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#### Abstract

We analyze the consequences of the proposal by Glashow that monojet events observed by UA1 are related to a new form of quark matter. We find that this idea requires the production of about $2 \mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}, 2 \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$and $2 \gamma+$ hadron events, all at the same large effective mass, for every monojet event explained in this way.


In an attempt to explain the peculiar events seen at the CERN p $\bar{p}$ collider by the UAl collaboration [1], the exciting idea [2] has been proposed that there exists a new kind of quark matter, endowed with a new strong gauge interaction, "odor", besides the familiar flavor and color. Odor forces are supposed to be similar to QCD , in that $\Lambda_{\mathrm{odor}} \simeq \Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}$ and odor quarks are assumed to be unable to form an odor singlet state in conjunction with any number of light, normal, quarks and/or gauge fields. If this is the case, an odor quark pair, $\mathrm{Q} \overline{\mathrm{Q}}\left(m_{\mathrm{Q}} \simeq 65 \mathrm{GeV}\right)$ produced abundantly by gluon fusion, would be unable to dissociate for a wide range of invariant masses:
$2 m_{\mathrm{Q}} \leqslant m_{\mathrm{QQ}} \leqslant 4 m_{\mathrm{Q}}$,
and would fall into the lightest, $J=0$, and 1 odoronium states, by emitting gluons and light odorballs, if necessary. Even though odorballs would escape detection [2], it is unlikely that a large amount of missing $p_{\perp}$ is produced in this cascade decay.

The peculiar UA1 monojet events, namely:
$\mathrm{p} \overline{\mathrm{p}} \rightarrow$ jets $+\operatorname{missing} p_{\perp}$,
are supposed to arise from odoronium decays
$(\mathrm{Q} \overline{\mathrm{Q}})_{J=1} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{Z}$,
where H is a standard, light Higgs boson, followed by Z decay into $\nu \bar{\nu}$ pairs, and H into hadrons.

Unlike the case of a toponium with a similar mass value, the wide energy range in (1) easily leads to an odoronium production cross section of the order of 1 nb . This, together with the relatively large branching ratios involved in process (2) and in the subsequent decays, was the basis for the proposal of ref. [2].

We consider this idea to be very attractive and intriguing. However, looking more closely at the decay modes of odoronium, we have found that it leads to a striking prediction, namely that for each monojet event one should observe definitely more than one, and most likely about two events with an $\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$pair with invariant mass
$m_{\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}}=M_{J=1} \simeq 2 m_{\mathrm{Q}}$,
and as many $\mu^{+} \mu^{-}$events at the same mass. Corresponding to the 5 observed monojet events, one would expect at least $5 \mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$and $5 \mu^{+} \mu^{-}$events. Another easily detectable consequence of the scheme is that one should see more than 0.8 and most likely about 2 events with one hard $\gamma$ plus hadrons, for each monojet event.

We are not sure whether such events should already have been observed in UA1 or UA2. We urge our ex-
perimental colleagues to make an explicit test of these predictions, to obtain a confirmation or rejection of such a clever idea.

To be definite, we consider one weak isodoublet of mass-degenerate quarks U, D, and assume the electric charge pattern
$Q_{\mathrm{U}}=q, \quad Q_{\mathrm{D}}=q-1$.
Adapting to this case the well-known charmonium formalism, we find that the decay rate for process (2) is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Gamma_{J=1}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H})=\frac{4}{3}(\alpha G / \sqrt{2}) N|\psi(0)|^{2} V^{2} \\
& \quad \times\left[1-\left(M_{\mathrm{Z}}^{2}+M_{\mathrm{H}}^{2}\right) / M^{2}\right]^{-2} \Phi, \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

with $N$ the overall color and odor multiplicity of $\mathrm{Q}\left(N=N_{\text {col }} \times N_{\text {od }}\right) V$ the $\overline{\mathrm{Q}}$ vector coupling to Z , in units of the proton electric charge:

$$
\begin{equation*}
V=\left(\sin \theta_{\mathrm{w}} \cos \theta_{\mathrm{w}}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{4} \tau_{3}-Q \sin ^{2} \theta_{\mathrm{w}}\right), \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, finally, $\Phi$, the phase space factor:
$\Phi=(2|q| / M)\left\{\left[1+\left(M_{\mathrm{Z}}^{2}-M_{\mathrm{H}}^{2}\right) / M^{2}\right]^{2}+2 M_{\mathrm{Z}}^{2} / M^{2}\right\}$,
$M=M_{J=1} \simeq 2 m_{\mathrm{Q}}$.
With the same assumptions which lead to eq. (4), one may compute the decay rate for the process
$(\mathrm{Q} \overline{\mathrm{Q}})_{J=1} \rightarrow \gamma$ or $\mathrm{Z} \rightarrow \mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$,
which leads to production of $\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$(or $\mu^{+} \mu^{-}$) pairs with invariant mass $M$. One finds:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Gamma_{J=1}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right)=\frac{8}{3} \pi \alpha^{2} N|\psi(0)|^{2} \\
& \quad \times\left\{\left|Q-\left[M^{2} /\left(M^{2}-M_{\mathrm{Z}}^{2}\right)\right] g_{\mathrm{L}}^{\mathrm{e}} V\right|^{2}\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\left|Q-\left[M^{2} /\left(M^{2}-M_{\mathrm{Z}}^{2}\right)\right] g_{\mathrm{R}}^{\mathrm{e}} V\right|^{2}\right\} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

where the chiral couplings of the electron are
$g_{\mathrm{L}}^{\mathrm{e}}=\left(\sin \theta_{\mathrm{w}} \cos \theta_{\mathrm{w}}\right)^{-1}\left(-\frac{1}{2}+\sin ^{2} \theta_{\mathrm{w}}\right)$,
$g_{\mathrm{R}}^{\mathrm{e}}=\tan \theta_{\mathrm{w}}$,
and $V$ is given by eq. (5). With obvious changes, eq.
(7) gives the decay rate into any light $f \bar{f}$ pair. Finally,
the $\gamma+\mathrm{H}$ decay rate is given by:
$\Gamma_{J=1}(\gamma+\mathrm{H})=\frac{4}{3}(\alpha G / \sqrt{2}) N|\psi(0)|^{2} Q^{2}\left(1-M_{\mathbf{H}}^{2} / M^{2}\right)$.

We can now parametrize the total decay rates of the

$$
\begin{align*}
& J=1 \text { states according to } \\
& \Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}^{J=1}=\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H})+\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\gamma+\mathrm{H}) \\
&+3\left[\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right)+\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\nu \bar{\nu})+\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{u} \overline{\mathrm{u}})+\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{~d} \overline{\mathrm{~d}})\right]+\Gamma_{\mathrm{h}} \\
& \equiv \Gamma_{0 \mathrm{U}}+\Gamma_{\mathrm{h}}, \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

and fimilarly for $D$. $\Gamma_{\mathrm{h}}$ is the partial width into color and odor gluons, which is the same in the two cases, and three light fermion families are assumed.
$J=0$ states are easily shown to be irrelevant for our purposes: they do not decay into $f \bar{f}$ via $Z$ or $\gamma$ annihilation and we have found the decay width into $\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}$ to vanish, in the limit where we neglect the odoronium binding energy (i.e. $M=2 m_{\mathrm{Q}}$ ). In addition, the total hadronic width of $J=0$ states is considerably larger than $J=1$ states.

It is a simple matter now to compute the ratio of direct $\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$versus $\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}$ events:

$$
\begin{align*}
R & =n\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / n(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}) \\
& =\left[\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / \Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}^{J=1}+\Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / \Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}^{J=1}\right] \\
& \times\left[\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}) / \Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}^{J=1}+\Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}) / \Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}^{J=1}\right]^{-1} \\
& =\frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right)}{\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H})} \frac{1+r \Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / \Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right)}{1+r \Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}) / \Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H})} . \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

The ratio
$r=\left(\Gamma_{0 \mathrm{U}}+\Gamma_{\mathrm{h}}\right) /\left(\Gamma_{0 \mathrm{D}}+\Gamma_{\mathrm{h}}\right)$,
varies between 1 and $\Gamma_{0 \mathrm{U}} / \Gamma_{0 \mathrm{D}}$ and, correspondingly, $R$ varies between
$R_{1}=\frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right)+\Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right)}{\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H})+\Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H})}$,
and
$R_{2}=\frac{\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / \Gamma_{0 \mathrm{U}}+\Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / \Gamma_{0 \mathrm{D}}}{\Gamma_{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}) / \Gamma_{0 \mathrm{U}}+\Gamma_{\mathrm{D}}(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}) / \Gamma_{0 \mathrm{D}}}$,
both $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$ are independent from unknown factors such as the overall quark multiplicity, $N$, or $\psi(0)$.

For the values $M=130 \mathrm{GeV}, M_{\mathrm{H}}=10 \mathrm{GeV}, \sin ^{2} \theta_{\mathrm{w}}$ $=0.22, q=\frac{2}{3}$ we find
$\Gamma_{0 \mathrm{U}} / \Gamma_{0 \mathrm{D}}=0.72$,
and
$0.418=R_{2} \leqslant R \leqslant R_{1}=0.426$.
Taking into account a branching ratio for $\mathrm{Z} \rightarrow \nu \bar{\nu}$ of
0.18 , we conclude that, irrespectively from the value of $\Gamma_{h}$ :
$n\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / n($ monojets $) \simeq 2.3$.
The ratio (17) is very insensitive to the values of the unknown parameters. By letting $q$ in eq. (3) vary from +1 to $-\frac{4}{3}$, the ratio in eq. (17) varies of about $10 \%$, and the lower bound to $R$ never becomes much smaller than the value given in (16) if we make $M$ to run from 110 GeV to 185 GeV .

There could be a correction to eq. (17) because of the decay
$(\mathrm{Q} \overline{\mathrm{Q}})_{J=1} \rightarrow \gamma$ or $\mathrm{Z} \rightarrow \tau^{+} \tau^{-}$,
one $\tau$ being missed and the other decaying into $\nu_{\tau}+$ hadrons. In this case, process (18) would contribute to monojet events and one should replace eq. (17) by
$\frac{n\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right)}{n(\text { monojets })}=\frac{R}{0.18+0.65(2 f) R}$,
where we have assumed a semihadronic branching ratio of 0.65 for $\tau$ and $f$ is the probability for completely missing one $\tau . f$ can be determined explicitly for a given experimental setup. We think it unlikely that a $\tau$ can be missed completely in UA1 or UA2, if it decays into three charged tracks. The one charged prong branching ratio for $\tau$ is
$B(\tau \rightarrow 1$ charged part $)=B_{\tau 1} \simeq 0.44$.
A reasonable estimate could be
$f=0.1 B_{\tau 1}$,
which gives
$n\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / n($ monojets $)=2.1$.
For the extreme case where
$f=B_{\tau 1}$,
we obtain
$n\left(\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}\right) / n($ monojets $) \simeq 1$.
By a similar reasoning, one obtains that the ratio
$R^{\gamma}=n(\gamma+\mathrm{H}) / n(\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H})$,
is bounded according to
$0.34 \leqslant R^{\gamma} \leqslant 0.40$,
and that
$\frac{n(\gamma+\text { hadrons })}{n \text { (monojets) }}=\frac{R^{\gamma}}{0.18+0.65(2 f) R}$,
with $R$ defined in eq. (11). We find

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{n(\gamma+\text { hadrons })}{n(\text { monojets })} & \simeq 1.7 \quad\left(f=0.1 B_{\tau 1}\right) \\
& \simeq 0.8 \quad\left(f=B_{\tau 1}\right) \tag{28}
\end{align*}
$$

One could also envisage the case where odor matter is made of scalar instead of spin $\frac{1}{2}$ particles. However in this case not only the $\mathrm{e}^{+} \mathrm{e}^{-}$and hard $\gamma$ signals disappear, but also the $\mathrm{Z}+\mathrm{H}$ decay is forbidden, for the ground state $J^{P C}=0^{++}$.
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