

THEORY OF XYZ

AD Polosa

Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN
Sapienza Universita` di Roma

THE 'NEW' HADRON RESONANCES

Brambilla et al. QWG, arXiv:10105827


State	m (MeV)	Γ (MeV)	J^{PC}	Process (mode)	Experiment ($\# \sigma$)	Year	Status
X(3872)	3871.52 ± 0.20	1.3 ± 0.6 (< 2.2)	$1^{++}/2^{-+}$	$B \rightarrow K(\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi)$	Belle [85, 86] (12.8), BABAR [87] (8.6)	2003	OK
				$p\bar{p} \rightarrow (\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi) + \dots$	CDF [88-90] (np), DØ [91] (5.2)		
				$B \rightarrow K(\omega J/\psi)$	Belle [92] (4.3), BABAR [93] (4.0)		
				$B \rightarrow K(D^{*0}\bar{D}^0)$	Belle [94, 95] (6.4), BABAR [96] (4.9)		
				$B \rightarrow K(\gamma J/\psi)$	Belle [92] (4.0), BABAR [97, 98] (3.6)		
				$B \rightarrow K(\gamma\psi(2S))$	BABAR [98] (3.5), Belle [99] (0.4)		
X(3915)	3915.6 ± 3.1	28 ± 10	$0/2^{?+}$	$B \rightarrow K(\omega J/\psi)$	Belle [100] (8.1), BABAR [101] (19)	2004	OK
				$e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-(\omega J/\psi)$	Belle [102] (7.7)		
X(3940)	3942_{-8}^{+9}	37_{-17}^{+27}	$?^{?+}$	$e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi(D\bar{D}^*)$	Belle [103] (6.0)	2007	NC!
				$e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi(\dots)$	Belle [54] (5.0)		
G(3900)	3943 ± 21	52 ± 11	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma(D\bar{D})$	BABAR [27] (np), Belle [21] (np)	2007	OK
Y(4008)	4008_{-49}^{+121}	226 ± 97	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi)$	Belle [104] (7.4)	2007	NC!
Z ₁ (4050) ⁺	4051_{-43}^{+24}	82_{-55}^{+51}	?	$B \rightarrow K(\pi^+\chi_{c1}(1P))$	Belle [105] (5.0)	2008	NC!
Y(4140)	4143.4 ± 3.0	15_{-7}^{+11}	$?^{?+}$	$B \rightarrow K(\phi J/\psi)$	CDF [106, 107] (5.0)	2009	NC!
X(4160)	4156_{-25}^{+29}	139_{-65}^{+113}	$?^{?+}$	$e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi(D\bar{D}^*)$	Belle [103] (5.5)	2007	NC!
Z ₂ (4250) ⁺	4248_{-45}^{+185}	177_{-72}^{+321}	?	$B \rightarrow K(\pi^+\chi_{c1}(1P))$	Belle [105] (5.0)	2008	NC!
Y(4260)	4263 ± 5	108 ± 14	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi)$	BABAR [108, 109] (8.0)	2005	OK
					CLEO [110] (5.4)		
					Belle [104] (15)		
				$e^+e^- \rightarrow (\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi)$	CLEO [111] (11)		
				$e^+e^- \rightarrow (\pi^0\pi^0J/\psi)$	CLEO [111] (5.1)		
Y(4274)	$4274.4_{-6.7}^{+8.4}$	32_{-15}^{+22}	$?^{?+}$	$B \rightarrow K(\phi J/\psi)$	CDF [107] (3.1)	2010	NC!
X(4350)	$4350.6_{-5.1}^{+4.6}$	$13.3_{-10.0}^{+18.4}$	$0, 2^{++}$	$e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^-(\phi J/\psi)$	Belle [112] (3.2)	2009	NC!
Y(4360)	4353 ± 11	96 ± 42	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\psi(2S))$	BABAR [113] (np), Belle [114] (8.0)	2007	OK
Z(4430) ⁺	4443_{-18}^{+24}	107_{-71}^{+113}	?	$B \rightarrow K(\pi^+\psi(2S))$	Belle [115, 116] (6.4)	2007	NC!
X(4630)	4634_{-11}^{+9}	92_{-32}^{+41}	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\Lambda_c^+\Lambda_c^-)$	Belle [25] (8.2)	2007	NC!
Y(4660)	4664 ± 12	48 ± 15	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma(\pi^+\pi^-\psi(2S))$	Belle [114] (5.8)	2007	NC!
Y _b (10888)	10888.4 ± 3.0	$30.7_{-7.7}^{+8.9}$	1^{--}	$e^+e^- \rightarrow (\pi^+\pi^-\Upsilon(nS))$	Belle [37, 117] (3.2)	2010	NC!

Prencipe
BaBar
Charm
2012


NO

YES


As Predicted by Charmonium Theory




Experimentally Observed Levels




The New States




As Predicted by Bottomonium Theory







Experimentally Observed Levels



Newcomers in the b-System



THE X(3872) DISCOVERY (2003)



X : CHARMONIUM OR 'EXOTIC'?

- From the beginning it was realized that the radiative decay of $X \rightarrow J/\psi \gamma$ was way too small in comparison with $J/\psi + \rho$ to fit a standard charmonium picture as 2^3P_1 (Eichten, Lane and Quigg)
- $J/\psi + \rho$ and $J/\psi + \omega$ channels have very similar rates (isospin violation) - unexpected for a cc^* !
- The **mass** of the X is almost *exactly* equal to the **sum of the masses of D and D*** open charm mesons
- The mass of the X does *not fit* with the expected accuracy *any of the predicted charmonium levels*.

For a rather long time the X has been supposed to be a 1^{++} state.

We are now in the puzzling situation that data could (re)open the 2^{-+} option ...

R. Faccini, F. Piccinini, A. Pilloni, and ADP, 'On the Spin of the X(3872)', arXiv:1204.1223

T. Burns, F. Piccinini, ADP, C. Sabelli, 'The 2^{-+} assignment for the X(3872)', *Phys. Rev. D* 2010

Are Mesons Elementary Particles?

E. FERMI AND C. N. YANG*

Institute for Nuclear Studies, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

(Received August 24, 1949)

The hypothesis that π -mesons may be composite particles formed by the association of a nucleon with an anti-nucleon is discussed. From an extremely crude discussion of the model it appears that such a meson would have in most respects properties similar to those of the meson of the Yukawa theory.

I. INTRODUCTION

IN recent years several new particles have been discovered which are currently assumed to be "elementary," that is, essentially, structureless. The probability that all such particles should be really elementary becomes less and less as their number increases.

It is by no means certain that nucleons, mesons, electrons, neutrinos are all elementary particles and it could be that at least some of the failures of the present theories may be due to disregarding the possibility that some of them may have a complex structure. Unfortunately, we have no clue to decide whether this is true, much less to find out what particles are simple and what particles are complex. In what follows we will try to work out in some detail a special example more as an illustration of a possible program of the theory of particles, than in the hope that what we suggest may actually correspond to reality.

We propose to discuss the hypothesis that the π -meson may not be elementary, but may be a composite particle formed by the association of a nucleon and an anti-nucleon. The first assumption will be, therefore, that both an anti-proton and an anti-neutron exist, having the same relationship to the proton and the neutron, as the electron to the positron. Although this is an assumption that goes beyond what is known experimentally, we do not view it as a very revolutionary one. We must assume, further, that between a nucleon and an anti-nucleon strong attractive forces exist, capable of binding the two particles together.

* Now at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey.

We assume that the π -meson is a pair of nucleon and anti-nucleon bound in this way. Since the mass of the π -meson is much smaller than twice the mass of a nucleon, it is necessary to assume that the binding energy is so great that its mass equivalent is equal to the difference between twice the mass of the nucleon and the mass of the meson.

According to this view the positive meson would be the association of a proton and an anti-neutron and the negative meson would be the association of an anti-proton and a neutron. As a model of a neutral meson one could take either a pair of a neutron and an anti-neutron, or of a proton and an anti-proton.

It would be difficult to set up a not too complicated scheme of forces between a nucleon and an anti-nucleon, without about equally strong forces between two ordinary nucleons. These last forces, however, would be quite different from the ordinary nuclear forces, because they would have much greater energy and much shorter range. The reason why no experimental indication of them has been observed for ordinary nucleons may be explained by the assumption that the forces could be attractive between a nucleon and an anti-nucleon and repulsive between two ordinary nucleons. If this is the case, no bound system of two ordinary nucleons would result out of this particular type of interaction. Because of the short range very little would be noticed of such forces even in scattering phenomena.


Ordinary nuclear forces from the point of view of this theory will be discussed below.

Unfortunately we have not succeeded in working out a satisfactory relativistically invariant theory of nucleons among which such attractive forces act. For this reason all the conclusion that will be presented will be

X - A DIFFERENT KIND OF MOLECULE

N. Tornqvist, E. Braaten & Kusunoki, E. Swanson, F. Close and many others

The *loosely bound* (~ 0 MeV) molecule (DD^*) interpretation is tempting - it accommodates the isospin problem. But what about production at hadron colliders?



But then, what about the high production cross sections at Tevatron and LHC?
Computer simulations leave no space to the molecule hypothesis.

[C. Bignamini, B. Grinstein, F. Piccinini, ADP, C. Sabelli, Phys Rev Lett, **103**, 162001 \(2009\)](#)

[C. Bignamini, B. Grinstein, F. Piccinini, ADP, C. Sabelli, Phys Lett, **B684**, 228 \(2010\)](#)

Can final state interactions allow such high production cross sections?


How can occur the decay into J/ψ initiated by a 10 fm bound state of color neutral mesons?

[P. Artoisenet and E. Braaten, Phys Rev **D81**, 114018 \(2010\)](#)

And more: if 2^- is confirmed the molecule hypothesis is ruled out.

THRESHOLDS (CHARM SECTOR)

A considerable amount of 'unoccupied' thresholds









THRESHOLDS (CHARM SECTOR)

See E. Braaten talk at CHARM2012

- For an hadron being constituent in a hadron molecule its width has to be smaller than binding energy (e.g. ρ is just too broad)
- Close to thresholds of narrow mesons (say DD^*) interesting things might happen. There are several narrow charm-charm threshold one can form starting from $D, D^*, D_s, D_s^*, D_{s0}, D_{s1}^*, D_{s1}'$
- Narrow light hadrons should also make up molecules ($\pi, K, \eta, \eta', \omega, \varphi$). Similarly with light baryons.


OPTIONS FOR COLOR NEUTRAL STATES



-  quark (heavy or light)
-  antiquark
-  gluon

CHARMED DIQUARKS: THE SYMMETRY APPROACH

The octet with diquarks -
the 'azimuthal approach'



$$\mathcal{Q}_{i\alpha} = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \bar{q}_C^{j\beta} \gamma_5 q^{k\gamma} = [qq]_0$$

$$\mathcal{Q}_\alpha^{jk} = \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \bar{q}_C^\beta (j \vec{\gamma} q^k)^\gamma = [qq]_1$$

J^{PC}	$dq-dq^*$
0^{++}	$[cq]_0 [\bar{c}\bar{q}]_0 \vee ([cq]_1 [\bar{c}\bar{q}]_1)_0$
1^{++}	$\frac{[cq]_1 [\bar{c}\bar{q}]_0 + [cq]_0 [\bar{c}\bar{q}]_1}{\sqrt{2}}$
1^{+-}	$\frac{[cq]_1 [\bar{c}\bar{q}]_0 - [cq]_0 [\bar{c}\bar{q}]_1}{\sqrt{2}} \vee ([cq]_1 [\bar{c}\bar{q}]_1)_1$
2^{++}	$([cq]_1 [\bar{c}\bar{q}]_1)_2$

$$([\]_s [\]_s)_J$$

ISOSPIN VIOLATIONS

We set in the flavor basis X_u, X_d

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 2m_u & 0 \\ 0 & 2m_d \end{pmatrix} + \delta \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where the mixing matrix has a diagonal structure in the Isospin $I = 0, 1$ basis, its eigenvectors being

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

At the charmonium scale we expect the annihilations to be small and quark mass to dominate - observed $X \rightarrow \omega/\rho$ isospin breaking

G.C. Rossi, G. Veneziano; L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, ADP, V.Riquer PRD 2005

DIQUARK MODEL

Drenska, Faccini, ADP, Phys. Lett. B669, 160 (2008), Phys. Rev. D79, 077502 (2009)

$$H = 2m_{\mathbf{q}} + H_{SS}^{(qq)} + H_{SS}^{(q\bar{q})} + H_{SL} + H_{LL}$$

$$H_{SS}^{(qq)} = 2\kappa_q (\vec{S}_{q_1} \cdot \vec{S}_{q_2} + \vec{S}_{\bar{q}_1} \cdot \vec{S}_{\bar{q}_2})$$

$$H_{SS}^{(q\bar{q})} = 2\kappa_{q_1\bar{q}_2} (\vec{S}_{q_1} \cdot \vec{S}_{\bar{q}_2} + \vec{S}_{\bar{q}_1} \cdot \vec{S}_{q_2}) + 2\kappa_{q_1\bar{q}_1} \vec{S}_{q_1} \cdot \vec{S}_{\bar{q}_1} + 2\kappa_{q_2\bar{q}_2} \vec{S}_{q_2} \cdot \vec{S}_{\bar{q}_2}$$

$$H_{SL} = 2A_q (\vec{S}_q \cdot \vec{L} + \vec{S}_{\bar{q}} \cdot \vec{L})$$


$$H_{LL} = B_q \frac{L(L+1)}{2}$$

$$\kappa_{c\bar{c}}([cq][\bar{c}\bar{q}]) = \frac{1}{3}(\kappa_{c\bar{c}})_1 + \frac{2}{3}(\kappa_{c\bar{c}})_8$$

$$\kappa_{c\bar{c}} \sim (C_R^{(2)} - C_3^{(2)} - C_{\bar{3}}^{(2)})$$

TETRAQUARKS ?

L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, ADP, V. Riquer, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 014028 (2005)



- Two neutral X predicted with an hyperfine separation in mass to accomodate isospin
- Charged partners (degenerate in mass?) with $Q=\pm 1$ or even $Q=2$ such as in $[cu][d^*s^*]$. Not seen. Are they just too broad?
- The heavier partners of light tetraquarks (scalars) ...

G. 't Hooft, G. Isidori, L. Maiani, ADP, V. Riquer, Phys Lett B 2008

Today we have 5 charged states - not explained by any unified picture
(to be confirmed)

$Z(4430)$, $Z_1(4050)$, $Z_2(4250)$, $Z(10610)$, $Z(10650)$

The decay pattern preferring a $\psi(2S)$ (or $\eta(2S)$) is completely obscure.
The last two were found in May 2011.


TETRQUARKS PREFER BARYON DECAYS

G. Cotugno, R. Faccini, ADP, C. Sabelli *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 132005 (2010)

We observed that $Y(4660)$ and $Y(4630)$ might be one and the same particle (Y_B) showing how this hypothesis improves the fit to Belle data.

Under this hypothesis we found the remarkable ratio

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(Y_B \rightarrow \Lambda_c \bar{\Lambda}_c)}{\mathcal{B}(Y_B \rightarrow \psi(2S)\pi^+\pi^-)} = 24.6 \pm 6.6$$





Search for similar resonances having 'baryon affinity' in the b-system.

THE X(3872) SPIN

EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH ON SPIN

$O(1000)$ fully reconstructed $B \rightarrow X(3872) K^+$ events with X decaying into $J/\psi \rho$ are expected at LHCb in 2013 - sufficient to have an unambiguous determination of quantum numbers performing an angular analysis. Results achievable within 2013/2014



R. Faccini, F. Piccinini, A. Pilloni, and ADP, 'On the Spin of the $X(3872)$ ', arXiv:1204.1223

Belle & BaBar stopped data taking in 2010 and 2008 respectively.
Ongoing analyses with low manpower but still possible and interesting.

With 2011 (1fb^{-1}), LHCb has about 15000 prompt X candidates on tape.

MATRIX ELEMENTS

R. Faccini, F. Piccinini, A. Pilloni, and ADP, arXiv:1204.1223

Spin 1 :: 1++

$$\langle \psi(\epsilon, p) V(\eta, q) | X(\lambda, P) \rangle = g_{1\psi V} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \lambda_\mu(P) \epsilon_\nu^*(p) \eta_\rho^*(q) P_\sigma$$

$V = \rho, \omega$

Spin 2 :: 2-+

$$\langle \psi(\epsilon, p) V(\eta, q) | X(\pi, P) \rangle = g_{2\psi V} T_A + g'_{2\psi V} T_B$$

$$T_A = \epsilon^{*\alpha}(p) \pi_{\alpha\mu}(P) \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} p_\nu q_\rho \eta_\sigma^*(q) - \eta^{*\alpha}(q) \pi_{\alpha\mu}(P) \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} q_\nu p_\rho \epsilon_\sigma^*(p)$$

$$T_B = Q^\alpha \pi_{\alpha\mu}(P) \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} P_\nu \epsilon_\rho^*(p) \eta_\sigma^*(q)$$

where the sum over the five polarizations is

$$\sum_{\text{pol}} \pi_{\mu\nu}(k) \pi_{\alpha\beta}^*(k) = \frac{1}{2} (P_{\mu\alpha} P_{\nu\beta} + P_{\mu\beta} P_{\nu\alpha}) - \frac{1}{3} (P_{\mu\nu} P_{\alpha\beta})$$

$$P_{\mu\nu} = -g_{\mu\nu} + \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{m^2}$$

CALCULATION OF WIDTHS

In our approach we do not need any orbital barrier factor (Blatt-Weisskopf) as the decay wave is fixed by the matrix elements. Instead we take into account the hadron finite sizes by introducing a 'polar' form factor (n=1,2)

$$g \rightarrow \frac{g}{(1 + R^2 q^{*2})^n}$$

The R parameters will be fit on data. Next we compute the widths, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(X \rightarrow \psi \pi^+ \pi^-) &= \frac{1}{2J+1} \frac{1}{48\pi m_X^2} \int ds \sum_{\text{pol}} |\langle \psi \rho(s) | X \rangle|^2 p^*(m_X^2, m_\psi^2, s) \\ &\times \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{1}{(s - m_\rho^2)^2 + (m_\rho \Gamma_\rho)^2} \int d\Phi^{(2)} \sum_{\text{pol}} |\langle \pi^+ \pi^- | \rho(s) \rangle|^2 \end{aligned}$$

(for ρ and ω) in both hypotheses (spin=1,2) and compare to data.

COMBINED FIT ANALYSIS

In the channel $X \rightarrow \psi 2\pi$ both hypotheses $J=1,2$ fit data well (no discrimination).
On the contrary in $X \rightarrow \psi 3\pi$ the 2^- hypothesis is the better one

Because of this, following Hanhart et al (*Phys. Rev. D*85, 011501, 2012), we also made a combined $J=1,2$ fit. But our statistical analysis gives opposite results with respect to those presented in that paper


Fit parameters

fit $J = 1 : R_1, g_{1\psi\rho}, g_{1\psi\omega}$



fit $J = 2 : R_2, g_{2\psi\rho}, g'_{2\psi\rho}, g_{2\psi\omega}, g'_{2\psi\omega}$

It is interesting to note that the radii, the fit parameters with a physical content, have reasonably small errors and **get values consistent with 1 fm**, the scale of the size of a standard hadron interaction.


RESULTS



$n=1$



$n=2$




TOY MC

We have performed a statistical analysis of data based on the Toy-MC method studying the estimator $\Delta\chi^2$

$$\Delta\chi^2 = \chi^2(1^{++}) - \chi^2(2^{-+})$$

where the χ^2 are related to fits to MC samples generated under the J=1 or 2 hypothesis. With available data there is very little room for the 1⁺⁺ hypothesis



$$P(\Delta\chi^2 > 7.5 | 1^{++}) = 0.2\%$$

$$P(\Delta\chi^2 < 7.5 | 2^{-+}) = 46\%$$

(n=1)

are the probabilities for the two spin hypotheses

(TOY MC METHOD)


- Generate N MC data samples with the same # of events as real data
- The samples can be generated using the parameters that better fit the $J=1$ or $J=2$ hypothesis (extracting, sample by sample, the parameters according to the best combined fit to data)
 - Mass bins b_i are filled by extraction from Poisson distributions of mean values μ_i given, bin per bin, by the combined fit model vs data - the errors on b_i are assumed to be the statistical fluctuations on μ_i

BELLE ANGULAR CORRELATIONS

Belle, arXiv:1107.0613

The angle θ_X is measured. It is the angle between the J/ψ and the direction opposite to the K (from $B \rightarrow K X$) in the X rest frame (the resulting decay distribution is flat in S-wave and $\sim(1 + 3 \cos^2\theta_X)$ in P-wave)

Two more angles θ_1 and χ are introduced according to the definition



In the next slide our distributions for $\cos \theta_X$ and $\cos \theta_1$

RESULTS (PRELIMINARY)

★ $J/\psi + 2\pi$ (angular analysis + invariant mass)

$$P(1^{++}) = 23\%$$

$$P(2^{-+}) \lesssim 0.1\%$$

★ $J/\psi + 3\pi$ (invariant mass)

$$P(1^{++}) = 0.1\%$$

$$P(2^{-+}) = 81\%$$

★ $J/\psi + 3\pi$ (combined)

$$P(1^{++}) = 6.2\%$$



$$P(2^{-+}) = 0.1\%$$

WHAT IF 2^{-+} ??

THE SIMPLEST QCD STRING

Selem and Wilczek hep-ph/0602128 (on the Chew-Frautschi model)

Charmonia with hadron strings?



$$\mathcal{E} = \frac{m_1}{\sqrt{1 - (\omega r_1)^2}} + \frac{m_2}{\sqrt{1 - (\omega r_2)^2}} + \frac{\sigma}{2\pi\omega} \int_0^{\omega r_1} \frac{dv}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}} + \frac{\sigma}{2\pi\omega} \int_0^{\omega r_2} \frac{dv}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}}$$

$$\ell = \frac{\omega r_1^2 m_1}{\sqrt{1 - (\omega r_1)^2}} + \frac{\omega r_2^2 m_2}{\sqrt{1 - (\omega r_2)^2}} + \frac{\sigma}{2\pi\omega^2} \int_0^{\omega r_1} \frac{dv v^2}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}} + \frac{\sigma}{2\pi\omega^2} \int_0^{\omega r_2} \frac{dv v^2}{\sqrt{1 - v^2}}$$

$\sigma \sim 1 \text{ GeV}^2$ from Regge slopes and $d\mathcal{E}'/dr' = T = \sigma/2\pi$ and $T = \frac{dp}{ds} \cdot \hat{u} = m\omega^2 \gamma^2 r$

THE SIMPLEST QCD STRING II


Cotugno, Faccini, Polosa, Sabelli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 132005 (2010)

Burns, Piccinini, Polosa, Sabelli, *Phys Rev D* 2010


We take the limit in which the mass attached to the ends of the string is the largest scale in the problem

$$\mathcal{E}(r)_{\text{TOT}} \simeq \underbrace{2M + \frac{3}{(16\pi^2 M)^{1/3}} (\sigma \ell)^{2/3}}_{\mathcal{E}(r) \text{ as } T/(M\omega) \rightarrow 0} + A \left(\vec{S} \cdot \vec{\ell} \right) \frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} \mathcal{E}(r)$$

No spin-spin because of large r and M



(charm)




(beauty)

THE NEXT-TO-SIMPLEST QCD STRING


$$\mathcal{E}(r)_{\text{TOT}} \simeq \underbrace{2M + \frac{3}{(16\pi^2 M)^{1/3}} (\sigma\ell)^{2/3}}_{\mathcal{E}(r) \text{ as } T/(M\omega) \rightarrow 0} + A (\vec{S} \cdot \vec{\ell}) \frac{1}{r} \frac{d}{dr} \mathcal{E}(r) + B \left[\vec{S}^2 - 3 (\vec{S} \cdot \vec{n})^2 \right]$$

Prediction + 1 MeV



Burns, Piccinini, Polosa, Sabelli, *Phys Rev D* 2010


D-WAVE BOTTONIUM




Based on BaBar data

CHARMONIUM L=1

The situation for charmonium is a bit more tricky since the `infinite` mass limit is less appropriate here.



IS THE X(3872) A 1D_2 (2^{-+}) CHARMONIUM?!



Maybe isospin violations mentioned are not the main problem,

But what about radiative decays?

$J/\psi\gamma$ and $J/\psi\rho$ would be P-wave decays - but then why

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi\gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-)} = (0.3 \pm 0.1)$$

FRAGMENTATION OF A GLUON IN A 1^1D_2

Cho and Wise hep-ph/9410214

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dp_{\perp}}(p\bar{p} \rightarrow 1^1D_2 + \text{All}) = \sum_{h=0}^2 \int_0^1 dz \frac{d\sigma}{dp_{\perp}}(p\bar{p} \rightarrow g(p_{\perp}/z) + \text{All}; \mu) \times D_{g \rightarrow 1^1D_2^{(h)}}(z; \mu)$$

$$x \simeq \sqrt{M_{\perp}^2/1960^2} \simeq 0.02$$


$$p_{\perp} \gtrsim 5 \text{ GeV}$$

$$|y| \leq 6$$

factorization scale $\mu \simeq M_{\perp}$

Updating the pdf's we find

$$\sigma(p\bar{p} \rightarrow 1^1D_2) = 0.6 \text{ nb}$$




Still very small w/ respect to the prompt production at CDF

BARYONS STRING AND DIQUARKS

't Hooft hep-th/0408148

Masses at the endpoints neglected




$$X^{\mu,1}(\sigma = 0, \tau) = X^{\mu,2}(\sigma = 0, \tau) = X^{\mu,3}(\sigma = 0, \tau)$$

$\sigma \in [0, L^i(\tau)]$ variable length in time

$$S = - \sum_{i=1}^3 \int d\tau \int_0^{L^i(\tau)} d\sigma \sqrt{(\partial_\sigma X_\mu^i \cdot \partial_\tau X^{\mu i})^2 - (\partial_\sigma X_\mu^i)^2 (\partial_\tau X_\nu^i)^2}$$

It is found that one of the three harms will soon (τ) disappear shedding its energy into the excitation modes of the two other harms: we end up with a single open string connecting three quarks.




Quantum effects will then favor the configuration with one quark at one end and a diquark at the other hand. Baryons are like mesons as in Regge trajectories

2-+ OPTION

- Molecule ruled out
- Standard charmonium suffers
- Tetraquarks can be but, again - more states required -
- Are there reasons to expect more states? In the following we give one of the possible ones

Having more XYZ (or having underestimated their br's) would improve on a old puzzle about the momentum decay of J/ψ in $B \rightarrow J/\psi + \text{All}$ decays observed by BaBar



T. Burns, F. Piccinini, ADP, V. Prospero, C. Sabelli, *Phys Rev D* **83**, 114029 2011



$Y(4S)$ rest frame

Hypothesis:

no interaction between the hard part and soft part of the process.



If the cc^* pair is produced in **color singlet** configuration one has a two body decay: $B \rightarrow J/\psi K$.

MANY STATES...STATISTICAL METHODS?

E.N.M. Cirillo, M. Mori and A.D.P, *Phys. Lett.* **B705**, 498 (2011)




Fig. 4. Sampled distributions for $\Lambda(7)$. The histograms are obtained with 19980 GOE samples and 20000 Poisson samples and rescaled to unit area. The vertical lines indicate the $\Lambda(7)$ value for the *standard* and the *exotica* series. The bin width is equal 0.008.


Hamiltonian classically chaotic → quantum level repulsion, Wigner law of GOE eigenvalues

Hamiltonian classically integrable → Poisson distribution

Study done with **six I^{--} charmonia vs. six I^{--} possible exotic hadrons**

EXOTIC HADRONS AND HIC

- What are the fragmentation functions of diquark-antidiquark mesons? Could they be modeled and confronted with data from ALICE and CMS/ATLAS?



$$R_{CP} = \frac{N_{\text{coll}}(b)}{N_{\text{coll}}(b=0)} \left(\frac{dN_H/d^2p_{\perp}(b=0)}{dN_H/d^2p_{\perp}(b)} \right)$$

$$R_{AA} = \frac{1}{N_{\text{coll}}(b=0)} \left(\frac{dN_H/d^2p_{\perp}(b=0)}{dN_H/d^2p_{\perp}|pp} \right)$$

The numerators are dominated by the 'coalescence' mechanism (B. Muller et al). Molecule and tetraquark denominators should also be different

L. Maiani, A.D. Polosa, V. Riquer, C. Salgado, *Phys Lett B* 2007 (light mesons)

EXOTIC HADRONS AND HIC

- I - The transverse momentum of partons is steeply falling with p_T (assume exp.)
- II - Fragmentation functions favor the situation where the energy of the fragmenting parton is democratically distributed amid all the radiated partons

For this reason fragmentation is inefficient at producing high p_T hadrons. In particular pions are produced more efficiently with respect to baryons. But what if the phase space is densely populated with partons?

$$P_\pi = p_u + p_{\bar{d}} \sim 2 p$$

$$P_p = p_u + p_u + p_d \sim 3 p$$


$$\#(\text{protons}) \sim \exp(-3 p) \sim \exp(-P_p)$$

$$\#(\text{pions}) \sim \exp(-2 p) \sim \exp(-P_\pi)$$

$$\#(\text{protons})/\#(\text{pions}) \sim 1 \quad \text{if} \quad P_\pi \sim P_p$$

$$\#(X_{4q}) \sim \exp(-P_X)$$

$$\#(X_{\text{mol}}) \sim C \exp(-P_X)$$



C = Combinatorial factor of producing a (almost non relatively recoiling) pair (D,D*)

CONCLUSIONS

- We have spent quite some time debating about which is the correct description of these resonances.
- The models presented all have pros/cons but none of them has -the- solution
 - Hopefully a new bunch of results from the LHC will revitalize the field

BACKUP SLIDES


DEUTERIUM & X

Deuterium has a binding energy of ~ 2.2 MeV.
The X has ~ -0.14 MeV.

For Deuterium one can make a square well potential model with a depth of ~ 20 MeV
For the X the depth could be of about 7 MeV.
The *expectation* for the X to be found outside 3 fm is 77%
($\sim 72\%$ to be within [3,20] fm and only 20% to be in [0,3] fm)

The Deuterium has spin
D and D* do not have spin-spin interactions

Production at hadron colliders?



HOW LARGE IS A MOLECULE?

Using the indetermination principle

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{2\mu r_0^2} - \frac{g^2}{4\pi} \frac{e^{-\frac{m_\pi c}{\hbar} r_0}}{r_0} = \mathcal{E} = M_D + M_{D^*} - M_X \sim 0.25 \text{ MeV}$$


and the fact that $g^2/4\pi \sim 10$ we find a characteristic size

$$r_0 \sim 8 \text{ fm}$$

which could either be infinity(!) as

$$\mathcal{E} = -0.12 \pm 0.35 \text{ MeV}$$

PROMPT PRODUCTION



$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma(pp\bar{p} \rightarrow X(3872)) &\sim \left| \int d^3k \langle X | D\bar{D}^*(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \langle D\bar{D}^*(\mathbf{k}) | pp\bar{p} \rangle \right|^2 \\
 &\simeq \left| \int_{\mathcal{R}} d^3k \langle X | D\bar{D}^*(\mathbf{k}) \rangle \langle D\bar{D}^*(\mathbf{k}) | pp\bar{p} \rangle \right|^2 \\
 &\leq \int_{\mathcal{R}} d^3k |\psi(\mathbf{k})|^2 \int_{\mathcal{R}} d^3k |\langle D\bar{D}^*(\mathbf{k}) | pp\bar{p} \rangle|^2 \\
 &\leq \int_{\mathcal{R}} d^3k |\langle D\bar{D}^*(\mathbf{k}) | pp\bar{p} \rangle|^2
 \end{aligned}$$



Using Pythia & Herwig we can compute

$$\sigma_{\max}(pp\bar{p} \rightarrow X(3872)) = \int_{\mathcal{R}} d^3k |\langle D\bar{D}^*(\mathbf{k}) | pp\bar{p} \rangle|^2$$


where $\mathcal{R} \sim [0.40]$ MeV

as $k \sim \sqrt{2\mu(-0.25 + 0.40)} \simeq 17$ MeV



TUNING MC'S



[The $D^0 D^{*-}$ pair cross section as function of $\Delta\phi$ at CDF Run II. We find that we have to rescale the Herwig cross section values by a factor $K=1.8$ to best fit the data on open charm production. As for Pythia we need $K=0.74$]



COUNTING PAIRS OVER $5 \cdot 10^9$ SIMULATED EVENTS



Bignamini, Grinstein, Piccinini, Polosa, Sabelli Phys Rev Lett 2009

In the Ball R of relative momenta found above the cross section turns out to be 0.07-0.11 nb, about **300 times smaller** than the minimum experimental value found by CDF data (~ 30 nb).

One needs to integrate cross section up to about 205 MeV with Herwig and 130 MeV with Pythia in order to reach the experimental value. We thus **EXCLUDE** any molecular interpretation of X(3872).

FSI

Artoisenet & Braaten: Phys Rev D81, 114018 (2010)





$$\sigma(p\bar{p} \rightarrow X(3872))^{\text{prompt}} = \sigma(k < \Lambda) \times \frac{6\pi\sqrt{2\mu\mathcal{E}_0}}{\Lambda}$$

- (1) FSI can make a high relative momentum pair to rescatter in a lower relative momentum pair: k can range up to $\Lambda \approx 2m_\pi$
- (2) Enhancement factor

In this way σ^{th} and σ^{exp} can be reconciled


FSI II



a is the range of
strong interaction:
 $a \sim 1 \text{ fm}$
 $k < 1/a \sim 200 \text{ MeV}$

:: Bignamini, Piccinini, Polosa, Riquer, Sabelli, Phys.Lett.B684:228-230,2010 ::


FSI II



a is the range of strong interaction:
 $a \sim 1 \text{ fm}$
 $k < 1/a \sim 200 \text{ MeV}$


:: Bignamini, Piccinini, Polosa, Riquer, Sabelli, Phys.Lett.B684:228-230,2010 ::

FSI II



a is the range of strong interaction:
 $a \sim 1 \text{ fm}$
 $k < 1/a \sim 200 \text{ MeV}$


1.



In the standard treatment of FSI (Watson Theorem) one should have **no more than two particles rescattering in the final state**. We find that this is not the case in the CDF simulation.

:: Bignamini, Piccinini, Polosa, Riquer, Sabelli, Phys.Lett.B684:228-230,2010 ::


FSI II



a is the range of strong interaction:
 $a \sim 1 \text{ fm}$
 $k < 1/a \sim 200 \text{ MeV}$

S-wave scattering requires: $ka \ll 1$
 $k \ll 200 \text{ MeV}$


1.



In the standard treatment of FSI (Watson Theorem) one should have **no more than two particles rescattering in the final state.**
 We find that this is not the case in the CDF simulation.

:: Bignamini, Piccinini, Polosa, Riquer, Sabelli, Phys.Lett.B684:228-230,2010 ::


Newcomers in the b-System



FESHBACH MOLECULES

E. Braaten

Much studied in cold atoms physics. What about hadrons?








$$i\frac{\Gamma}{2} = \langle \psi_B | H_{BA} \frac{1}{\mathcal{E} - H_{AA}} H_{AB} | \psi_B \rangle \sim |g|^2$$

[The Breit-Wigner width of a Feshbach resonance is proportional to the coupling squared between the open (A) and closed (B) channels]

LIGHT SCALAR MESONS

LIGHT SCALAR MESONS



Observed by R Jaffe in several works

Diquark Exoticity

$$\begin{aligned}
 q &\mapsto \bar{q} \\
 \bar{q} &\mapsto q
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathfrak{q} = [q \uparrow q \downarrow]_{\bar{\mathbf{3}}_c, \bar{\mathbf{3}}_f} \text{ or, more precisely, } \mathfrak{q}_{i\alpha} = \epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \bar{q}_C^{j\beta} \gamma_5 q^{k\gamma}$$


with such a notation we would write

$$\sigma = \mathfrak{q}^3 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^3; \text{ where } 1, 2, 3 = u, d, s$$

$$\kappa = \mathfrak{q}^2 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^3, \mathfrak{q}^1 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^3, + \text{ conj. doubl.}$$

$$f_0 = \frac{\mathfrak{q}^2 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^2 + \mathfrak{q}^1 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^1}{\sqrt{2}}$$

$$a_0 = \mathfrak{q}^2 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^1, \frac{\mathfrak{q}^2 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^2 - \mathfrak{q}^1 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^1}{\sqrt{2}}, \mathfrak{q}^1 \bar{\mathfrak{q}}^2$$




HOW DOES F0 DECAY?


't Hooft, Isidori, Maiani, Polosa, Riquer, Phys Lett B 2008

The $f_0(980)$, $[us][u^*s^*]$ is known to decay mostly in two pions; the kaon channel being closed by phase space.

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = g_1 S^i_j \epsilon_{ilk} \epsilon^{jmn} \partial_\mu \Pi_m^\ell \partial^\mu \Pi_n^k$$




$$\mathcal{L}_2 = g_2 \text{Tr} S \partial_\mu \Pi \partial^\mu \Pi$$



6-fermion interaction induced by instantons.

vs. double annihilation



BEST FIT

't Hooft, Isidori, Maiani, Polosa, Riquer, *Phys Lett B* 2008

Why not simply invoking the annihilation of strange quarks?

Annihilation would mean 1-the breaking of diquarks 2-the annihilation of strange quarks.

Instantanton induced interactions proceed directly from the diquarks.

Yet the effective treatment of the problem is at the meson level.


Processes	$\mathcal{A}_{\text{th}}([qq][\bar{q}\bar{q}])$			$\mathcal{A}_{\text{th}}(q\bar{q})$		$\mathcal{A}_{\text{expt}}$
	with inst.	no inst.	best fit	with inst.	no inst.	
$\sigma \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$	input	input	1.6	input	input	3.22 ± 0.04
$\kappa^+ \rightarrow K^0 \pi^+$	7.3	7.7	3.3	6.0	5.5	5.2 ± 0.1
$f_0 \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^-$	input	[0-1.6]	1.6	input	[0-1.6]	1.4 ± 0.6
$f_0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$	6.7	6.4	3.5	6.4	6.4	3.8 ± 1.1
$a_0 \rightarrow \pi^0 \eta$	6.7	7.6	2.7	12.4	11.8	2.8 ± 0.1
$a_0 \rightarrow K^+ K^-$	4.9	5.2	2.2	4.1	3.7	2.16 ± 0.04

This is the first global fit which works.

QUARKS IN HADRONS


Quarks are the building blocks of matter.

We describe *baryons* (p, n, \dots) and *mesons* (π ions, K 's, ...) as aggregations of confined quarks



$$\text{baryon} : \epsilon^{ijk} q^i q^j q^k$$


$$\text{meson} : q^i \bar{q}_i$$



This is the picture since the first days of the quark model and the discovery of *color*.

Attraction and repulsion between electric charges is a matter *product of signs*.

In chromodynamics (color SU(3)) it is more complicated than that (matrix tensor products)



DIQUARKS

The 9x9 matrix obtained can be diagonalized along the Kronecker decomposition

$$R_1 \times R_2 = S_1 + S_2 + \dots$$

For example, in the decomposition of

$$\mathbf{3} \times \bar{\mathbf{3}} = \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{8}$$

the tensor product of T 's is **negative** along the **singlet component** (*attraction in the color neutral channel*) and **positive** along the **eight remaining matrix entries** (*repulsion*). However there is *attraction* also in the antitriplet 'channel' of the decomposition

$$\mathbf{3} \times \mathbf{3} = \bar{\mathbf{3}} + \mathbf{6}$$

One gluon-exchange suggests that *diquarks* - qq - states might be formed as a result of this attraction (lattice confirmation!)

HADRONS (60s)

Exponentially rising density of hadron resonances.

$$Z = \sum \underbrace{m^{-k} e^{m/T_H}}_{\rho(m)} e^{-m/T}$$

Hadron matter cannot exist at temperatures $T > T_H$




Fig. 1.2 Number of hadron states as function of mass