14 June 2001

PHYSICS LETTERS B

ELSEVIER

Physics Letters B 509 (2001) 365

www.elsevier.nl/locate/npe

Erratum

Erratum to: "Why the $f_0(980)$ is mostly $s\bar{s}$" [Phys. Lett. B 495 (2000) 300] ☆

Eef van Beveren [a], George Rupp [b], Michael D. Scadron [c]

[a] *Centro de Física Teórica, Departamento de Física, Universidade de Coimbra, P-3004-516 Coimbra, Portugal*
[b] *Centro de Física das Interacções Fundamentais, Instituto Superior Técnico, Edifício Ciência, P-1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal*
[c] *Physics Department, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721, USA*

The factor $\sqrt{2}$ in the denominator on the right-hand side of Eq. (3) should instead be a factor 2. This follows from the W^+-emission (or vacuum-saturation) amplitude for Cabibbo-angle-enhanced weak decays, as given, e.g., in Eqs. (4a)–(4c) of Ref. [1], which concerns the analogue parity-violating weak decay $D^0 \to \pi^+ K^-$. So Eq. (3) of the present Letter should correctly read for the parity-conserving weak decay $D_s^+ \to f_0(980)\pi^+$:

$$\left|\mathcal{M}\left(D_s^+ \to f_0(980)\pi^+\right)\right|_{W^+\text{-emission}} = \frac{G_F c_1^2}{2} f_\pi \left(m_{D_s}^2 - m_{f_0}^2\right) \approx 1.50 \times 10^{-6}\ \text{GeV}.$$

This value is still well within the error bars of the measured decay rate, even when a non-strange admixture of 14°–20° in the $f_0(980)$ is allowed.

Consequently, the conclusions of the Letter remain unaltered.

References

[1] M.D. Scadron, Phys. Rev. D 29 (1984) 1375.

☆ PII of original article: S0370-2693(00)01264-8.

E-mail addresses: eef@teor.fis.uc.pt (E. van Beveren), george@ajax.ist.utl.pt (G. Rupp), scadron@physics.arizona.edu (M.D. Scadron).

0370-2693/01/$ – see front matter
PII: S0370-2693(01)00604-9