Heavy exotics and kinematical effects

Feng-Kun Guo

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences

New Frontiers in QCD 2018 — Confinement, Phase Transition, Hadrons and Hadron Interactions, YITP, May 28 – June 29, 2018

Based on:

M. Bayar, F. Aceti, FKG, E. Oset, PRD94(2016)074039; (initiated here!)

FKG, U.-G. Meißner, W. Wang, Z. Yang, PRD92(2015)071502(R);

J.-J. Xie, FKG, PLB774(2017)108;

M. Albaladejo, FKG, C. Hidalgo-Duque, J. Nieves, PLB755(2016)337

The search of resonances

In practice, resonance hunting is normally the search of peaks.

Some famous peaks:

$Z_b(10610)$ and $Z_b(10650)$







$Z_c(3900)$, $X(5568)$, $P_c(4380, 4450)$







However, . . .

Resonances do not always appear as peaks:



J. R. Taylor, *Scattering Theory — The Quantum Theory on Nonrelativistic Collisions*

Peaks are not always resonances

- Hadron resonances due to QCD dynamics $\Rightarrow$ poles in the S-matrix:



- Kinematic effects $\Rightarrow$ (normally) branching points of the S-matrix
  - ☞ normal two-body threshold cusp
  - ☞ triangle singularity
  - ☞ . . .

traps/tools in hadron spectroscopy

Peaks are not always resonances

- Hadron resonances due to QCD dynamics $\Rightarrow$ poles in the S-matrix:



- Kinematic effects $\Rightarrow$ (normally) branching points of the S-matrix
  - ☞ normal two-body threshold cusp
  - ☞ triangle singularity
  - ☞ . . .

  traps/tools in hadron spectroscopy

Threshold cusp

- There is always a cusp at an S-wave threshold



$$= \quad \text{disc}\, \mathcal{A}(s) \propto C^*(s) \frac{q_{\rm cm}(s)}{\sqrt{s}} B(s) \theta(s-(m_1+m_2)^2)$$

Threshold cusp: a well-known example

- Cusp effect as a useful tool for precise measurement:
  - ☞ example of the cusp in $K^\pm \to \pi^\pm\pi^0\pi^0$
  - ☞ strength of the cusp measures the interaction strength!

  Meißner, Müller, Steininger (1997); Cabibbo (2004); Colangelo, Gasser, Kubis, Rusetsky (2006); . . .





a precise measurement with an uncertainty of about 2%

$\pi^+\pi^-$ cusp in $\Upsilon(3S) \to \Upsilon(1S)\pi^0\pi^0$

X.-H. Liu, FKG, E. Epelbaum, EPJC73(2013)2284



measurable at Belle-II

Bin width	Events	6×10^4	6×10^5	3×10^6	6×10^6
0.1 MeV	χ^2/dof	1.21	1.09	1.16	0.88
	$a_0 - a_2$	0.293 ± 0.036	0.260 ± 0.012	0.2717 ± 0.0048	0.2661 ± 0.0036
0.2 MeV	χ^2/dof	0.72	1.15	1.05	1.12
	$a_0 - a_2$	0.286 ± 0.035	0.251 ± 0.014	0.2722 ± 0.0048	0.2621 ± 0.0038
0.5 MeV	χ^2/dof	0.93	0.54	1.27	1.30
	$a_0 - a_2$	0.262 ± 0.026	0.256 ± 0.012	0.2659 ± 0.0051	0.2693 ± 0.0035
1 MeV	χ^2/dof	1.05	0.78	1.17	0.69
	$a_0 - a_2$	0.221 ± 0.054	0.291 ± 0.010	0.2658 ± 0.0054	0.2661 ± 0.0037
2 MeV	χ^2/dof	0.59	1.06	1.05	1.37
	$a_0 - a_2$	0.260 ± 0.040	0.262 ± 0.012	0.2592 ± 0.0055	0.2632 ± 0.0037

Triangle singularity



$$\frac{1}{2m_A}\sqrt{\lambda(m_A^2, m_1^2, m_2^2)} \equiv \boxed{p_{2,\text{left}} = p_{2,\text{right}}} \equiv \gamma\,(\beta\, E_2^* - p_2^*)$$

on-shell momentum of m_2 at the left and right cuts in the A rest frame

$\beta = |\vec{p}_{23}|/E_{23}, \gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-\beta^2}$ Bayar et al., PRD94(2016)074039

- $p_2 > 0,\, p_3 = \gamma\,(\beta\, E_3^* + p_2^*) > 0 \Rightarrow m_2$ and m_3 move in the same direction
- velocities in the A rest frame: $v_3 > \beta > v_2$

$$v_2 = \beta\,\frac{E_2^* - p_2^*/\beta}{E_2^* - \beta\, p_2^*} < \beta\,, \qquad v_3 = \beta\,\frac{E_3^* + p_2^*/\beta}{E_3^* + \beta\, p_2^*} > \beta$$

- Conditions (Coleman–Norton theorem): Coleman, Norton (1965); Bronzan (1964)
  - ☞ all three intermediate particles can go on shell simultaneously
  - ☞ $\vec{p}_2 \parallel \vec{p}_3$, particle-3 can catch up with particle-2 (as a classical process)
- needs very special kinematics ⇒ process dependent! (contrary to pole position)

Triangle singularity



$$\frac{1}{2m_A}\sqrt{\lambda(m_A^2, m_1^2, m_2^2)} \equiv \boxed{p_{2,\text{left}} = p_{2,\text{right}}} \equiv \gamma\left(\beta\, E_2^* - p_2^*\right)$$

on-shell momentum of m_2 at the left and right cuts in the A rest frame

$\beta = |\vec{p}_{23}|/E_{23}, \gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-\beta^2}$ Bayar et al., PRD94(2016)074039

- $p_2 > 0$, $p_3 = \gamma\left(\beta\, E_3^* + p_2^*\right) > 0 \Rightarrow m_2$ and m_3 move in the same direction
- velocities in the A rest frame: $v_3 > \beta > v_2$

$$v_2 = \beta\,\frac{E_2^* - p_2^*/\beta}{E_2^* - \beta\, p_2^*} < \beta\,, \qquad v_3 = \beta\,\frac{E_3^* + p_2^*/\beta}{E_3^* + \beta\, p_2^*} > \beta$$

- Conditions (Coleman–Norton theorem): Coleman, Norton (1965); Bronzan (1964)
  ☞ all three intermediate particles can go on shell simultaneously
  ☞ $\vec{p}_2 \parallel \vec{p}_3$, particle-3 can catch up with particle-2 (as a classical process)
- needs very special kinematics ⇒ process dependent! (contrary to pole position)

TS: some details (I)



Consider the scalar three-point loop integral

$$I = i\int \frac{d^4q}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{1}{[(P-q)^2 - m_1^2 + i\epsilon]\,(q^2 - m_2^2 + i\epsilon)\,[(p_{23}-q)^2 - m_3^2 + i\epsilon]}$$

Rewriting a propagator into two poles:

$$\frac{1}{q^2 - m_2^2 + i\epsilon} = \frac{1}{(q^0 - \omega_2 + i\epsilon)\,(q^0 + \omega_2 - i\epsilon)} \quad \text{with} \quad \omega_2 = \sqrt{m_2^2 + \vec{q}^{\,2}}$$

focus on the positive-energy poles

$$I \simeq \frac{i}{8m_1m_2m_3}\int \frac{dq^0 d^3\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{1}{(P^0 - q^0 - \omega_1 + i\epsilon)\,(q^0 - \omega_2 + i\epsilon)\,(p_{23}^0 - q^0 - \omega_3 + i\epsilon)}$$





Contour integral over $q^0 \Rightarrow$

$$I \propto \int \frac{d^3\vec{q}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{[P^0 - \omega_1(q) - \omega_2(q) + i\,\epsilon][p_{23}^0 - \omega_2(q) - \omega_3(\vec{p}_{23} - \vec{q}\,) + i\,\epsilon]}$$

$$\propto \int_0^\infty dq\, \frac{q^2}{P^0 - \omega_1(q) - \omega_2(q) + i\,\epsilon} f(q)$$

The second cut:

$$f(q) = \int_{-1}^{1} dz\, \frac{1}{p_{23}^0 - \omega_2(q) - \sqrt{m_3^2 + q^2 + p_{23}^2 - 2p_{23}qz} + i\,\epsilon}$$

TS: some details (III)

Relation between singularities of integrand and integral

- singularity of integrand does not necessarily give a singularity of integral:
  integral contour may be deformed to avoid the singularity
- Two cases that a singularity cannot be avoided:
  - ☞ endpoint singularity
  - ☞ pinch singularity



TS: some details (III)

Relation between singularities of integrand and integral

- singularity of integrand does not necessarily give a singularity of integral:
  integral contour may be deformed to avoid the singularity
- Two cases that a singularity cannot be avoided:
  - ☞ endpoint singularity
  - ☞ pinch singularity



TS: some details (IV)



$$I \propto \int_0^\infty dq \, \frac{q^2}{P^0 - \omega_1(q) - \omega_2(q) + i\,\epsilon} f(q)$$

$$f(q) = \int_{-1}^{1} dz \, \frac{1}{A(q,z)} \equiv \int_{-1}^{1} dz \, \frac{1}{p_{23}^0 - \omega_2(q) - \sqrt{m_3^2 + q^2 + p_{23}^2 - 2p_{23}qz} + i\,\epsilon}$$

Singularities of the **integrand of I** in the rest frame of initial particle ($P^0 = M$):

- 1st cut: $M - \omega_1(l) - \omega_2(l) + i\,\epsilon = 0 \Rightarrow$

$$q_{\text{on}\pm} \equiv \pm \left(\frac{1}{2M} \sqrt{\lambda(M^2, m_1^2, m_2^2)} + i\,\epsilon \right)$$

- 2nd cut: $A(q, \pm 1) = 0 \Rightarrow$ endpoint singularities of $f(q)$

$$z = +1: \quad q_{a+} = \gamma\,(\beta\,E_2^* + p_2^*) + i\,\epsilon\,, \qquad q_{a-} = \gamma\,(\beta\,E_2^* - p_2^*) - i\,\epsilon\,,$$

$$z = -1: \quad q_{b+} = \gamma\,(-\beta\,E_2^* + p_2^*) + i\,\epsilon\,, \quad q_{b-} = -\gamma\,(\beta\,E_2^* + p_2^*) - i\,\epsilon$$

$$\beta = |\vec{p}_{23}|/E_{23}, \qquad \gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-\beta^2} = E_{23}/m_{23}$$

$E_2^*(p_2^*)$: energy (momentum) of particle-2 in the cmf of the (2,3) system

TS: some details (IV)



$$I \propto \int_0^\infty dq \, \frac{q^2}{P^0 - \omega_1(q) - \omega_2(q) + i\,\epsilon} f(q)$$

$$f(q) = \int_{-1}^{1} dz \, \frac{1}{A(q,z)} \equiv \int_{-1}^{1} dz \, \frac{1}{p_{23}^0 - \omega_2(q) - \sqrt{m_3^2 + q^2 + p_{23}^2 - 2p_{23}qz} + i\,\epsilon}$$

Singularities of the **integrand of I** in the rest frame of initial particle ($P^0 = M$):

- 1st cut: $M - \omega_1(l) - \omega_2(l) + i\,\epsilon = 0 \Rightarrow$

$$q_{\text{on}\pm} \equiv \pm \left(\frac{1}{2M} \sqrt{\lambda(M^2, m_1^2, m_2^2)} + i\,\epsilon \right)$$

- 2nd cut: $A(q, \pm 1) = 0 \Rightarrow$ endpoint singularities of $f(q)$

$$z = +1: \quad q_{a+} = \gamma\,(\beta\,E_2^* + p_2^*) + i\,\epsilon\,, \qquad q_{a-} = \gamma\,(\beta\,E_2^* - p_2^*) - i\,\epsilon\,,$$

$$z = -1: \quad q_{b+} = \gamma\,(-\beta\,E_2^* + p_2^*) + i\,\epsilon\,, \quad q_{b-} = -\gamma\,(\beta\,E_2^* + p_2^*) - i\,\epsilon$$

$$\beta = |\vec{p}_{23}|/E_{23}, \qquad \gamma = 1/\sqrt{1-\beta^2} = E_{23}/m_{23}$$

$E_2^*(p_2^*)$: energy (momentum) of particle-2 in the cmf of the (2,3) system

TS: some details (V)

All singularities of the integrand of I:

$$q_{\text{on}+}, \qquad q_{a+} = \gamma\,(\beta\, E_2^* + p_2^*) + i\,\epsilon, \qquad q_{a-} = \gamma\,(\beta\, E_2^* - p_2^*) - i\,\epsilon,$$

$$q_{\text{on}-} < 0, \quad q_{b-} = -q_{a+} < 0 \text{ (for } \epsilon = 0), \qquad q_{b+} = -q_{a-},$$



(a) (b) (c)



2-body threshold singularity at $m_{23} = m_2 + m_3$

triangle singularity at $q_{\text{on}+} = q_{a-}$

$q_{\text{on}+}$: $p_{2,\text{left}}$, q_{a-}: $p_{2,\text{right}}$ in page 8

LHCb's P_c

PRL115(2015)072001 [arXiv:1507.03414]



$M_1 = (4380 \pm 8 \pm 29)$ MeV, $\Gamma_1 = (205 \pm 18 \pm 86)$ MeV,

$M_2 = (4449.8 \pm 1.7 \pm 2.5)$ MeV, $\Gamma_2 = (39 \pm 5 \pm 19)$ MeV.

LHCb's P_c (II)

- Quantum numbers not fully determined, for ($P_c(4380), P_c(4450)$):
  $(3/2^-, 5/2^+)$, $(3/2^+, 5/2^-)$, $(5/2^+, 3/2^-)$, ... (more see later slides)
- In $J/\psi\, p$ invariant mass distribution, with hidden charm
  $\Rightarrow$ pentaquarks if they are really hadron states
- Narrow pentaquark-like structures with hidden-charm had been predicted 5 years before (07.2010):
  Prediction of narrow N^* and Λ^* resonances with hidden charm above 4 GeV,
  J.-J. Wu, R. Molina, E. Oset, B.-S. Zou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105** (2010) 232001
- Pentaquark candidates! thus important to study in great details

Coincidence of $P_c(4450)$ with kinematic singularities

- Mass: $M_{P_c(4450)} = (4449.8 \pm 1.7 \pm 2.5)$ MeV
- Trivial observation: $P_c(4450)$ coincides with the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold:

$$M_{P_c(4450)} - M_{\chi_{c1}} - M_p = (0.9 \pm 3.1)\ \text{MeV}$$

- Non-trivial observation: there is a triangle singularity at the same time! Solving the equation $p_{2,\text{left}} = p_{2,\text{right}}$ $\Rightarrow$
  to have a TS at $M_{J/\psi p} = M_{\chi_{c1}} + M_p$, we need $M_{\Lambda^*} \simeq 1.89$ GeV
  On shell $\Rightarrow$ Λ^* must be unstable, the TS is then a finite peak



More possible relevant TSs, see X.-H. Liu, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao, PLB757(2015)231

Coincidence of $P_c(4450)$ with kinematic singularities

- Mass: $M_{P_c(4450)} = (4449.8 \pm 1.7 \pm 2.5)$ MeV
- Trivial observation: $P_c(4450)$ coincides with the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold:

$$M_{P_c(4450)} - M_{\chi_{c1}} - M_p = (0.9 \pm 3.1)\ \text{MeV}$$

- Non-trivial observation: there is a triangle singularity at the same time! Solving the equation $\boxed{p_{2,\text{left}} = p_{2,\text{right}}}$ $\Rightarrow$
  to have a TS at $M_{J/\psi p} = M_{\chi_{c1}} + M_p$, we need $M_{\Lambda^*} \simeq 1.89$ GeV
  On shell $\Rightarrow$ Λ^* must be unstable, the TS is then a finite peak





More possible relevant TSs, see X.-H. Liu, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao, PLB757(2015)231

Trajectories of triangle singularities in complex energy plane

Dalitz plot for $\Lambda_b \to \chi_{c1} p K^-$:





numbers: assumed masses for Λ^*

- ☞ blue: proton and χ_{c1} are parallel, in the 2nd Riemann sheet
- ☞ green: proton and χ_{c1} are anti-parallel

$M_{\Lambda_b} = 5.62$ GeV, $M_{\chi_{c1}} = 3.51$ GeV, $\sqrt{s} \equiv M(\chi_{c1} p)$

$$M_{K^-p,A} = M_{\Lambda_b} - M_{\chi_{c1}}, \qquad M_{K^-p,B} = \sqrt{\frac{M_{\Lambda_b}^2 M_p + M_K^2 M_{\chi_{c1}}}{M_{\chi_{c1}} + M_p} - M_{\chi_{c1}} M_p}$$

FKG et al., PRD92(2015)071502(R); X.-H. Liu, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao, PLB757(2015)231

- When $M_{\Lambda^*} = 1.89$ GeV, TS is located exactly at the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold, 4.449 GeV!
- Four-star baryon $\Lambda(1890)$: $J^P = 3/2^+$, $\Gamma:\ 60 - 200$ MeV
- triangle loop with S-wave $\chi_{c1}p$: $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^+$ or $\frac{3}{2}^+$





- impossible to produce a narrow peak for $\chi_{c1}p$ in other partial waves

Bayar et al., PRD94(2016)074039

TS for $P_c(4450)$

FKG et al., PRD92(2015)071502(R); X.-H. Liu, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao, PLB757(2015)231

- When $M_{\Lambda^*} = 1.89$ GeV, TS is located exactly at the $\chi_{c1}p$ threshold, 4.449 GeV!
- Four-star baryon $\Lambda(1890)$: $J^P = 3/2^+$, $\Gamma:\ 60 - 200$ MeV
- triangle loop with S-wave $\chi_{c1}p$: $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^+$ or $\frac{3}{2}^+$





- impossible to produce a narrow peak for $\chi_{c1}p$ in other partial waves

Bayar et al., PRD94(2016)074039

TS for $P_c(4450)$: Comments

- Position of the TS completely fixed; shape also largely fixed
- but, strength of the TS is unknown
- operative in $J/\psi\pi$ quantum numbers $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^+$ or $\frac{3}{2}^+$

		$P_c(4380)$		$P_c(4450)$	
$J^p(4380, 4450)$	$(\sqrt{\Delta(-2\ln\mathcal{L})})^2$	M_0	Γ_0	M_0	Γ_0
	$(3/2-, 5/2^+)$ solution				
$3/2^-, 5/2^+$	$--$	4359	151	4450.1	49
	Δ from $(3/2-, 5/2^+)$ solution				
$5/2^+, 3/2^-$	-3.6^2	10	-7	-1.6	-6
$5/2^-, 3/2^+$	-2.7^2	-4	-9	-3.6	-2
$3/2^-, 5/2^+$	$-$	$-$	$-$	$-$	$-$

from a reanalysis of the LHCb data using an extended Λ^* model

N. Jurik, CERN-THESIS-2016-086

- does not exclude the possibility of the existence of a pentaquark in addition

TS for $P_c(4450)$: Comments

- Position of the TS completely fixed; shape also largely fixed
- but, strength of the TS is unknown
- operative in $J/\psi\pi$ quantum numbers $J^P = \frac{1}{2}^+$ or $\frac{3}{2}^+$

		$P_c(4380)$		$P_c(4450)$	
$J^p(4380, 4450)$	$(\sqrt{\Delta(-2\ln\mathcal{L})})^2$	M_0	Γ_0	M_0	Γ_0
	$(3/2-, 5/2^+)$ solution				
$3/2^-, 5/2^+$	$--$	4359	151	4450.1	49
	Δ from $(3/2-, 5/2^+)$ solution				
$5/2^+, 3/2^-$	-3.6^2	10	-7	-1.6	-6
$5/2^-, 3/2^+$	-2.7^2	-4	-9	-3.6	-2
$3/2^-, 5/2^+$	–	–	–	–	–

from a reanalysis of the LHCb data using an extended Λ^* model

N. Jurik, CERN-THESIS-2016-086

- does not exclude the possibility of the existence of a pentaquark in addition

How to distinguish a TS from a genuine resonance?

- Schmid theorem: C. Schmid, Phys. Rev. 154 (1967) 1363

see also, A. V. Anisovich, V. V. Anisovich, Phys. Lett. B 345 (1995) 321

Triangle singularity cannot produce an additional peak in the invariant mass distribution of the elastic channel when neglecting inelasticity



Nearby the effective singularity:

$$\mathcal{A}_{(a)+(b)}(s) \sim [1 + 2i\rho(s)T(s)]\, \mathcal{A}_{(a)}(s) = e^{2i\,\delta_{\chi_{c1}p}(s)} \mathcal{A}_{(a)}(s)$$

here $\delta_{\chi_{c1}p}$ is the elastic $\chi_{c1}p$ scattering phase shift

- corrections from coupled channels A. Szczepaniak, PLB757(2016)61

How to distinguish a TS from a genuine resonance?

- determining quantum numbers unambiguously:

  TS as discussed here requires the $\chi_{c1}p$ in S-wave $\Rightarrow J^P = \frac{1}{2}^+$ or $\frac{3}{2}^+$

- processes (such as photoproduction) with a different kinematics

  Q. Wang, X.-H. Liu, Q. Zhao, PRD92(2015)034022;

  V. Kubarovsky, M. Voloshin, PRD92(2015)031502;

  M. Karliner, J. L. Rosner, PLB752(2015)329; ...

- measuring the process $\Lambda_b^0 \to \chi_{c1}\, p\, K^-$

  ☞ if a narrow near-threshold peak in $\chi_{c1}\, p \Rightarrow$ a real exotic resonance

  recently measured by LHCb in PRL119(2017)062001, no invariant mass distribution reported:

$$\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b^0 \to \chi_{c1} p K^-) = \left(7.4 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.6^{+1.0}_{-0.7}\right) \times 10^{-5}$$
$$\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b^0 \to J/\psi p K^-) = \left(3.01 \pm 0.22^{+0.43}_{-0.27}\right) \times 10^{-4}$$

  With LHC Run-1 data, statistics not enough N. Jurik, Mitsuyoshi Tanaka Dissertation Award Talk at the APS April Meeting 2018

P_s searching

- A ϕp bound state was predicted in several models with a mass ~ 2 GeV
  H. Gao, T.S.H. Lee, V. Marinov, PRC63(2001)022201;
  F. Huang, Z.-Y. Zhang, Y.-W. Yu, PRC73(2006)025207;
  H. Gao, H. Huang, T. Liu, J. Ping, F. Wang, Z. Zhao, PRC95(2017)055202
- Lattice evidence for strangenium-nucleon bound state at a large quark mass
  $m_{u,d,s}^{\text{Lat.}} = m_s^{\text{ph.}} \quad (M_\pi^{\text{Lat.}} \simeq 805\text{ MeV})$ S.R. Beane et al. [NPLQCD], PRD91(2015)114503
- Bump observed at $\sqrt{s} \sim 2$ GeV by LEPS and CLAS in $\gamma p \to \phi p$
  LEPS, PRL95(2005)182001; CLAS, PRC89(2014)055208, PRC90(2014)019901
- Suggestion to search for P_s in $\Lambda_c \to \pi^0 \phi p$ R. Lebed, PRD92(2015)114030





- No clear evidence was found in Belle searching Belle, PRD96(2017)051102(R)

TS and P_s in $\Lambda_c \to p\phi\pi^0$

J.-J. Xie, FKG, PLB774(2017)108









Model I: the BV interaction model (P_s generated) of A. Ramos, E. Oset, PLB727(2013)287;

Model II: no resonance, constant interaction; Model III: phase space

P_s (continued)



- TS produces a bump at around 2.02 GeV, width mainly from that of K^*
- P_s, if exists, could distort the line shape, but difficult to be distinguished from TS in this process
- A measurement of $\Lambda_c \to \Sigma^* K^*$ can help constrain the TS strength

Z_b/Z_c: threshold cusps?

- Models of $Z_b(10610, 10650), Z_c(3900, 4020)$ as threshold cusps
  - ☞ Bugg, Swanson: D. Bugg, EPL96(2011)11002; E. Swanson, PRD91(2015)034009





  - ☞ Initial pion radiation: D.-Y.Chen, X.Liu, PRD84(2011)094003; PRD84(2011)034032; Chen, Liu, Matsuki, PRD84(2011)074032; PRL110(2013)232001; ...

Z_b/Z_c: threshold cusps?

- Models of $Z_b(10610, 10650)$, $Z_c(3900, 4020)$ as threshold cusps
  - ☞ Bugg, Swanson: D. Bugg, EPL96(2011)11002; E. Swanson, PRD91(2015)034009





  - ☞ Initial pion radiation: D.-Y.Chen, X.Liu, PRD84(2011)094003; PRD84(2011)034032; Chen, Liu, Matsuki, PRD84(2011)074032; PRL110(2013)232001; . . .





Z_b/Z_c: threshold cusps?

- But $Z_c(3900)[Z_b]$ as a narrow peak in $D\bar{D}^*[B\bar{B}^*]$ distribution cannot be only due to cusp: prominent cusp $\Rightarrow$ strong int. $\Rightarrow$ pole!

FKG, Hanhart, Wang, Zhao, PRD91(2015)051504





Black curve: up to 1 loop with $C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E_{\rm th}) = -1/2$,

no narrow peak any more!

$g_Y\,[1 + C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) + C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) + \ldots]$ produces a pole

- so far, triangle diagrams not considered (see next slides)

Z_b/Z_c: threshold cusps?

- But $Z_c(3900)[Z_b]$ as a narrow peak in $D\bar{D}^*[B\bar{B}^*]$ distribution cannot be only due to cusp: prominent cusp $\Rightarrow$ strong int. $\Rightarrow$ pole!

FKG, Hanhart, Wang, Zhao, PRD91(2015)051504



Black curve: up to 1 loop with $C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E_{\text{th}}) = -1/2$, no narrow peak any more!

$g_Y\,[1 + C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) + C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) + \ldots]$ produces a pole

- so far, triangle diagrams not considered (see next slides)

Z_b/Z_c: threshold cusps?

- But $Z_c(3900)[Z_b]$ as a narrow peak in $D\bar{D}^*[B\bar{B}^*]$ distribution cannot be only due to cusp: prominent cusp $\Rightarrow$ strong int. $\Rightarrow$ pole!

FKG, Hanhart, Wang, Zhao, PRD91(2015)051504





Black curve: up to 1 loop with $C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E_{\text{th}}) = -1/2$,

no narrow peak any more!

$g_Y\,[1 + C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) + C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) + \ldots]$ produces a pole

- so far, triangle diagrams not considered (see next slides)

Z_b/Z_c: threshold cusps?

- But $Z_c(3900)[Z_b]$ as a narrow peak in $D\bar{D}^*[B\bar{B}^*]$ distribution cannot be only due to cusp: prominent cusp $\Rightarrow$ strong int. $\Rightarrow$ pole!

FKG, Hanhart, Wang, Zhao, PRD91(2015)051504





Black curve: up to 1 loop with $C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E_{\text{th}}) = -1/2$,

no narrow peak any more!

$g_Y\,[1 + C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) + C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) C_\Lambda\, G_\Lambda(E) + \ldots]$ produces a pole

- so far, triangle diagrams not considered (see next slides)

$Z_c(3900)$: triangle diagram

- Consider the triangle loop:



- For $E_{\rm cm} = 4.26$ GeV, TS in the unphysical region

- Enhancement very sensitive to the cm energy

- Consider the triangle loop:



- For $E_{\rm cm} = 4.26$ GeV, TS in the unphysical region



- Enhancement very sensitive to the cm energy

$Z_c(3900)$: triangle diagram

- Consider the triangle loop:



- For $E_{\rm cm} = 4.26$ GeV, TS in the unphysical region



- Enhancement very sensitive to the cm energy





More about $Z_c(3900)$

Triangle + coupled-channel FSI

Albaladejo, FKG, Hidalgo-Duque, Nieves, PLB755(2016)337



More about $Z_c(3900)$



M_{Z_c} (MeV)	$\Gamma_{Z_c}/2$ (MeV)	Ref.	Final state
3899 ± 6	23 ± 11	[1] (BESIII)	$J/\psi\ \pi$
3895 ± 8	32 ± 18	[2] (Belle)	$J/\psi\ \pi$
3886 ± 5	19 ± 5	[3] (CLEO-c)	$J/\psi\ \pi$
3884 ± 5	12 ± 6	[4] (BESIII)	$\bar{D}^* D$
3882 ± 3	13 ± 5	[5] (BESIII)	$\bar{D}^* D$
$3894 \pm 6 \pm 1$	$30 \pm 12 \pm 6$	$\Lambda_2 = 1.0$ GeV	$J/\psi\ \pi,\ \bar{D}^* D$
$3886 \pm 4 \pm 1$	$22 \pm 6 \pm 4$	$\Lambda_2 = 0.5$ GeV	$J/\psi\ \pi,\ \bar{D}^* D$
$3831 \pm 26^{+7}_{-28}$	virtual state	$\Lambda_2 = 1.0$ GeV	$J/\psi\ \pi,\ \bar{D}^* D$
$3844 \pm 19^{+12}_{-21}$	virtual state	$\Lambda_2 = 0.5$ GeV	$J/\psi\ \pi,\ \bar{D}^* D$

resonance pole

or virtual state

$Z_c(3900)$: Interpreting lattice results by Prelovsek et al.





Albaladejo, Fernandez-Soler, Nieves, EPJC76(2016)573



- Lat. ($M_\pi = 266$ MeV): Prelovsek et al., PRD91(2015)014504
  “no additional eigenstate” corresponding to Z_c
- In finite volume ($L = 2$ fm): consistent with lattice energy levels, but with a pole in continuum!

$Y(4260) \to Z_c\pi$: TS or not?

- Importance of TS in $Y(4260) \to Z_c\pi$ already noticed, but Z_c pole still needed

  Q.Wang, Hanhart, Q.Zhao, PRL111(2013)132002; PLB725(2013)106

- however, debate continues: whether Z_c pole is needed seems still inconclusive

  Pilloni et al. (JPAC), PLB772(2017)200

$Y(4260) \to Z_c\pi$: TS or not?

- Importance of TS in $Y(4260) \to Z_c\pi$ already noticed, but Z_c pole still needed

Q.Wang, Hanhart, Q.Zhao, PRL111(2013)132002; PLB725(2013)106

- however, debate continues: whether Z_c pole is needed seems still inconclusive

Pilloni et al. (JPAC), PLB772(2017)200

Pole+TS:



$Y(4260) \to Z_c\pi$: TS or not?

- Importance of TS in $Y(4260) \to Z_c\pi$ already noticed, but Z_c pole still needed

  Q.Wang, Hanhart, Q.Zhao, PRL111(2013)132002; PLB725(2013)106

- however, debate continues: whether Z_c pole is needed seems still inconclusive

  Pilloni et al. (JPAC), PLB772(2017)200



Pole+TS:



Only TS:

But...

More data needed

New data from BESIII in the $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ channel

BESIII, PRL119(2017)072001



To-do list

- To search for resonances in processes with different kinematics, and to measure the quantum numbers
- To estimate the strength of the TS contributions, see, e.g., many papers by Eulogio
- Analysis framework incorporating kinematic singularities
- Not just traps, but also tools:
  TS enhancement $\Rightarrow$ enhanced production;
  S-wave $\Rightarrow$ quantum number filter

To-do list

- To search for resonances in processes with different kinematics, and to measure the quantum numbers
- To estimate the strength of the TS contributions, see, e.g., many papers by Eulogio
- Analysis framework incorporating kinematic singularities
- Not just traps, but also tools:
  TS enhancement $\Rightarrow$ enhanced production;
  S-wave $\Rightarrow$ quantum number filter

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!

Backup slides

Triangle singularity – literature

- Some recent works using triangle singularity to explain (part of) peak structures [$\eta(1405/1475)$, $a_1(1420)$, $\ldots$]:

  J.-J. Wu, X.-H. Liu, Q. Zhao and B.-S. Zou, PRL108(2012)081803;

  X.-G. Wu, J.-J. Wu, Q. Zhao and B.-S. Zou, PRD87(2013)014023(2013);

  Q. Wang, C. Hanhart and Q. Zhao, PLB725(2013)106;

  M. Mikhasenko, B. Ketzer and A. Sarantsev, PRD91(2015)094015;

  X.-H. Liu, M. Oka and Q. Zhao, PLB753(2016)297;

  A. P. Szczepaniak, PLB747(2015)410; PLB757(2016)61;

  F. Aceti, L.-R. Dai and E. Oset, PRD94(2016)096015;

  A. E. Bondar and M. B. Voloshin, PRD93(2016)094008

  V. R. Debastiani, F. Aceti, W.-H. Liang, E. Oset, PRD95(2017)034015

  ......

  Recent reviews:

  Q.Zhao, JPS Conf.Proc.13(2017)010008; FKG et al., RMP90(2018)015004

  Recent lecture notes by one of the key players:

  I. J. R. Aitchison, arXiv:1507.02697 [hep-ph], *Unitarity, Analyticity and Crossing Symmetry in Two- and Three-hadron Final State Interactions*

$\eta(1405/1475)$

J.-J. Wu, X.-H. Liu, Q. Zhao and B.-S. Zou, PRL108(2012)081803;

X.-G. Wu, J.-J. Wu, Q. Zhao and B.-S. Zou, PRD87(2013)014023(2013)





Unique consequence: huge isospin breaking, vary narrow $f_0(980)$ peak ~ 10 MeV





BESIII, PRL108(2012)182001