Charmonium and X, Y at Belle

Anna Vinokurova BINP, Novosibirsk, Russia

- X(3872)
 - mass & width determination, BR $J/\psi \pi^+\pi^-$ mode
 - angular analysis
 - radiative decays
- Y(4260)
 - search in J/ψπ⁰π⁰ channel
- η_c and $\eta_c(2S)$
 - estimation of the interference effect

Introduction

B-factories provide a great opportunity to study known charmonium states and discover new ones.

Since 2002 B-factories found more than 10 states that

- probably contain a (c anti-c) pair \Rightarrow "charmonium-like" states
- have mass above the open charm threshold
- are in poor agreement with the charmonium potential model

Exotic state models:

- Multiquark state
 - Molecule (two loosely bound charm mesons)
 - Tetraquark (tightly bound four-quark state)
- Hybrid (state with excited gluonic degrees of freedom)
- Hadrocharmonium (charmonium state "coated" by light-hadron matter)
- Threshold effects
 - Virtual state at threshold
 - Charmonium state shifted by nearby D^(*)D^(*) thresholds

None of these models explains all properties of observed exotic states!

X(3872)

First observed by Belle[1] in 2003 in B \rightarrow K(J/ $\psi\pi^+\pi^-$). Mass is close to the (D⁰anti-D^{*0}) threshold. Width is less than experimental resolution. Confirmed by BaBar, CDF, and D0.

Possible interpretations:



large $\mathcal{B}(\chi_{c1}(2P) \rightarrow J/\psi\gamma)$ expected

large width expected



- Charmonium state
 - $\chi_{c1}(2P) \blacksquare$ $\eta_{c2} \blacksquare$
- D⁰anti-D^{*0} molecule most popular model **—** unexplained production in B decays and p anti-p
- (c anti-c) and (D⁰anti-D^{*0}) mixture
- Tetraquark (diquark-diantiquark)
 no charged partner of X found

There are two possibilities for quantum numbers

- $M(\pi^+\pi^-)$ close to ρ decay (Belle[2] and CDF[3]) \oplus X(3872) \rightarrow J/ $\psi\gamma$ (Belle[4] and Babar[5]) established C=+1
- $X \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ (study by CDF[6]) $\Rightarrow 1^{++}$ or 2⁻⁺
- $X \rightarrow J/\psi\gamma$ (Belle and Babar[7]) favors 1⁺⁺
- $X \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^- \pi^0$ (BaBar[8]) favors 2⁻⁺ (?)
- Molecular state model $\Rightarrow 0^{-+}$ or 1^{++}

Anna Vinokurova "Charmonium and X, Y, Z at Belle"

PRL 91 261001
 arXiv:hepex/0505038
 PRL 96 102002
 arXiv:1105.0177
 PRL 102 132001
 PRL 98 132002
 arXiv:1007.4541
 PRD 82 011101

$X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ (1) arXiv:1107.0163

Full Belle data sample: 711 fb⁻¹

Diquark-antidiquark model predicts mass difference ΔM_x on the X mass in the two modes

 $B^+ \rightarrow K^+(J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-)$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^0(J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-)$.



 $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^0$ (2)



 $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \rightarrow K^- X^+) \times \mathcal{B}(X^+ \rightarrow \rho^+ J/\psi) < 4.2 \times 10^{-6}$ No evidence of a charged partner X^+ $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^0 X^+) \times \mathcal{B}(X^+ \rightarrow \rho^+ J/\psi) < 6.1 \times 10^{-6}$

$X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^{+}\pi^{-}(3)$ Angular correlations $(\theta_{x}^{*}, \chi, \theta_{1}) \Rightarrow 1^{++}$ and 2^{-+} hypotheses are both possible

(insufficient statistics).



 $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$ (4)

Fits to $M(\pi^+\pi^-)$ distribution taking $\rho-\omega$ interference into account $\Rightarrow 1^{++}$ and 2^{-+} hypotheses are both possible.



S-wave – dashed, P-wave - solid

$X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi(\psi')\gamma$

Molecular model $\Rightarrow X \rightarrow \psi' \gamma$ is highly suppressed compared to $X \rightarrow J/\psi \gamma$. BaBar[1] results $\Rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X \rightarrow \psi' \gamma)$ is 3 times larger than $\mathcal{B}(X \rightarrow J/\psi \gamma)$. Can be an indication of a (c anti-c) admixture (in addition to a (D⁰anti-D^{*0}) component).



Anna Vinokurova "Charmonium and X, Y, Z at Belle"

arXiv:1105.0177

Y(4260)

 $\psi(2S)\pi^+\pi^-$

First observed by BaBar[1] in 2005 in $e^+e^- \rightarrow (J/\psi \pi^+\pi^-)\gamma_{ISR}$. Confirmed by Belle and CLEO.

Production in ISR \Rightarrow Y(4260) is a 1⁻state.

Family of 4 Y resonances (4008, 4260, 4360, 4660) does not fit into the charmonium spectrum.

Possible interpretations:

Undiscovered ψ resonances
 (3³D₁(4560), 5³S₁(4760), 4³D₁(4810))

• Hybrids - most popular model -

- Hadrocharmonium
- Tetraquarks
- (D anti-D₁) or (D⁰ anti-D^{*}) molecules
- $f_0(980)\psi(2S)$ molecule for Y(4660)



Contra: shifted by ~300 MeV , exotic decay channels
Y(4360) and Y(4660) (higher than DD^{**} threshold) are not seen in e⁺e⁻ → hadrons

> [1] PRL 95 142001 [2] PRL 99 182004

 $Y(4260) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^0 \pi^0$ (1)

Isospin symmetry \Rightarrow Y decays to $(J/\psi\pi^0\pi^0)$ with half the rate of $(J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-)$. Large isospin symmetry violation could be a strong evidence of the exotic nature of Y.

Study of cross-section $e^+e^- \rightarrow (J/\psi \pi^0 \pi^0) \gamma_{ISR}$ as a function of mass is based on 790 fb⁻¹.

Analysis features:

- Require γ_{ISR} (lower backgrounds)
- $J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- (J/\psi \rightarrow e^+e^-)$ is wiped out by the skim conditions)







 M^2_{recoil} distribution for events above 4 GeV is consistent with production via ISR.



$Y(4260) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^0 \pi^0$ (2)



 $\Gamma_{ee} \mathcal{B}(J/\psi \pi^0 \pi^0) = (3.19^{+1.82}_{-1.53}) eV$

 $\Gamma_{ee} \mathcal{B}(J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-) = 2 \cdot (3.0^{+0.6}_{-0.5}) \text{ eV} \text{ [PDG]}$

 $\Gamma_{\text{ee}}(\psi(2S)) = (2.30 \pm 0.10) \text{ keV}$ consistent with $\Gamma_{\rm m}(\psi(2S)) = (2.35 \pm 0.04) \text{ keV} \text{[PDG]}$

Y parameters are fixed from PDG. Background: $(x-x_{\min}) \cdot e^{c(x-x_{\min})}, x_{\min} = m_{J/\psi} - 2m_{\pi^0}$ The shape accounts for effective luminosity and efficiency as a function of mass.



 $B^{\pm} \rightarrow K^{\pm} (K_{s} K \pi)^{0}$ (1) arXiv:1105.0978

A large spread of measured η_c and, especially, $\eta_c(2S)$ parameters.

	BaBar [1][2]	CLEO [3]	Belle[4]
$M(\eta_c), MeV$	2982.2±0.4±1.6	2981.8±1.3±1.5	$2981.4 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.4$
$\Gamma(\eta_{c}), MeV$	31.7±1.2±0.8	24.8±3.4±3.5	36.6±1.5±2.0
$M(\eta_{c}(2S)), MeV$	3630.8±3.4±1.0	3642.9±3.1±1.5	3633.7±2.3±1.9
$\Gamma(\eta_c(2S)), MeV$	17.0±8.3±2.5	6.3±12.4±4.0	19.1±6.9±6.0

[1] PRD 81 052010 [3] PRL 92 142001 [2] PRL 92 142002 [4] NPPS 184 220

B[±]→K[±](K_sKπ)⁰ with the (c anti-c) formation from (K_sKπ)⁰ - **signal** B[±]→K[±](K_sKπ)⁰ without the (c anti-c) formation – **non-resonant component**

Same final state \Rightarrow interference is inevitable! Gives large model uncertainty (>50% for signal yield) \Rightarrow should be taken into account.



 $B^{\pm} \rightarrow K^{\pm} (K_{S} K \pi)^{0}$ (2)

7.150 VN

100

50

N/0.2

100

50

non-res

signal

 $M(K_sK\pi)$ and $\cos\theta$ distributions are used to distinguish signal and non-resonant components. 2D fit:



\mathbf{R}^{\pm} _	$\neg K^{\pm}$	(\mathbf{K})	$(K\pi)^0$	(\mathbf{Z})

$B^{\pm} \rightarrow K^{\pm} \eta_{c}, \eta_{c} \rightarrow (K_{S} K \pi)^{0}$			
<i>B</i> × <i>B</i> , 10 ^{−6}	$26.7 \pm 1.4(\text{stat})^{+2.9}_{-2.6}(\text{syst}) \pm 4.9(\text{model})$		
M(η _c), MeV	$2985.4 \pm 1.5(\text{stat})^{+0.2}_{-2.0}(\text{syst})$		
$\Gamma(\eta_{c}), MeV$	$35.1\pm3.1(\text{stat})^{\pm1.0}_{-1.6}$ (syst)		
$B^{\pm} \rightarrow K^{\pm}$	$= \eta_c(2S), \eta_c(2S) \rightarrow (K_S K \pi)^0$		
<i>B</i> × <i>B</i> , 10 ^{−6}	$3.4^{+2.2}_{-1.5}$ (stat+model) $^{+0.5}_{-0.4}$ (syst)		
$M(\eta_c(2S)), MeV$	$3636.1_{-4.2}^{+3.9}$ (stat+model) $_{-2.0}^{+0.5}$ (syst)		
Γ(η _c (2S)), MeV	$6.6^{+8.4}_{-5.1}$ (stat+model) $^{+2.6}_{-0.9}$ (syst)		

Some of the parameters of the 2D fitting function are dependent \Rightarrow model error.

The procedure of taking the interference into account:

- no assumptions about the phase or absolute value of the interference
- significant decrease of model error for *B*
- comparable errors (despite the additional model error)

Results are consistent with those obtained in the most accurate measurements.

Conclusion

- New measurements of X(3872) parameters. UL on the width is significantly reduced.
- A difference in X(3872) masses produced via decays $B^+ \rightarrow K^+(J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-)$ and $B^0 \rightarrow K^0(J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-)$ is consistent with zero, which does not corroborate diquark-antidiquark model.
- Study of angular correlations and $M(\pi^+\pi^-)$ spectrum in $B^+ \rightarrow K^+(J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-) \Rightarrow$ both 1^{++} or 2^{-+} hypotheses for X(3872) are possible (more statistics is needed).
- No evidence of $X(3872) \rightarrow \psi' \gamma \Rightarrow$ hypothesis of large (c anti-c) admixture in the X(3872) is not confirmed.
- The value of $\mathcal{B}(Y(4260) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^0 \pi^0)$ is consistent with the expectation from isospin.
- Parameters of η_c and $\eta_c(2S)$ have been measured taking into account the interference between signal and non-resonant component.
- B-factories discovered a large number of new charmonium-like states and launched a new era of spectroscopy. Despite the large amount of data that was accumulated, statistics are still insufficient to resolve all the puzzles of exotic states. New Super B-factories are needed!

Backup slides

$X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$



FIG. 2: The $M_{\rm bc}$ (left), $M(\pi^+\pi^- J/\psi)$ (center) and ΔE (right) distributions for $B^+ \to K^+ X(3872)$ (top) and $B^0 \to K_S X(3872)$ (bottom) event candidates within the signal regions of the other two quantities. The curves show the results of the fit described in the text .

TABLE IV: Systematic errors on the mass measurement.

Source	Systematic error (MeV)
$m_{J/\psi}$	0.01
$m_{\psi'}$	0.04
Bias correction	0.16
3-dim. fit model	0.03
MC model dependence	0.09
Quadrature sum	0.19

TABLE V: Systematic errors on the product branching fraction measurement.

Source	$K^+X(3872)$ (percent)	$K_SX(3872)$ (percent)	$\frac{K_S/K^+}{(\text{percent})}$
N _{BB}	1.4	1.4	-
Secondary BF	1.0	1.0	-
MC statistics	1.0	1.0	1.4
MC model	2.1	2.1	-
Hadron ID	3.7	2.6	1.1
Lepton ID	1.1	1.1	-
Tracking	1.8	1.4	0.4
3-dim. fit model	3.0	5.0	6.0
K_S efficiency	12	4.5	4.5
Quadrature sum	6.0	8.1	7.7

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{d\Omega} = \sum_{j} \left| \sum_{\lambda_{J/\psi}\lambda_{\rho}} A^{J^{PC}}_{\lambda_{J/\psi}\lambda_{\rho}} D^{1}_{\lambda_{J/\psi}} (\phi_{J/\psi}, \theta_{J/\psi}) D^{1}_{-\lambda_{\rho}0}(\phi_{\rho}, \theta_{\rho}) D^{J_{X}}_{0 \ (\lambda_{J/\psi}-\lambda_{\rho})}(\phi_{X}, \theta_{X}) \right|^{2}$$

$X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-$



FIG. 3: Fitted vaules for $\Gamma_{X(3872)}$ (vertical) versus the MC generator input values (horizontal). The curve is the result of a fit to a second-order polynomial.



FIG. 4: Likelihood values from the $\Gamma_{X(3872)}$ scan described in the text. The region of the plot below the arrow contains 90% of the total area under the points.

	N_{sig}	r_{ω}	$N_{\rho \to \pi\pi}$	$N_{\omega \to \pi\pi}$	$N_{\rho-\omega \text{ interf}}$
S-wave	159 ± 15	0.07 ± 0.05	140.9	0.6 ± 0.5	17.8
P-wave	158 ± 15	$0.48\substack{+0.20 \\ -0.14}$	93.2	$3.6^{+1.5}_{-1.1}$	60.0

 $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi(\psi')\gamma$

Evidence of $B \rightarrow K\chi_{c2}$: $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\chi_{c2}) / \mathcal{B}(B^+ \rightarrow K^+\chi_{c1}) = (2.25^{+0.73}_{-0.69} \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-2}$ more suppressed than expected in theory[2]

[2] NPB 811 155



FIG. 1: $M_{J/\psi\gamma}$ distributions for (a) $B^+ \to \chi_{c1,c2}(\to J/\psi\gamma)K^+$ and (b) $B^0 \to \chi_{c1,c2}(\to J/\psi\gamma)K^0_S$ decays. The curves show the signal (pink dot-dashed for χ_{c1} and red dashed for χ_{c2}), and the background component (black dot-ted) as well as the overall fit (blue solid). The insets show a reduced range of $M_{J/\psi\gamma}$ and the contribution of the $B \to \chi_{c2}K$ peak.

 $Y(4260) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^0 \pi^0$



Events / 0.17 GeV	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	
	0 ^{[-}	

Table 1:	Summary	of systematic	c uncertainties.
I UUIU I.	Julilla	OI DI DI DICIII alli	

Source	Error on	yield (%)
Luminosity	±1.4	
Branching Fractions	± 1.0	
MuID	±	2.7
Tracking	± 2.0	
Trigger	± 2.8	
Cut selection	+3.2	-2.8
Y(4260) mass and width	+5.5	-5.7
Choice of fit function	+18.3	-7.8
Sum in quadrature	+20	-11

Table 2: Results of fit to $M(\pi^0\pi^0 J/\psi)$ spectrum. The non-resonant contribution is fit using a falling exponential with threshold function.

Parameter	Value	Positive	Negative	Units
		error	error	
$\Gamma_{e^+e^-} \cdot \mathcal{B}(Y(4260) \to \pi^0 \pi^0 J/\psi)$	3.19	+1.82	-1.53	eV
$N(\psi(2S))$	629	+26	-25	
$\psi(2S)$ mean	3.6842	+0.0005	-0.0005	GeV
$N(1\gamma_{bkg})/N(\psi(2S))$	23	+4	-4	%
$N(>1\gamma_{bkg})/N(\psi(2S))$	3.6	+3.5	-3.4	%
N(non-resonant)	14	+8	-7	
Non-resonant shape parameter	-1.4	+0.7	-0.6	

 $Y(4260) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^0 \pi^0$

Cuts:

- Events with only two tracks passing track quality cuts
- MuID: One-hard, one-loose selection require one track with MuID > 0.9, no MuID cut on other track.
 However if the second tracks has MuID equal to zero: require the track to be in the detector forward of cos(θ) > -0.85
- $|M(\mu\mu) m_{J/\psi}| < 25 \text{ MeV} (m_{J/\psi} \text{ is PDG mass})$
- $E(\gamma) > 35$ MeV, quite low by Belle standards, with four π^0 photons in each event, the smallest energy photon distibution goes to quite low energies
- $|M(\gamma\gamma) m_{\pi^0}| < 15 \text{ MeV} (m_{\pi^0} \text{ is PDG mass})$
- $P_{\perp}(\pi^0\pi^0 J/\psi) w.r.t. \gamma_{ISR} < 0.05$ GeV, we require our candidate have the opposite the direction of the ISR photon.
- $|M^2_{recoil}| < 1.2 \text{ GeV}^2$

Multiple π^0 candidates, for a best candidate selection we minimise the sum of the absolute value of the two π^0 decay angles:

$$|\cos(\theta_{\gamma})| = |\frac{E(\pi^{0})}{P(\pi^{0})} \cdot \frac{E(\gamma_{1}) - E(\gamma_{2})}{E(\gamma_{1}) + E(\gamma_{2})}|$$

 $B^{\pm} \rightarrow K^{\pm} (K_{S} K \pi)^{0}$



4

ΔE, GeV





 $B^{\pm} \rightarrow K^{\pm} (K_{S} K \pi)^{0}$





 $B^{\pm} \rightarrow K^{\pm} (K_{S} K \pi)^{0}$

	a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Source	$B^{\pm} \to K^{\pm}$	$^{\pm}(K_SK\pi)^0$
	η_c	$\eta_c(2S)$
Number of $B\bar{B}$ pairs	1.3	1.3
${\cal B}(K_S o \pi^+ \pi^-)$	0.1	0.1
Model efficiency dependence	$^{+8.6}_{-6.7}$	$^{+2.0}_{-1.5}$
Background approximation		+2.3
Bin size	-3.3	$^{+13.3}_{-3.9}$
$\Delta E \operatorname{cut}$	-2.2	+2.3
Detector resolution	+1.1	$^{+4.7}_{-8.6}$
M_{inv} efficiency dependence	+2.2	+0.8
Track reconstruction	3	3
K^{\pm} identification	1.6	1.6
π^{\pm} identification	1 .5	1.5
K_S reconstruction	4.4	4.4
Total, %	$^{+10.7}_{-9.8}$	$^{+15.8}_{-11.9}$

Source	η_c		$\eta_c(2S)$	
	Mass	Width	Mass	Width
Background approximation	<u></u>		+0.2	-0.1
Bin size	+0.2	-1.0	-1.1	+2.4
Detector resolution	-0.1	$^{+1.0}_{-1.2}$	$^{+0.5}_{-0.1}$	$^{+1.8}_{-0.9}$
Scale uncertainty	-2.0	1000	-1.7	- 1
Total, MeV/c^2	$^{+0.2}_{-2.0}$	$^{+1.0}_{-1.6}$	$^{+0.5}_{-2.0}$	$^{+2.6}_{-0.9}$







State	M (MeV)	$\Gamma({ m MeV})$	J^{PC}	Process (mode)	Experiment
B-decays					
$\eta_{ m c}(2S)$	3637 ± 4	14 ± 7	0-+	$K(K^0_SK^-\pi^+)$	Belle(2002), BaBar, CLEO
X(3872)	3871.52 ± 0.20	$1.3 {\pm} 0.6$	1++	$K(\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi)$	Belle(2003), BaBar,CDF,D0
				$K(D^{*0}ar{D^0}),$	
Y(3940)	3915.7 ± 4.2	41 ± 12	$0/2^{?+}$	$K(\omega J/\psi)$	Belle(2004), BaBar
$Z_1(4050)^+$	4051^{+24}_{-43}	82^{+51}_{-55}	?	$K(\pi^+\chi_{c1}(1P))$	Belle (2008)
$Z_2(4250)^+$	4248^{+185}_{-45}	177^{+321}_{-72}	?	$K(\pi^+\chi_{c1}(1P))$	Belle (2008)
$Z(4430)^+$	4443^{+24}_{-18}	107^{+113}_{-71}	?	$K(\pi^+\psi(2S))$	Belle (2007)
Double charmonium					
X(3940)	3942^{+9}_{-8}	37^{+27}_{-17}	$_{3,+}$	$J/\psi(Dar{D^*})$	Belle (2007)
X(4160)	4156^{+29}_{-25}	139^{+113}_{-65}	? ^{?+}	$J/\psi(D^*\bar{D^*})$	Belle (2007)
ISR					
Y(4008)	4008^{+121}_{-49}	226 ± 97	1	$(\pi^+\pi^-J/\psi)$	Belle (2007)
Y(4260)	4263 ± 5	108 ± 14	1	$(\pi^+\pi^- J/\psi)$	BaBar (2005), Belle, CLEO
Y(4360)	4353 ± 11	96 ± 42	1	$(\pi^+\pi^-\psi(2S))$	BaBar (2007), Belle
X(4630)	4634^{+9}_{-11}	92^{+41}_{-32}	1	$(\Lambda_c \Lambda_c)$	Belle (2007)
Y(4660)	4664 ± 12	48 ± 15	1	$(\pi^+\pi^-\psi(2S))$	Belle (2007)
Two photons					
$\chi_{\mathrm{c2}}(2P)$	3927.2 ± 2.6	$24.1{\pm}6.1$	2++	$(D\bar{D})$	Belle(2005), BaBar
X(3915)	3914 ± 4	23^{+10}_{-13}	$0, 2^{++}$	$(\omega J/\psi)$	Belle(2009)
X(4350)	$4350.6^{+4.6}_{-5.1}$	$13.3^{+18.4}_{-10.0}$	$^{0,2^{++}}$	$(\phi J/\psi)$	Belle(2009)
Energy scan and Υ transitions					
$\eta_b(1S)$	9390.7 ± 2.9	?	0-+	$\gamma + ()$	BaBar(2008), CLEO
Y_b	10889.6 ± 2.3	$54.7^{+8.0}_{-7.6}$	1	$\pi^+\pi^-\Upsilon(nS)$	Belle (2008)



