

Reference = ANASHIN 14; PL B738 391
Verifier code = EIDELMAN

PLEASE READ NOW



Normally we send all verifications for one experiment to one person, usually the spokesperson or data-analysis coordinator, who then distributes them to the appropriate people. Please tell us if we should send the verifications for your experiment to someone else.

Simon Eidelman

EMAIL: simon.eidelman@cern.ch

July 21, 2016

Dear Colleague,

- (1) Please check the results of your experiment carefully. They are marked.
- (2) Please reply within one week.
- (3) Please reply even if everything is correct.
- (4) IMPORTANT!! Please tell WHICH papers you are verifying. We have lots of requests out.
- (5) Feel free to make comments on our treatment of any of the results (not just yours) you see.

Thank you for helping us make the Review accurate and useful.

Sincerely,

Simon Eidelman
BINP, Budker Inst. of Nuclear Physics
Prospekt Lavrent'eva 11
RU-630090 Novosibirsk
Russian Federation

EMAIL: simon.eidelman@cern.ch

- ¹ AAIJ 15BI reports $m_{J/\psi} - m_{\eta_c(1S)} = 114.7 \pm 1.5 \pm 0.1$ MeV from a sample of $\eta_c(1S)$ and J/ψ produced in b -hadron decays. We have used current value of $m_{J/\psi} = 3096.900 \pm 0.006$ MeV to arrive at the quoted $m_{\eta_c(1S)}$ result.
- ² Taking into account an asymmetric photon lineshape.
- ³ With floating width.
- ⁴ Ignoring possible interference with the non-resonant 0^- amplitude.
- ⁵ Using both, $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decays.
- ⁶ From a simultaneous fit to six decay modes of the η_c .
- ⁷ Accounts for interference with non-resonant continuum.
- ⁸ Taking into account interference with the non-resonant $J^P = 0^-$ amplitude.
- ⁹ From a fit of the J/ψ recoil mass spectrum. Supersedes ABE,K 02 and ABE 04G.
- ¹⁰ Using mass of $\psi(2S) = 3686.00$ MeV.
- ¹¹ Not independent from the measurements reported by LEES 10.
- ¹² MITCHELL 09 observes a significant asymmetry in the lineshapes of $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$ and $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$ transitions. If ignored, this asymmetry could lead to significant bias whenever the mass and width are measured in $\psi(2S)$ or J/ψ radiative decays.
- ¹³ From the fit of the kaon momentum spectrum. Systematic errors not evaluated.
- ¹⁴ Superseded by LEES 10.
- ¹⁵ From a simultaneous fit of five decay modes of the η_c .
- ¹⁶ Superseded by VINOKUROVA 11.
- ¹⁷ Weighted average of the $\psi(2S)$ and $J/\psi(1S)$ samples. Using an η_c width of 13.2 MeV.
- ¹⁸ Average of several decay modes. Using an η_c width of 13.2 MeV.
- ¹⁹ Superseded by ASNER 04.
- ²⁰ Average of several decay modes.
- ²¹ $\eta_c \rightarrow \phi\phi$.
- ²² Mass adjusted by us to correspond to $J/\psi(1S)$ mass = 3097 MeV.

NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=D

NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=E
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=AL
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=LS
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=EL
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=BL
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=VA
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=LE
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=EB
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=BG
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=DE
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=MI

NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=AU
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=UB
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=AK
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=FA
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=KZ
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=C1
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=NN
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=A
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=B
 NODE=M026M;LINKAGE=M

 $\eta_c(1S)$ WIDTH

NODE=M026W

NODE=M026W

VALUE (MeV)	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
31.9$\pm$ 1.0 OUR AVERAGE				
Error includes scale factor of 1.2.				
27.2 $\pm$ 3.1 $^{+5.4}_{-2.6}$		¹ ANASHIN	14 KEDR	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$
25.2 $\pm$ 2.6 $\pm$ 2.4	4.5k	^{2,3} LEES	14E BABR	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^-\pi^0$
34.8 $\pm$ 3.1 $\pm$ 4.0	900	^{2,3,4} LEES	14E BABR	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^-\eta$
32.0 $\pm$ 1.2 $\pm$ 1.0		^{5,6} ABLIKIM	12F BES3	$\psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$
36.4 $\pm$ 3.2 $\pm$ 1.7	832	² ABLIKIM	12N BES3	$\psi(2S) \rightarrow \pi^0\gamma$ hadrons
37.8 $^{+5.8}_{-5.3} \pm$ 3.1	486	ZHANG	12A BELL	$e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-\eta'\pi^+\pi^-$
36.2 $\pm$ 2.8 $\pm$ 3.0	11k	DEL-AMO-SA..11M	BABR	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K^+K^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$
35.1 $\pm$ 3.1 $^{+1.0}_{-1.6}$	920	⁶ VINOKUROVA	11 BELL	$B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm(K_S^0 K^\pm\pi^\mp)$
31.7 $\pm$ 1.2 $\pm$ 0.8	14k	⁷ LEES	10 BABR	$10.6 e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^- K_S^0 K^\pm\pi^\mp$
36.3 $^{+3.7}_{-3.6} \pm$ 4.4	0.9k	AUBERT	08AB BABR	$B \rightarrow \eta_c(1S)K(*) \rightarrow K\bar{K}\pi K(*)$
28.1 $\pm$ 3.2 $\pm$ 2.2	7.5k	UEHARA	08 BELL	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta_c \rightarrow$ hadrons
48 $^{+8}_{-7} \pm$ 5	195	WU	06 BELL	$B^+ \rightarrow p\bar{p}K^+$
40 $\pm$ 19 $\pm$ 5	20	WU	06 BELL	$B^+ \rightarrow \Lambda\bar{\Lambda}K^+$
24.8 $\pm$ 3.4 $\pm$ 3.5	592	ASNER	04 CLEO	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta_c \rightarrow K_S^0 K^\pm\pi^\mp$
20.4 $^{+7.7}_{-6.7} \pm$ 2.0	190	AMBROGIANI	03 E835	$\bar{p}p \rightarrow \eta_c \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
23.9 $^{+12.6}_{-7.1}$		ARMSTRONG	95F E760	$\bar{p}p \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •				
32.1 $\pm$ 1.1 $\pm$ 1.3	12k	⁸ DEL-AMO-SA..11M	BABR	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow K_S^0 K^\pm\pi^\mp$
34.3 $\pm$ 2.3 $\pm$ 0.9	2.5k	⁹ AUBERT	04D BABR	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta_c(1S) \rightarrow K\bar{K}\pi$
17.0 $\pm$ 3.7 $\pm$ 7.4		¹⁰ BAI	03 BES	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$
29 $\pm$ 8 $\pm$ 6	180	¹¹ FANG	03 BELL	$B \rightarrow \eta_c K$
11.0 $\pm$ 8.1 $\pm$ 4.1		¹² BAI	00F BES	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$ and $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$
27.0 $\pm$ 5.8 $\pm$ 1.4		¹³ BRANDENB...	00B CLE2	$\gamma\gamma \rightarrow \eta_c \rightarrow K^\pm K_S^0 \pi^\mp$
7.0 $^{+7.5}_{-7.0}$	12	BAGLIN	87B SPEC	$\bar{p}p \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$
10.1 $^{+33.0}_{-8.2}$	23	¹⁴ BALTRUSAIT..86	MRK3	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma p\bar{p}$

OCCUR=2

OCCUR=2

OCCUR=2

YOUR NOTE

YOUR DATA

11.5 ± 4.5		GAISER	86	CBAL	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma X, \psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma X$
< 40 90% CL	18	HIMEL	80B	MRK2	e^+e^-
< 20 90% CL		PARTRIDGE	80B	CBAL	e^+e^-

YOUR NOTE

- 1 Taking into account an asymmetric photon lineshape.
- 2 With floating mass.
- 3 Ignoring possible interference with the non-resonant 0^- amplitude.
- 4 Using both, $\eta \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ and $\eta \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ decays.
- 5 From a simultaneous fit to six decay modes of the η_c .
- 6 Accounts for interference with non-resonant continuum.
- 7 Taking into account interference with the non-resonant $J^P = 0^-$ amplitude.
- 8 Not independent from the measurements reported by LEES 10.
- 9 Superseded by LEES 10.
- 10 From a simultaneous fit of five decay modes of the η_c .
- 11 Superseded by VINOKUROVA 11.
- 12 From a fit to the 4-prong invariant mass in $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$ and $J/\psi(1S) \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$ decays.
- 13 Superseded by ASNER 04.
- 14 Positive and negative errors correspond to 90% confidence level.

NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=A
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=AL
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=LS
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=EL
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=BL
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=VA
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=LE
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=DE
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=UB
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=AK
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=FA
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=KZ
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=NN
 NODE=M026W;LINKAGE=L

$\eta_c(1S)$ REFERENCES

YOUR PAPER

AAIJ	15BI	EPJ C75 311	R. Aaij <i>et al.</i>	(LHCb Collab.)
ANASHIN	14	PL B738 391	V.V. Anashin <i>et al.</i>	(KEDR Collab.)
LEES	14E	PR D89 112004	J.P. Lees <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
ABLIKIM	12F	PRL 108 222002	M. Ablikim <i>et al.</i>	(BES III Collab.)
ABLIKIM	12N	PR D86 092009	M. Ablikim <i>et al.</i>	(BES III Collab.)
ZHANG	12A	PR D86 052002	C.C. Zhang <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
DEL-AMO-SA...	11M	PR D84 012004	P. del Amo Sanchez <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
VINOKUROVA	11	PL B706 139	A. Vinokurova <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
LEES	10	PR D81 052010	J.P. Lees <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
MITCHELL	09	PRL 102 011801	R.E. Mitchell <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
AUBERT	08AB	PR D78 012006	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
UEHARA	08	EPJ C53 1	S. Uehara <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
ABE	07	PRL 98 082001	K. Abe <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
AUBERT	06E	PRL 96 052002	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
WU	06	PRL 97 162003	C.-H. Wu <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
ABE	04G	PR D70 071102	K. Abe <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
ASNER	04	PRL 92 142001	D.M. Asner <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
AUBERT	04D	PRL 92 142002	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)
AMBROGIANI	03	PL B566 45	M. Ambrogiani <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL E835 Collab.)
BAI	03	PL B555 174	J.Z. Bai <i>et al.</i>	(BES Collab.)
FANG	03	PRL 90 071801	F. Fang <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
ABE,K	02	PRL 89 142001	K. Abe <i>et al.</i>	(BELLE Collab.)
BAI	00F	PR D62 072001	J.Z. Bai <i>et al.</i>	(BES Collab.)
BRANDENB...	00B	PRL 85 3095	G. Brandenburg <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)
BAI	99B	PR D60 072001	J.Z. Bai <i>et al.</i>	(BES Collab.)
ABREU	98O	PL B441 479	P. Abreu <i>et al.</i>	(DELPHI Collab.)
ARMSTRONG	95F	PR D52 4839	T.A. Armstrong <i>et al.</i>	(FNAL, FERR, GENO+)
BISELLO	91	NP B350 1	D. Bisello <i>et al.</i>	(DM2 Collab.)
BAI	90B	PRL 65 1309	Z. Bai <i>et al.</i>	(Mark III Collab.)
BAGLIN	87B	PL B187 191	C. Baglin <i>et al.</i>	(R704 Collab.)
BALTRUSAIT...	86	PR D33 629	R.M. Baltrusaitis <i>et al.</i>	(Mark III Collab.)
GAISER	86	PR D34 711	J. Gaiser <i>et al.</i>	(Crystal Ball Collab.)
BALTRUSAIT...	84	PRL 52 2126	R.M. Baltrusaitis <i>et al.</i>	(CIT, UCSC+) JP
HIMEL	80B	PRL 45 1146	T.M. Himel <i>et al.</i>	(SLAC, LBL, UCB)
PARTRIDGE	80B	PRL 45 1150	R. Partridge <i>et al.</i>	(CIT, HARV, PRIN+)

NODE=M026

REFID=57147
 REFID=56130
 REFID=55937
 REFID=54271
 REFID=54741
 REFID=54763
 REFID=16751
 REFID=53927
 REFID=53236
 REFID=52676
 REFID=52267
 REFID=52064
 REFID=51627
 REFID=51059
 REFID=51472
 REFID=50182
 REFID=49745
 REFID=49746
 REFID=49465
 REFID=49185
 REFID=49206
 REFID=49188
 REFID=48546
 REFID=48553
 REFID=47385
 REFID=46553
 REFID=44623
 REFID=41668
 REFID=41354
 REFID=40018
 REFID=22009
 REFID=22012
 REFID=22006
 REFID=22003
 REFID=22004
 NODE=M070

 $J/\psi(1S)$

$$I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^-(1^{--})$$

$J/\psi(1S)$ BRANCHING RATIOS

NODE=M070230

RADIATIVE DECAYS

NODE=M070310

 $\Gamma(\gamma\eta_c(1S))/\Gamma_{\text{total}}$
 Γ_{146}/Γ

VALUE (units 10^{-2})	EVTS	DOCUMENT ID	TECN	COMMENT
--------------------------	------	-------------	------	---------

1.7 ± 0.4 OUR AVERAGE Error includes scale factor of 1.5.

2.01 ± 0.32 ± 0.02	1	MITCHELL	09	CLEO	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma X$
1.27 ± 0.36		GAISER	86	CBAL	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma X$

• • • We do not use the following data for averages, fits, limits, etc. • • •

YOUR DATA

seen		ANASHIN	14	KEDR	$J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\eta_c$
0.79 ± 0.20	273 ± 43	2	AUBERT	06E	$B^\pm \rightarrow K^\pm X_{c\bar{c}}$
seen	16	BALTRUSAIT..84	MRK3		$J/\psi \rightarrow 2\phi\gamma$

NODE=M070R85
 NODE=M070R85

¹ MITCHELL 09 reports $(1.98 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.30) \times 10^{-2}$ from a measurement of $[\Gamma(J/\psi(1S) \rightarrow \gamma \eta_c(1S))/\Gamma_{\text{total}}] \times [B(\psi(2S) \rightarrow J/\psi(1S)\pi^+\pi^-)]$ assuming $B(\psi(2S) \rightarrow J/\psi(1S)\pi^+\pi^-) = (35.04 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.77) \times 10^{-2}$, which we rescale to our best value $B(\psi(2S) \rightarrow J/\psi(1S)\pi^+\pi^-) = (34.49 \pm 0.30) \times 10^{-2}$. Our first error is their experiment's error and our second error is the systematic error from using our best value.

² Calculated by the authors using an average of $B(J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma \eta_c) \times B(\eta_c \rightarrow K\bar{K}\pi)$ from BALTRUSAITIS 86, BISELLO 91, BAI 04 and $B(\eta_c \rightarrow K\bar{K}\pi) = (8.5 \pm 1.8)\%$ from AUBERT 06E.

NODE=M070R85;LINKAGE=MI

NODE=M070R85;LINKAGE=AU

J/ψ(1S) REFERENCES

NODE=M070

YOUR PAPER	ANASHIN	14	PL B738 391	V.V. Anashin <i>et al.</i>	(KEDR Collab.)	REFID=56130
	MITCHELL	09	PRL 102 011801	R.E. Mitchell <i>et al.</i>	(CLEO Collab.)	REFID=52676
	AUBERT	06E	PRL 96 052002	B. Aubert <i>et al.</i>	(BABAR Collab.)	REFID=51059
	BAI	04	PL B578 16	J.Z. Bai <i>et al.</i>	(BES Collab.)	REFID=49620
	BISELLO	91	NP B350 1	D. Bisello <i>et al.</i>	(DM2 Collab.)	REFID=41668
	BALTRUSAIT...	86	PR D33 629	R.M. Baltrusaitis <i>et al.</i>	(Mark III Collab.)	REFID=22009
	GAISER	86	PR D34 711	J. Gaiser <i>et al.</i>	(Crystal Ball Collab.)	REFID=22012
	BALTRUSAIT...	84	PRL 52 2126	R.M. Baltrusaitis <i>et al.</i>	(CIT, UCSC+)	REFID=22006