B decays, Nucl. Phys.* **B423** (1994) 33.

[75] P. Gambino, J. F. Kamenik, *Lepton energy moments in semileptonic charm decays, Nucl. Phys.* **B840** (2010) 424.

[76] D. Asner et al., *Averages of b-hadron, c-hadron, and* $\tau-$*lepton properties*, arXiv:1010.1589 [hep-ex].

[77] P. Ball, G. W. Jones, $B \to \eta^{(\prime)}$ *Form Factors in QCD, JHEP* **0708** (2007) 025; P. Ball, R. Zwicky, *New results on* $B \to \pi$, K, η *decay form factors from light-cone sum rules, Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 014015.

[78] P. del Amo Sanchez, *Measurement of the* $B^0 \to \pi^l l^+\nu$ *and* $B^+ \to \eta' l^+\nu$ *Branching Fractions, the* $B^0 \to \pi^- l^+\nu$ *and* $B^+ \to \eta l^+\nu$ *Form-Factor Shapes, and Determination of* $|V_{ub}|$, *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 052011.

[79] B. Aubert et al., *Measurements of* $B \to \{\pi, \eta, \eta'\}\ell\nu_\ell$ *branching fractions and determination of* $|V_{ub}|$ *with semileptonically tagged B mesons, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 081801.

[80] N. E. Adam et al., *A study of exclusive charmless semileptonic B decay and* $|V_{ub}|$, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 041802.

[81] S. B. Athar et al., *Study of the* q^2 *dependence of* $B \to \pi l\nu$ *and* $B \to \rho(\omega) l\nu$ *decay and extraction of* $|V_{ub}|$, *Phys. Rev.* **D68** (2003) 072003.

[82] M. V. Carlucci, P. Colangelo and F. De Fazio, *Rare* B_s *decays to* η *and* η' *final states, Phys. Rev.* **D80** (2009) 055023.

[83] R. Fleischer, G. Ricciardi and R. Knegjens, *Exploring CP violation and* η-η' *mixing with the* $B^0_{s,d} \to J/\psi\eta^{(\prime)}$ *systems, Eur. Phys. J.* **C 71** (2011) 1798.

[84] E. Kou and A.I. Sanda, $B \to K\eta^{(\prime)}$ *decay in perturbative QCD, Phys. Lett.* **B525** (2002) 240.

[85] A. S. Dighe, M. Gronau, J. L. Rosner, *Amplitude relations for b decays involving* η *and* η', *Phys. Lett.* **B367** (1996) 357 [Erratum-ibid. **B377** (1996) 325].

[86] M. Gronau, J. L. Rosner, *Determining the weak phase* γ *from charged B decays, Phys. Rev.* **D53** (1996) 2516.

[87] M. Beneke, M. Neubert, *Flavor singlet B decay amplitudes in QCD factorization, Nucl. Phys.* **B651** (2003) 225.

[88] Y.-Y. Charng, T. Kurimoto, H.n. Li, *Gluonic contribution to* $B \to \eta^{(\prime)}$ *form factors, Phys. Rev.* **D74** (2006) 074024.

[89] A. R. Williamson, J. Zupan, *Two body B decays with isosinglet final states in SCET, Phys. Rev.*

D74 (2006) 014003, [Erratum-ibid. **D74** (2006) 03901].

[90] P. del Amo Sanchez et al., *B-meson decays to $\eta'\rho$, $\eta' f_0$, and $\eta' K^*$, Phys. Rev.* **D82** (2010) 011502.

[91] B. Aubert et al., *Measurement of time dependent CP asymmetry parameters in B^0 meson decays to ωK^0_S, $\eta' K^0$, and π^0 K^0_S, Phys. Rev.* **D79** (2009) 052003.

[92] K. F. Chen et al., *Observation of time-dependent CP violation in $B^0 \to \eta' K^0$ decays and improved measurements of CP asymmetries in $B^0 \to \phi K^0$, $K^0_s K^0_s K^0_s$ and $B^0 \to J/\Psi K^0$ decays, Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98** (2007) 031802.