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#### Abstract

Motivated by recent evidence for the decay $\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu$, a search for this decay has been carried out in $e^{+} e^{-}$annihilation at $\sqrt{s}=3.77 \mathrm{GeV}$. No evidence for the decay is found; an upper limit of $2.5 \%$ at the $90 \%$ confidence level is set on the branching fraction $B(\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu)$.
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[^0]Evidence for the decay $\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu$ has recently been presented ${ }^{[1]}$. The existence of this decay mode would indicate the presence of second class hadronic weak currents, which cannot be accomodated in the standard model ${ }^{[2]}$. We report herein a search for this decay in the reaction ${ }^{[3]}$


The data, comprising a total integrated luminosity of $9.4 \mathrm{pb}^{-1}$, collected at $\sqrt{s}=3.77 \mathrm{GeV}$, were taken with the Mark III detector at the $e^{+} e^{-}$storage ring SPEAR. The reconstruction and analysis of events through the $\eta \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ channel closely follows that of our study of the decays $\tau \rightarrow \rho \nu{ }^{[4]}$; details of the detector performance, track selection, and particle identification are found there. In the study using the channel $\eta \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$, the acollinearity and acoplanarity cuts applied in the $\eta \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ analysis are omitted.

A total of 939 events pass the selection criteria for two charged particles and two isolated photons. The $\gamma \gamma$ invariant mass distribution for these events is shown in Fig. 1(a). A $\pi^{0}$ signal is observed, but no significant structure in the $\eta$ mass region is seen. The spectrum in the region above the $\pi^{0}$ peak is fitted to an exponentially falling background plus a Breit-Wigner function combined with a Gaussian resolution function to describe the $\eta$. The result of the fit, which has a $\chi^{2}$ of 11.6 for 10 degrees of freedom, is shown as a dashed curve in Fig.1(b). The exponential background, shown as a solid curve, describes the spectrum
well. The most probable value for the $\eta$ signal is 1.9 events. By integrating the likelihood function (inset in Fig.1(b)) which includes effects of uncertainties in the background, we derive an upper limit of 20.7 events at the $90 \%$ confidence level (C.L.). The branching ratio limit, calculated using the efficiencies in Table I, includes the errors on efficiency, luminosity and cross sections for dilepton production from $\tau$ pairs. The total statistical and systematic errors are added linearly, yielding an error of $15 \%$. This increases the limit on the number of $\eta$ 's to 23.8 , resulting in an upper limit on $\mathrm{B}(\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu)$ of $4.4 \%$ at the $90 \%$ C.L.

TABLE I. $\eta \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ Analysis

| Channel | $e \eta \pi$ | $\mu \eta \pi$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Efficiency (\%) | $3.9 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.2$ | $1.6 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.1$ |
| Upper Limit on Signal | 23.8 |  |
| Upper Limit on B | $4.4 \%$ |  |

The reconstruction of the final state arising from $\eta \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$, while suffering from reduced efficiency, has lower background. This final state is studied in the four charged particle and two isolated photon topology, where one particle must be identified as a lepton and the remaining three as pions. The two photons are constrained to the $\pi^{0}$ mass by a one-constraint kinematic fit. Figure 2(a) shows the expected $\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$ mass distribution which contains two combinations per event obtained from a Monte Carlo simulation of the signal. The decay $\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu$ is simulated with a phase space distribution. A narrow $\eta$ peak is seen above a background from wrong combinations. This background, shown as hatched entries in Fig.2(a), is determined by flagging the true $\eta$ in the Monte Carlo
calculation. An efficiency of $93.0 \pm 1.5 \%$ is obtained by selection of combinations with a mass between 0.5 and $0.6 \mathrm{GeV} / c^{2}$. The combinatorial background within this interval is $9 \%$ of the total background.

In order to estimate the level of background in the data, the distribution of wrong zero-charge pion combinations $\left(\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}\right)$ in the Monte Carlo simulation is compared with that of doubly-charged combinations $\left(\pi^{ \pm} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{0}\right)$. The latter is found to be a good description of the background shape, as indicated by the dashed curve in Fig. 2(a). In the data, the integral of the doubly charged $\pi^{ \pm} \pi^{ \pm} \pi^{0}$ combination spectrum is weighted by the calculated fraction of background under the $\eta$ signal ( $9 \%$ ) to obtain an estimate of background contamination in the $e \eta \pi$ and $\mu \eta \pi$ samples. The detection efficiencies and estimated backgrounds for these samples are shown in Table II. When the two channels are combined, we estimate $1.9 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$ background events, where the systematic errors have been added linearly.

TABLE II. $\eta \rightarrow \pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$ Analysis

| Channel | $e \eta \pi$ | $\mu \eta \pi$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Background | $1.3 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.2$ | $0.6 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.1$ |
| Efficiency (\%) | $0.65 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.03$ | $0.39 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.02$ |
| combined upper limit on B | $2.5 \%$ |  |

The $\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$ mass combinations in the data from both detection channels are shown in Fig. 2(b). No events are observed in the interval from 0.5 to 0.6 $\mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$. Including the statistical and systematic errors increases the 2.3 event
limit for our null observation, obtained using Poisson statistics, to 2.6 at the $90 \%$ C.L. The resulting upper limit on the branching fraction is

$$
B(\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu) \leq 2.5 \%
$$

In summary, we have searched for $\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu$ events in $\tau$ pair production using two distinct $\eta$ decay modes, and find no evidence for this decay. Both analyses provide upper limits significantly below the recently reported measurement ${ }^{[1]}$ of the $\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu$ branching ratio of ( $5.1 \pm 1.5$ ) \% .

We gratefully acknowledge the efforts of the SPEAR staff. One of us (G. E.) thanks the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation for support. This work was supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Energy under Contracts No. DE-AC03-76SF00515, No. DE-AC02-76ER01195, No. DE-AC03-81ER40050, and No. DE-AM03-76SF00034.

## References

1. M. Derrick et al., ANL-HEP-PR-86-106 (1987) (to be published in Physics Letters).
2. F. J. Gilman, SLAC-PUB-4265 (1987) (submitted to Physical Review Rapid Communications).
3. A reference to a particle state implies reference to its charge conjugate.
4. J. Adler et al., SLAC-PUB-4205 (submitted to Physical Review Letters).

## Figure Captions

Fig. 1. $\quad \gamma \gamma$ invariant mass distributions are shown (a) for all selected events and (b) for all selected events with $\gamma \gamma$ mass above $0.3 \mathrm{GeV} / \mathrm{c}^{2}$. The curves are the results of the fit described in the text. The solid curve describes the exponentially falling background; the dashed curve includes the fitted $\eta$ signal. The inset shows the truncated relative likelihood function for the fit, with the shaded part representing $90 \%$ of the area. The dotted curve shows the expected ${ }^{[1]}$ $\eta$ signal, corresponding to $\mathrm{B}(\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu)=5.1 \%$, added to the exponential background.

Fig. 2. (a) $\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$ invariant mass distributions are shown for $e \pi \pi \pi \pi^{0}$ and $\mu \pi \pi \pi \pi^{0}$ events from a Monte Carlo calculation. The hatched entries under the peak are combinatorial background events. The dashed curve is the background estimate using doubly charged $\pi \pi \pi^{0}$ combinations. (b) $\pi^{+} \pi^{-} \pi^{0}$ invariant mass distributions are shown for $e \pi \pi \pi \pi^{0}$ and $\mu \pi \pi \pi \pi^{0}$ events as observed in the data. The dotted curve shows the expected ${ }^{[1]} \eta$ signal corresponding to $\mathrm{B}(\tau \rightarrow \eta \pi \nu)=5.1 \%$.
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