

$X(2239)$ and $\eta(2225)$ as hidden-strange molecular states from $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction

Jun-Tao Zhu^{1,*}, Yi Liu^{1,*}, Dian-Yong Chen², Longyu Jiang³, Jun He^{1,†}

¹*Department of Physics and Institute of Theoretical Physics, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210097, China,*

²*School of Physics, Southeast University, Nanjing 210094, China,*

³*The Laboratory of Image Science and Technology, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China*

(Dated: March 18, 2022)

In this work, we propose a possible assignment of the newly observed $X(2239)$, as well as the $\eta(2225)$, as a molecular state from the interaction of a baryon Λ and an antibaryon $\bar{\Lambda}$. With the help of effective Lagrangians, the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction is described within the one-boson-exchange model with η , η' , ω , ϕ , and σ exchanges considered. After inserting the potential kernel into the quasipotential Bethe-Salpeter equation, the bound states from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction can be studied by searching for the pole of the scattering amplitude. Two loosely bound states with spin parities $I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(0^{++})$ and $0^-(1^{--})$ appear near the threshold almost with the same parameter. The $0^-(1^{--})$ state can be assigned to the $X(2239)$ observed at BESIII, which is very close to the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold. The scalar meson $\eta(2225)$ can be interpreted as a $0^+(0^{++})$ state from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction. The annihilation effect is also discussed through a coupled-channel calculation plus a phenomenological optical potential. It provides large widths to two bound states produced from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction. The mass of the 1^- state is a little larger than the mass of the 0^- state after including the annihilation effect, which is consistent with our assignment of these two states as $X(2239)$ and $\eta(2225)$, respectively. The results suggest that further investigation is expected to understand the structures near the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold, such as $X(2239)$, $\eta(2225)$, and $X(2175)$.

I. INTRODUCTION

After the observation of $X(3872)$ at Belle, more and more XYZ particles were reported at different experimental facilities, and attract great interest from theoretical side [1]. Many XYZ particles are suggested to be candidates of the exotic hadrons beyond the conventional $q\bar{q}/qqq$ picture. One of the popular interpretations of the XYZ particles is the molecular state, which is a loosely bound state composed of two hadrons. The possible molecular states are widely discussed theoretically and applied to explain the observed exotic hadrons. The molecular states from the interaction of charmed/bottomed and anticharmed/antibottomed mesons are often related to the XYZ particles, such as the $Z_c(3900)$, $Z_b(4020)$, $Z_b(10610)$, and $Z_c(10650)$ [2–8]. The recent observed P_c states near the $\Sigma_c^* \bar{D}^{(*)}$ threshold give people more confidence in the molecular state picture [9–20]. In the light sector, the $\Lambda(1405)$ is also proposed to be generated from the $\bar{K}N$ interaction [21–24]. However, the study of a molecular state composed of a baryon and an antibaryon is scarce in the literature, and the experimental hint about such state was also rarely reported. In the charmed sector, the $Y(4630)$ was explained as a bound state from the $\Lambda_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$ interaction [25]. Theoretically, the interaction between two baryons is analogous to that between two mesons. Moreover, generally speaking, a baryon-antibaryon pair is also not difficult to be produced in experiment. Hence, it is interesting to study the molecular state composed of a baryon and an antibaryon.

In fact, even before proposition of the quark model, the possibility to interpret π meson as a $N\bar{N}$ bound state was discussed by Fermi and Yang [26]. However, such attempt is incorrect based on later studies, and was abandoned soon. The

$X(1835)$ was also connected to a $N\bar{N}$ bound state [27–29]. Recently, the BESIII collaboration reported a resonance structure by analyzing the cross section of the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow K^+K^-$ at the center-of-mass energies ranging from 2 to 3.08 GeV. The structure is denoted as $X(2239)$ which has a mass of $2239 \pm 7.1 \pm 11.3$ MeV and a width of $139.8 \pm 12.3 \pm 20.6$ MeV [30]. Some investigations were performed to interpret the $X(2239)$ [31, 32]. In Ref. [32], based on the mass estimated in a relativized quark model, the $X(2239)$ can be explained as a candidate of P-wave $ss\bar{s}$ tetraquark state. An important observation about the $X(2239)$ is that it is almost at the threshold of the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction after considering the experimental uncertainty of the mass. If we recall that the $X(2239)$ has spin parity $J^P = 1^-$ and was observed in the hidden-strange K^+K^- channel, it is a good candidate for a hidden-strange molecular state composed of a baryon Λ and an antibaryon $\bar{\Lambda}$.

Before the observation of $X(2239)$, another state with the same quantum number, the $Y(2175)$, also named as $\phi(2170)$ in the literature, was observed by the Babar Collaboration in the initial-state-radiation process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma_{ISR} \phi(1020) f_0(980)$ with a mass of about 2175 MeV [33]. Since the $Y(2175)$ was observed, it has been investigated in many theoretical pictures, which include qqg hybrid [34, 35], $ss\bar{s}$ tetraquark state [36–38], excited $1^{--}s\bar{s}$ state [39], resonance state of $\phi K \bar{K}$ [40, 41], and some other interesting speculations [42–44]. It is also possible that the $X(2239)$ and $X(2175)$ are the same state [1, 45]. However, a 1^{--} state with a mass of $2135 \pm 8 \pm 9$ MeV and a width of $104 \pm 24 \pm 12$ MeV was also observed in the $\phi f_0(980)$ channel at BESIII [46]. It is more appropriate to take these two states as two separate states if we accept the large mass gap of these two states as observed experimentally. Besides, a state with a mass of about 2220 MeV was observed by the DM2 Collaboration and confirmed at MARK-III in the radiative decays $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma \phi \phi$ [47, 48]. Later, the BES and BESIII Collaborations also confirmed the existence of the $\eta(2225)$ [49, 50]. There exist also a few

*These authors have contributed equally to this work.

†Corresponding author: junhe@njnu.edu.cn

theoretical interpretations of the $\eta(2225)$, such as a 4^1S_0 $s\bar{s}$ state [51, 52].

As indicated in Ref. [53], which was done before the observation of $X(2239)$ at BESIII, the $Y(2175)$ and $\eta(2225)$ can be interpreted as $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}(^3S_1)$ and $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}(^1S_0)$ molecular states, respectively, which is also the first attempt to discuss the possible molecular state from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction. However, it should be noticed that the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold is about 2231.3 MeV, while the mass of $Y(2175)$ is about 60 MeV lower than the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold, which is too deep to be a molecular state. Moreover, a recent measurement at BESIII indicates that the mass of $Y(2175)$ is about 2135 MeV [46], which is about one hundred MeV below the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold. As for the newly observed $X(2239)$, its mass seems closer to the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold. Hence, it is interesting to study the possibility of assignment of the $X(2239)$, rather than the $Y(2175)$, as candidate of $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}(1^-)$ molecular state. There also exist theoretically study about the molecular state from the $\Lambda\Lambda$ interaction [54–56]. It is found that in a lattice calculation the $\Lambda\Lambda$ interaction is attractive, but too weak to form a molecular state [54].

Recalling the results in Ref. [53], one can find that the mass gap between the $Y(2175)$ and $\eta(2235)$ was reproduced from a calculation with S-wave $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction in the one-boson-exchange model by solving the non-relativistic Schrödinger equation. The 1^- state has a larger binding energy than 0^- state. And the D-wave interaction only involve in the 1^- state, which suggests that inclusion of the relativistic effect and the S-D mixing may change the mass gap between two states. In the quasipotential Bethe-Salpeter (qBSE) approach, such effects can be included naturally. It is interesting to make a calculation in such approach to see the variation of the mass gap. It provides a possibility to obtain two bound states both close to the threshold, which is more consistent with the molecular state as a loosely bound state of two hadrons. Besides, for the $N\bar{N}$ interaction, the annihilation effect was found important in the literature [57–60], which may affect the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction also. The theoretical values of the mass will deviate from the one within the one-boson-exchange model, and the bound state will acquire a width after the annihilation effect is included.

In the current work, we adopt qBSE approach to study the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction. With the help of the effective Lagrangians, the one-boson-exchange model with pseudoscalar, scalar, and vector exchanges is applied to construct the interaction. The annihilation effect will be introduced by coupled-channel effect plus an imaginary optical potential. By inserting the potential into the qBSE, the molecular states with quantum numbers $I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(0^{+-})$ and $0^-(1^{--})$ will be investigated.

The paper is organized as follows. After the introduction, we present relevant Lagrangians to construct the meson exchange potential. The qBSE approach is also briefly introduced in Section II. The numerical results of bound states produced from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction within one-boson-exchange model are presented in Subsection III A. We discuss the annihilation effect on the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction, and the results with such effect are given in Subsection III B. The paper ends with discussion and summary.

II. THEORETICAL FRAME

First, we describe the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction within the one-boson-exchange model. As in Ref. [53], to construct the potential, the Lagrangians for the couplings between the Λ baryon and exchanged mesons can be written as,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\eta\Lambda\Lambda} = -ig_{\eta\Lambda\Lambda}\bar{\psi}_\Lambda\gamma_5\psi_\Lambda\eta, \quad (1)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\eta'\Lambda\Lambda} = -ig_{\eta'\Lambda\Lambda}\bar{\psi}_\Lambda\gamma_5\psi_\Lambda\eta', \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\sigma\Lambda\Lambda} = g_{\sigma\Lambda\Lambda}\bar{\psi}_\Lambda\psi_\Lambda\sigma, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\omega\Lambda\Lambda} = -g_{\omega\Lambda\Lambda}\bar{\psi}_\Lambda\gamma_\mu\omega^\mu\psi_\Lambda, \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\phi\Lambda\Lambda} = -g_{\phi\Lambda\Lambda}\bar{\psi}_\Lambda\gamma_\mu\phi^\mu\psi_\Lambda, \quad (5)$$

where the ψ_Λ , η , η' , σ , ω , and ϕ are the fields of Λ baryon, η , η' , σ , ω , and ϕ mesons. The coupling constant $g_{e\Lambda\Lambda}$ can be derived by the SU(3) symmetry and considering the mixings between octet and singlet states [53], and the masses of exchanged mesons m_e are cited from the Review of Particle Physics (PDG) [1], the explicit values are listed below,

$$g_{\eta\Lambda\Lambda}^2/4\pi = 4.473, \quad m_\eta = 548.8 \text{ MeV},$$

$$g_{\eta'\Lambda\Lambda}^2/4\pi = 9.831, \quad m_{\eta'} = 957.7 \text{ MeV},$$

$$g_{\sigma\Lambda\Lambda}^2/4\pi = 3.459, \quad m_\sigma = 500.0 \text{ MeV},$$

$$g_{\omega\Lambda\Lambda}^2/4\pi = 8.889, \quad m_\omega = 782.6 \text{ MeV},$$

$$g_{\phi\Lambda\Lambda}^2/4\pi = 2.222, \quad m_\phi = 1019.5 \text{ MeV}.$$

The mass of σ meson has a large uncertainty 400 – 550 MeV [1]. Here we choose a value of 500 MeV, and the uncertainty will be discussed latter.

In the current work, we consider the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction instead of the $\Lambda\Lambda$ interaction. Hence, the couplings between the light mesons and the antibaryon $\bar{\Lambda}$ are also required. As in the nucleon-antinucleon interaction, we adopt the well-known G-parity rule to write the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction from the $\Lambda\Lambda$ interaction. By inserting the $G^{-1}G$ operator into the potential, the G-parity rule can be obtained easily as [57, 61],

$$V = \sum_i \zeta_i V_{i\Lambda\Lambda}. \quad (6)$$

The G parity of the exchanged meson is left as a ζ_i factor for i meson. Since ω and ϕ mesons carry odd G parity, ζ_ω and ζ_ϕ should equal -1 , and others still equal 1. Finally, we reach a relation as,

$$V_{\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}} = V_{\eta\Lambda\Lambda} + V_{\eta'\Lambda\Lambda} + V_{\sigma\Lambda\Lambda} - V_{\omega\Lambda\Lambda} - V_{\phi\Lambda\Lambda}. \quad (7)$$

Now, we only need the potential of the $\Lambda\Lambda$ interaction. With the Lagrangians and the coupling constants given above, we can write the relevant meson exchange potentials with the standard Feynman rule as,

$$\begin{aligned} iV_{\mathbb{P}\Lambda\Lambda} &= -g_{\mathbb{P}\Lambda\Lambda}^2 \bar{u}_\Lambda \gamma_5 u_\Lambda \frac{1}{q^2 - m_{\mathbb{P}}^2} f_i(q^2) \bar{u}_\Lambda \gamma_5 u_\Lambda, \\ iV_{\mathbb{V}\Lambda\Lambda} &= g_{\mathbb{V}\Lambda\Lambda}^2 \bar{u}_\Lambda \gamma_\mu u_\Lambda \frac{-g^{\mu\nu} + q^\mu q^\nu / m_{\mathbb{V}}^2}{q^2 - m_{\mathbb{V}}^2} f_i(q^2) \bar{u}_\Lambda \gamma_\mu u_\Lambda, \\ iV_{\sigma\Lambda\Lambda} &= g_{\sigma\Lambda\Lambda}^2 \bar{u}_\Lambda u_\Lambda \frac{1}{q^2 - m_\sigma^2} f_i(q^2) \bar{u}_\Lambda u_\Lambda, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the u_Λ is the spinor of the Λ baryon. The q , $m_{\mathbb{P}}$, $m_{\mathbb{V}}$, and m_σ are the exchanged momentum, and the masses of exchanged pseudoscalar \mathbb{P} (η and η'), vector \mathbb{V} (ω and ϕ) and scalar σ mesons.

Usually, a form factor should be introduced at the vertices because the exchanged mesons are not point particles and have internal structure. Such form factors are also used to ensure the convergence of the integral (the qBSE is an integral equation and will be given later). There exist many types of the form factors in the literature. Due to absence of experimental data of the $\Lambda\Lambda$ interaction, we can not determine which type is more realistic. In the current work, we adopt three types of form factors as in Ref. [62],

$$f_1(q^2) = \frac{\Lambda_e^2 - m_e^2}{\Lambda_e^2 - q^2}, \quad (9)$$

$$f_2(q^2) = \frac{\Lambda_e^4}{(m_e^2 - q^2)^2 + \Lambda_e^4}, \quad (10)$$

$$f_3(q^2) = e^{-(m_e^2 - q^2)^2 / \Lambda_e^4}. \quad (11)$$

We parameterize the cutoff in a form of $\Lambda_e = m_e + \alpha_e \cdot 0.22 \text{ GeV}$ with m_e being the mass of exchanged meson [16, 62–66]. Such parameterization of cutoff can introduce the effect of the mass of exchanged meson, which is more reasonable than the adoption of the same cutoff for different mesons. The α_e is taken as a free parameter which is close to 1. Considering the explicit forms of form factors, the α for f_1 should be larger than 0 to avoid an unphysical suppression near $\Lambda_e = m_e$. For the other two types of form factors, a value about zero can be chosen. The above form factors satisfy the requirement as $f(m^2) = 1$. And the radius of Λ baryon can be estimated with a relation $r^2 = 6/f(0) df(q^2)/dq^2|_{q^2 \rightarrow 0}$, which leads to a reasonable value about 0.5 fm for three choices of form factors. Hence, the three types of form factors satisfy the basic requirements, and we will further check whether our conclusion is sensitive to different choices.

Different from Ref. [53], we will adopt the qBSE to explore possible bound states from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction. The potential kernel obtained above will be inserted into the Bethe-Salpeter equation to obtain the scattering amplitude, the poles of which correspond to bound states. The Bethe-Salpeter equation is a 4-dimensional integral equation in the Minkowski space. Considering the complexity and difficulty of directly solving such integral equation, we adopt a quasipotential approximation approach to reduce the 4-dimensional Bethe-Salpeter equation into a 3-dimensional integral equation [67–69]. Then, using the partial-wave decomposition, the 3-dimensional equation is further reduced into a 1-dimensional equation with fixed spin parity J^P as [5, 70],

$$i\mathcal{M}_{\lambda'\lambda}^{J^P}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = i\mathcal{V}_{\lambda'\lambda}^{J^P}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) + \sum_{\lambda''} \int \frac{p''^2 dp''}{(2\pi)^3} \cdot i\mathcal{V}_{\lambda'\lambda''}^{J^P}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}'') G_0(p'') i\mathcal{M}_{\lambda''\lambda}^{J^P}(\mathbf{p}'', \mathbf{p}), \quad (12)$$

where the sum extends only over nonnegative helicity λ'' . In the current case, we will consider spin parities $J^P = 0^-$ and 1^- , which can couple to baryons Λ and $\bar{\Lambda}$ in S wave, and are

called S-wave states in the non-relativistic calculation [53]. Since we make a decomposition on spin parity J^P directly, contributions from all possible orbital angular momenta L are included naturally. Hence, in the qBSE approach, no special treatment is needed to include the D-wave contribution.

The reduced propagator with the spectator approximation can be written down in the center-of-mass frame with $P = (W, \mathbf{0})$ as,

$$G_0 = \frac{\delta^+(p_2''^2 - m_2^2)}{p_1''^2 - m_1^2} = \frac{\delta(p_2''^0 - E_2(p''))}{2E_2(p'')[(W - E_2(p''))^2 - E_1^2(p'')]}, \quad (13)$$

where the $\delta^+(p_2''^2 - m_2^2)$ is the dirac delta function but with only $p_2''^0 = +E_2(p'')$. Here, as required by the spectator approximation, we put one of the particles, 2 here, on shell, which satisfies $p_2''^0 = E_2(p'') = \sqrt{m_2^2 + \mathbf{p}''^2}$. In above equations, a definition $\mathbf{p} = |\mathbf{p}|$ is adopted.

The partial-wave potential is defined with the potential of the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction obtained in the above as,

$$\mathcal{V}_{\lambda'\lambda}^{J^P}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) = 2\pi \int d\cos\theta [d_{\lambda\lambda'}^J(\theta)\mathcal{V}_{\lambda'\lambda}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p}) + \eta d_{-\lambda\lambda'}^J(\theta)\mathcal{V}_{\lambda'-\lambda}(\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{p})], \quad (14)$$

where $\eta = PP_1P_2(-1)^{J-J_1-J_2}$ with P and J being parity and spin for the system, Λ , or $\bar{\Lambda}$ baryon. The initial and final relative momenta are chosen as $\mathbf{p} = (0, 0, p)$ and $\mathbf{p}' = (p' \sin\theta, 0, p' \cos\theta)$. The $d_{\lambda\lambda'}^J(\theta)$ is the Wigner d-matrix. Since particle 1 is off-shell in the qBSE approach, a form factor should be also introduced to reflect its internal structure. Here, we adopt an exponential regularization by introducing a form factor into the propagator as $G_0(p) \rightarrow G_0(p)[e^{-(k_1^2 - m_1^2)^2 / \Lambda_r^4}]^2$ where the k_1 and m_1 are the momentum and the mass of the off-shell particle. With such regularization, the convergence of the integral equation is guaranteed even without the form factor for exchanged meson. The cutoff Λ_r is parameterized as in the Λ_e case, that is, $\Lambda_r = m_e + \alpha_r \cdot 0.22 \text{ GeV}$ with m_e being the mass of exchanged meson and α_r serving the same function as the parameter α_e .

With the Gauss discretization of momentum, the 1-dimensional integral equation in Eq. (12) is transformed into a matrix equation as $M = V + VG_0M$ [24]. The molecular states correspond to the poles of scattering amplitude M in complex energy plane at $|1 - V(z)G(z)| = 0$ with $z = W + i\Gamma/2$ being system energy W at real axis [5].

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We first consider the case without the annihilation effect included. Since only one channel is considered in this work, the bound state pole is located at real axis. The parameters in the qBSE approach are the cutoffs $\Lambda_{e,r}$ which have been parameterized into $\alpha_{e,r}$. In the calculation, we choose α_e equivalent to α_r , and rename them as a parameter α , for simplification. We

consider two spin parities 0^- and 1^- , which can be obtained from S-wave coupling.

A. Bound states from $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction

In Fig.1, the binding energy $E_B = m_{th} - W$ with m_{th} and W being the threshold and the position of the pole obtained with different types of form factors are presented. The bound state from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction with quantum numbers $I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(0^{-+})$ is presented in the upper panel of Fig.1. The bound state can be produced from the interaction with reasonable α . For the monopole type of the form factors $f_i(\alpha^2)$, the bound state appears at an α of about 1, which is a standard value of the α . In Fig.1, the suggested value of the mass of $\eta(2225)$ in the PDG [1] is also shown as a cyan line, which can be reproduced at an α of about 1.2. Since the uncertainty of the mass of $\eta(2225)$ is about 10 MeV, which just fills the region we considered, we do not show the uncertainty in the figure. The uncertainty corresponds to a range of α from 0.8 to 1.5. For other two types of form factors, the bound state is produced at α of about zero, which corresponds to a standard cutoff about 1 GeV. The shapes of three curves for different form factors are analogous to each other. Considering that α is a free parameter in a reasonable range, one can say that the different choices of form factors do not affect on the conclusion. Hence, comparing the theoretical results with experiment, the 0^- state from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction can be related to the $\eta(2225)$.

Now we turn to the $0^-(1^{--})$ case, which is shown in the lower panel of Fig.1. Contrary to the results in [53], the binding energies of 1^- state are similar to these of 0^- state with the same parameter. For the monopole form factor $f_1(q^2)$, the bound state appears at an α of about 0.9, increases with the increase of α , and reaches a binding energy about 20 MeV at an α of about 1.5. For other two types of form factors, the bound state is produced at α of about zero. The experimental mass of the $X(2239)$ reported by BESIII Collaboration is $2239 \pm 7.1 \pm 11.3$ MeV. The central value is lightly higher than the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold. After the uncertainty considered, the $X(2239)$ is just on the threshold. In Fig.1, we also present the uncertainty of the mass of $X(2239)$ below the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold as a cyan band. The experimental uncertainty of the $X(2239)$ corresponds to α from 0.8 to 1.2.

From above results, one can find that the mass gap between 0^- and 1^- states in our model is quite small. Two states appear almost at the same cutoff, and the mass gap at a certain α is only several MeV in the region considered in Fig. 1. It is quite different from the results in Ref. [53]. In that work, with reasonable cutoffs, they obtained a loosely bound state of 0^- with binding energy about $7 \sim 13$ MeV while the 1^- state has larger binding energy about $50 \sim 82$ MeV. The mass gap is about 50 MeV, which is much larger the one in the current work. Because the Lagrangians and coupling constants adopted in two works are the same, the difference should be from the different treatments, such as different solution method, the relativistic effect, and S-D mixing. Besides, we also present the bands from the uncertainties of the mass of σ meson. The results are




FIG. 1: The binding energy E_B with the variation of the α . The upper and lower panels are for bound states with spin parities 0^- and 1^- , respectively. The black square, red circle, and blue triangle are for the results with different types of form factors $f_i(q^2)$ with $i = 1, 2, 3$ in Eqs. (9-11), respectively. The bands are for the uncertainties from the uncertainties of mass of the σ meson, $400 \sim 550$ MeV [1]. The cyan line in the upper panel is the suggested value of mass of $\eta(2225)$ in the PDG [1]. The cyan band in the lower panel is for the experimental mass of $X(2239)$ with uncertainties, and here only the part below the threshold is presented [30]. More explanations are given in the text.

found not sensitive to this uncertainty.

In our model, five exchanges including η , η' , ϕ , ω , and σ exchanges, are considered to construct the interaction potential. Usually, these exchanges play different roles in producing bound states. In the qBSE approach, the potential can not be shown as a function of the range r as in the non-relativistic calculation [53]. We check their roles by turning on and off one or more exchanges and vary the parameter α from -1 to 3 to search for bound state. It is found that if we only keep one of five exchanges, no bound state can be produced from η , η' , or ϕ exchange while the interaction with only ω or only σ exchange is still strong enough to produce a bound state with a larger α . Such result suggests that the ω and σ exchanges play the most important role in producing the bound states. In the following we give more explicit results in Fig. 2 to show the role of exchanges.

We present the results after turning off η , η' and ϕ exchanges and only keeping ω and σ exchanges in panels (a) and (b) of Fig. 2. As shown in the figure, the bound states with 0^- and 1^- can be produced from the ω and σ exchanges with a light increase of the parameter α for all three types of form factors. We also check the case after removing both ω and σ exchanges but keeping η , η' and ϕ exchanges. No bound state can be found with a reasonable parameter. Such result sug-




FIG. 2: The binding energy E_B without the η, η' and ϕ exchange (a and b), without σ exchange (c and d) and without ω exchange (e and f). Other conventions are the same as in Fig. 1.

gests that the ω and σ exchanges are essential to produce the bound state with 0^- and 1^- . In panels (c) and (d), the results after removing σ exchange are presented. Larger values of α are required for the three types of form factors than in the previous case. The largest effect comes from the ω exchange as shown in panels (e) and (f). To reproduce a binding energy in the full model, the parameter α should be increased by 0.5 or more.

B. Annihilation effect from intermediated mesons

In the above calculation, we do not consider the effect of the annihilation of baryon Λ and antibaryon $\bar{\Lambda}$. The annihilation effect was found important in the study of the $N\bar{N}$ interaction [58–60]. Such contribution is often considered as the multipion intermediation in s channel, which is usually replaced by annihilation into two mesons, plus an optical po-

tential [71–74]. The annihilation effect induces an imaginary potential, which leads to a width and variation of the mass of the bound state [75, 76]. In the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction, such annihilation can occur also, which will effect the experimental observables [77, 78].

In the literature, the two-meson intermediation part of the annihilation effect was included by introducing box diagram or coupled-channel effect [75, 76, 79–81]. In the current work we will adopt the latter treatment, i.e., a coupled-channel calculation in our qBSE approach which was developed in Ref. [62]. Explicitly, we follow the method in Ref. [81], which is successful applied to $N\bar{N}$ interaction, and is more consistent with our qBSE approach.

In Ref. [81], the annihilation effect was introduced by the two-meson intermediation and an imaginary phenomenological optical potential. For the former, we still adopt two-meson intermediation picture here as in the $N\bar{N}$ case. As in the above calculation, only the pseudoscalar mesons \mathbb{P} (π, η and η'), vector mesons \mathbb{V} (ω and ϕ), and scalar meson σ will be considered to avoid more uncertainties from more Lagrangians and coupling constants involved. In the current work, we focus on states with quantum numbers $I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(0^{-+})$ and $0^-(1^{-+})$. For the former state, the possible intermediated two-meson channels include $\mathbb{V}\mathbb{V}$ and $\mathbb{P}\sigma$, which leads to an eight-channel calculation. For the latter state, the $\mathbb{P}\mathbb{V}$ and $\mathbb{V}\sigma$ channels involve in the calculation, which includes twelve channels. Beside, the $K\bar{K}$ channel will be considered for $0^-(1^{-+})$ state, which is forbidden for $0^+(0^{-+})$ state. We introduce the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda} - m_1 m_2$ interaction, where $m_1 m_2$ are two of the mesons considered. Following the treatment in the $N\bar{N}$ case [74], all interactions between two mesons and couplings between different meson channels are ignored in the calculation.

As in Ref. [81], here, we take a two-channel interaction to give a simple explanation about the relation of the standard coupled-channel approach to the well-known forms in the study of the the annihilation $N\bar{N}$ interaction from box diagram in Ref. [75]. The coupled-channel Bethe-Salpeter equation in matrix form is written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} M^{BB} & M^{Bm} \\ M^{mB} & M^{mm} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_{el} & V^{Bm} \\ V^{mB} & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} V_{el} & V^{Bm} \\ V^{mB} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} G^{BB} & 0 \\ 0 & G^{mm} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} M^{BB} & M^{Bm} \\ M^{mB} & M^{mm} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

where B and m mean $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ and $m_1 m_2$ channels, respectively, and V_{el} is the potential given in Eq. (7). Here, we choose $V^{mm} = 0$, that is, the interaction between two mesons are not considered. Then we can obtain following equations

$$M^{BB} = V_{el} + V_{el} G^{BB} M^{BB} + V^{Bm} G^{mm} M^{mB}, \quad (16)$$

$$M^{mB} = V^{mB} + V^{mB} G^{BB} M^{BB}. \quad (17)$$

By inserting Eq. (17) into Eq.(16), we obtain

$$M^{BB} = V^{BB} + V^{BB} G^{BB} M^{BB}, \quad (18)$$

$$M^{mB} = V^{mB} + V^{mB} G^{BB} M^{BB}, \quad (19)$$

where we define $V^{BB} = V_{el} + V^{Bm} G^{mm} V^{mB}$ as in Ref. [81]. Here the second term is the annihilation term from a box diagram. Hence, we need the transition potential which can be

obtained from the Lagrangians in Eqs. (1-5) as

$$V^{mB} = \zeta g_{m_1\Lambda\Lambda} g_{m_2\Lambda\Lambda} \bar{u}_\Lambda \Gamma_1 \frac{\not{q} + m_\Lambda}{q^2 - m_\Lambda^2} f_i(q^2) \Gamma_2 v_{\bar{\Lambda}}, \quad (20)$$

where $g_{m_{1,2}\Lambda\Lambda}$ is coupling constant which is given in the previous section, u_Λ and $v_{\bar{\Lambda}}$ are the spinors for the Λ and $\bar{\Lambda}$ baryons, respectively. The $\Gamma_{1,2}$ is vertex as 1, γ_5 , or $\not{\epsilon}$ for scalar, pseudoscalar and vector mesons, respectively. Here, we need an additional coupling constant $g_{NK\Lambda} = 13.926$ for $0^-(1^{--})$ state [87]. The q and m_Λ are the momentum and mass of the exchanged Λ baryon. $f_i(q^2)$ is the form factor as introduced in the previous section. The ζ is a sign from the difference between baryon and antibaryon as G-parity rule. It does not affect the result because the above interaction always appears in a pair.

Obviously, the above treatment is not enough to include all annihilation effect. A phenomenological treatment is often introduced in the literature [73, 78, 81–86]. In the current work, we introduce an additional imaginary optical potential into V_{el} with following parameterization in coordinate space as in Ref. [81]

$$V_{opt} = iW e^{-\frac{r}{2r_0}}. \quad (21)$$

To insert such optical potential into our qBSE approach, we need to transform it into momentum space by the Fourier transformation as,

$$V_{opt}(q^2) = 4\pi \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} iW r_0^3 e^{q^2 r_0^2/2} \bar{u}_\Lambda u_\Lambda \bar{u}_{\bar{\Lambda}} u_{\bar{\Lambda}}, \quad (22)$$

where the q is the four momentum as for the exchanged mesons. Due to lack of the experimental data for the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction, the parameters was not so well determined as the $N\bar{N}$ interaction. In Ref [78], the $p\bar{p} \rightarrow \Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ process was studied, and the parameters are determined as $W \approx -1$ GeV and $r_0 \approx 0.3$ fm, which will be adopted in the current calculation. Such values are similar to those in the nucleon-nucleon interaction as adopted in Ref. [81], $W = -1$ GeV and $r_0 = 0.4$ fm, which are also close to the values adopted in Ref. [86].

The positions of the poles of the bound states with different α are listed in Table I. The real part of the $M_{th} - z$ presented in the table is the binding energy of the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ molecular states. After including the annihilation effect, the poles appear at α around 1.9, 0.8 and 0.4 with different form factors, respectively. Compared with the results in Fig. 1, larger α is required to produce molecular states from the interaction. It suggests that the attraction of the interaction becomes weaker, which needs a larger α to compensate. However, the changes of the mass gap between 0^- and 1^- states is slight. For most cases, the mass of the 1^- state even becomes further larger than that of the 0^- state, with mass gaps about 11, 8, and 5 MeV for three form factors, which is more consistent with the assignment of two states as $X(2235)$ and $\eta(2225)$. In Table I, we also present the results without the coupled-channel effect, that is, only with the imaginary optical potential. The result suggests that coupled-channel effect on the mass is obvious. The mass decreases by about 5 and 10 MeV for 0^- and 1^- states after including the coupled-channel effect.

TABLE I: The position of the poles of 0^- and 1^- states with different α . The $M_{th} - z$ means mass of the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold M_{th} subtracted by the position of the pole z , in a unit of MeV. The f_i means the results with different types of form factors. The first and second lines for every α is for the results without and with couple-channel effect. For 1^- state, the results with couple-channel effect except the $K\bar{K}$ channel are listed in third line.

J^P	f_1		f_2		f_3	
	α	$M_{th} - z$	α	$M_{th} - z$	α	$M_{th} - z$
0^-	1.9	11.9 + 84i	0.8	8.42 + 38i	0.4	6.21 + 25i
		6.35 + 84i		3.41 + 37i		3.17 + 22i
	2.0	22.8 + 89i	0.9	16.8 + 43i	0.5	13.2 + 30i
		17.2 + 91i		10.3 + 41i		9.58 + 27i
	2.1	34.4 + 94i	1.0	25.9 + 48i	0.6	21.7 + 34i
		28.6 + 96i		18.6 + 46i		16.2 + 31i
1^-	2.0	14.5 + 85i	0.9	14.6 + 41i	0.5	12.2 + 27i
		--		--		--
	2.1	6.67 + 97i	1.0	2.41 + 46i	0.6	4.26 + 29i
		25.5 + 90i		22.2 + 44i		19.3 + 32i
	2.2	3.6 + 114i	1.1	1.21 + 55i	0.7	0.67 + 38i
		17.4 + 104i		9.02 + 50i		9.62 + 35i
	2.2	37.5 + 95i	1.1	37.7 + 48i	0.7	27.6 + 36i
		8.3 + 132i		12.5 + 65i		3.1 + 47i
			22.8 + 113i		26.4 + 58i	15.3 + 41i

Another obvious variation after including the annihilation effect is that the poles leave the real axis and the states acquire widths. The imaginary part of $M_{th} - z$ corresponds to the half of the width of the states. The current result suggests large widths for both 0^- and 1^- states, about 200, 100, and 60 MeV for three form factors, respectively. It is consistent with the experimental observation of the $X(2239)$ and $\eta(2225)$ with widths of $139.8 \pm 12.3 \pm 20.6$ MeV [30] and 185^{+40}_{-20} MeV [1], respectively. Here, we also consider the results without the coupled-channel effect. One can find that the variations of the widths for two states and different form factors are from several to about ten MeV. Considering the widths are several dozens of MeV, the variations of widths from the coupled-channel effect considered here are relatively small. The widths are mainly from the imaginary potential. For the 1^- state, we present the results with and without $K\bar{K}$ channel, the result suggests that $K\bar{K}$ channel provides a width comparable with all the contribution from other channels.

IV. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The molecular state composed of a baryon and an antibaryon is an interesting topic in the study of exotic mesons. In the present work, we study the possibility to assign the newly observed $X(2239)$ as a $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ molecular state in the qBSE approach. The potential kernel of the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction is constructed within the one-boson-exchange model with the help

of the Feynman rule, and the annihilation effect was introduced through introducing the coupled-channel effect and optical potential. After decomposition on spin parity, the bound state can be found by studying the pole of the scattering amplitude.

Two bound states with spin parities $J^P = 0^-$ and 1^- are produced from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction. Our results suggest that these two bound states are both close to the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold. Before the observation of the $X(2239)$, there existed only one possible state $Y(2175)$ near the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction, so it is often assigned as the 1^- molecular state. However, a binding energy larger than 50 MeV is required for this assignment. Now, the $X(2239)$ was observed in the K^+K^- channel, and is just on the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold if the experimental uncertainty is considered. Besides, in Ref. [87], the study of strong decays of the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ bound state was performed, and it was found that the dominant decay channel of the 1^- state is the $K\bar{K}$ channel, which is just the observation channel of the $X(2239)$ at BESIII. In the current work, the $K\bar{K}$ channel is also found to provide considered width in all channels considered. Hence, it is more suitable to assign these two states with spin parities 1^- and 0^- from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction to the $X(2239)$ and the $\eta(2225)$, respectively.

We discuss the effect of each exchange on producing the bound state. Among the five exchanges including η , η' , ϕ , ω , and σ exchanges, the ω and σ exchanges, especially the former, play the most important role to produce two bound states. Such conclusion is consistent with the previous studies in Refs. [25, 53]. We also check the effect of different choices of form factors on the conclusion. The behaviors of the results with three types of form factors are analogous to each other. If we recall that the cutoff is a free parameter, it suggests that the same conclusion can be reached with different choices of the form factors.

In the $N\bar{N}$ interaction, the annihilation is an important topic [58–60]. In the current work, we include the annihilation effect by following the procedure in Ref. [81]. The coupled-channel effect from the two-meson intermediation and an imaginary optical potential are introduced and insert to our qBSE approach. However, unlike the $N\bar{N}$ interaction, the experimental information about the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction is scarce. Hence, we choose the parameters from fitting the data of the $p\bar{p} \rightarrow \Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ process [78]. The calculation suggests that the variations of the poles are very large. The cutoff should be increased to give the molecular states. And a large width about 100 MeV is also produced from the annihilation especially the optical potential. However, our conclusion from the single-channel calculation with one-boson exchange is unchanged

qualitatively after the annihilation effect is considered. More exact determination of such effect requires more experimental data and theoretical analysis.

In the current work, we propose that the observation of the $X(2239)$ at BESIII provides a more suitable candidate of the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ molecular state with spin parity 1^- . In the charmed sector, the $\Lambda_c\bar{\Lambda}_c$ molecular state was also studied in theory, and was assigned as the $Y(4630)$ by some authors [25]. As in the hidden-strange sector, many states were observed near the $\Lambda_c\bar{\Lambda}_c$ threshold, including $Y(4630)$, $Y(4660)$ and a structure at 4625 MeV observed at Belle very recently [88], which attracts many attentions of theorists [89, 90]. More comprehensive investigation about the $\Lambda_{(c)}\bar{\Lambda}_{(c)}$ interaction in both theory and experiment is important to understand these structures.

The conclusion of the current work is based on the assumption that the $X(2239)$ is below the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ threshold. Though the experimental mass with uncertainties can reach the region below the threshold, the nominal value is above the threshold. If it is still true with smaller uncertainties, the $X(2239)$ can not be explained as a molecular state from the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction as suggested in the current work. Besides, the current work is based on the experimental results about the $X(2239)$ released by the BESIII Collaboration [30]. More experimental data and careful analysis are necessary to confirm whether the $X(2239)$ and $Y(2175)$ are different states. In Ref. [45], a fitting of the experimental data points for process $e^+e^- \rightarrow K^+K^-$ at BESIII suggests that the structure can be reproduced with the interference between a states near 2200 MeV, which is also much larger than usual mass of $Y(2175)$, and the background without a real state near 2.24 GeV. However, the current experimental data are not enough to give a confirmative conclusion. Hence, a more precise measurement of the mass of the $X(2239)$ is very important to confirm such assignment [91].

Acknowledgments

This project is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No.11675228, No. 11775050, and No. 61871124), the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, the national defense Pre-Research foundation of China, by State Key Laboratory of Acoustics, Chinese Academy of Sciences (No: SKLA201604), by Science and Technology on Sonar Laboratory, by the Stable Supporting Fund of Acoustic Science and Technology Laboratory.

-
- [1] M. Tanabashi *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of Particle Physics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, no. 3, 030001 (2018).
 [2] Q. Wang, C. Hanhart and Q. Zhao, “Decoding the riddle of $Y(4260)$ and $Z_c(3900)$,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, no. 13, 132003 (2013)
 [3] F. K. Guo, C. Hanhart, Q. Wang and Q. Zhao, “Could the near-threshold XYZ states be simply kinematic effects?,” *Phys. Rev.*

- D* **91**, no. 5, 051504 (2015)
 [4] F. Aceti, M. Bayar, E. Oset, A. Martinez Torres, K. P. Khemchandani, J. M. Dias, F. S. Navarra and M. Nielsen, “Prediction of an $I = 1 D\bar{D}^*$ state and relationship to the claimed $Z_c(3900)$, $Z_c(3885)$,” *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no. 1, 016003 (2014)
 [5] J. He, “The $Z_c(3900)$ as a resonance from the $D\bar{D}^*$ interaction,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no. 3, 034004 (2015)

- [6] J. He, X. Liu, Z. F. Sun and S. L. Zhu, “ $Z_c(4025)$ as the hadronic molecule with hidden charm,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73**, no. 11, 2635 (2013)
- [7] Z. G. Wang, “Reanalysis of the $Y(3940)$, $Y(4140)$, $Z_c(4020)$, $Z_c(4025)$ and $Z_b(10650)$ as molecular states with QCD sum rules,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, no. 7, 2963 (2014)
- [8] Z. F. Sun, J. He, X. Liu, Z. G. Luo and S. L. Zhu, “ $Z_b(10610)^\pm$ and $Z_b(10650)^\pm$ as the $B^*\bar{B}$ and $B^*\bar{B}^*$ molecular states,” *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 054002 (2011)
- [9] J. J. Wu, R. Molina, E. Oset and B. S. Zou, “Prediction of narrow N^* and Λ^* resonances with hidden charm above 4 GeV,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 232001 (2010)
- [10] Z. C. Yang, Z. F. Sun, J. He, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, “The possible hidden-charm molecular baryons composed of anti-charmed meson and charmed baryon,” *Chin. Phys. C* **36**, 6 (2012)
- [11] R. Chen, X. Liu, X. Q. Li and S. L. Zhu, “Identifying exotic hidden-charm pentaquarks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, no. 13, 132002 (2015)
- [12] L. Roca, J. Nieves and E. Oset, “LHCb pentaquark as a $\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c - \bar{D}^*\Sigma_c^*$ molecular state,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no. 9, 094003 (2015)
- [13] J. He, “ $\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c^*$ and $\bar{D}^*\Sigma_c$ interactions and the LHCb hidden-charmed pentaquarks,” *Phys. Lett. B* **753**, 547 (2016)
- [14] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, “New Exotic Meson and Baryon Resonances from Doubly-Heavy Hadronic Molecules,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, no. 12, 122001 (2015)
- [15] M. Z. Liu, Y. W. Pan, F. Z. Peng, M. Sanchez S nchez, L. S. Geng, A. Hosaka and M. Pavon Valderrama, “Emergence of a complete heavy-quark spin symmetry multiplet: seven molecular pentaquarks in light of the latest LHCb analysis,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, no. 24, 242001 (2019)
- [16] J. He, “Study of $P_c(4457)$, $P_c(4440)$, and $P_c(4312)$ in a quasipotential Bethe-Salpeter equation approach,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no. 5, 393 (2019)
- [17] L. Meng, B. Wang, G. J. Wang and S. L. Zhu, “The hidden charm pentaquark states and $\Sigma_c\bar{D}^{(*)}$ interaction in chiral perturbation theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.1, 014031
- [18] B. Wang, L. Meng and S. L. Zhu, “Hidden-charm and hidden-bottom molecular pentaquarks in chiral effective field theory,” *JHEP* **11** (2019), 108
- [19] C. J. Xiao, Y. Huang, Y. B. Dong, L. S. Geng and D. Y. Chen, “Exploring the molecular scenario of $P_c(4312)$, $P_c(4440)$, and $P_c(4457)$,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, no. 1, 014022 (2019)
- [20] Q. Wu and D. Chen, “Production of P_c states from Λ_b decay,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) no.11, 114002
- [21] J. A. Oller and U. G. Meissner, “Chiral dynamics in the presence of bound states: Kaon nucleon interactions revisited,” *Phys. Lett. B* **500**, 263 (2001)
- [22] E. Oset and A. Ramos, “Nonperturbative chiral approach to s wave anti-K N interactions,” *Nucl. Phys. A* **635**, 99 (1998)
- [23] J. M. M. Hall, *et. al.* “Lattice QCD Evidence that the $\chi(1405)$ Resonance is an Antikaon-Nucleon Molecule,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114** (2015) 132002
- [24] J. He and P. L. Lu, “The octet meson and octet baryon interaction with strangeness and the $\Lambda(1405)$,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **24**, no. 11, 1550088 (2015)
- [25] N. Lee, Z. G. Luo, X. L. Chen and S. L. Zhu, “Possible Deuteron-like Molecular States Composed of Heavy Baryons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 014031 (2011)
- [26] E. Fermi and C. N. Yang, “Are Mesons Elementary Particles?,” *Phys. Rev.* **76**, 1739 (1949).
- [27] A. Datta and P. J. O’Donnell, “A New state of baryonium,” *Phys. Lett. B* **567**, 273 (2003)
- [28] M. L. Yan, S. Li, B. Wu and B. Q. Ma, “Nucleon-antinucleon bound states in Skyrmin-type potential,” *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 034027 (2005)
- [29] B. Loiseau and S. Wycech, “Antiproton-proton channels in J/ψ decays,” *Phys. Rev. C* **72**, 011001 (2005)
- [30] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII Collaboration], “Measurement of $e^+e^- \rightarrow K^+K^-$ cross section at $\sqrt{s} = 2.00 - 3.08$ GeV,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, no. 3, 032001 (2019)
- [31] K. Azizi, S. Agaev and H. Sundu, “Light axial-vector and vector resonances $X(2100)$ and $X(2239)$,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **948** (2019), 114789
- [32] Q. L. K. Wang and Y. Dong, “The $ss\bar{s}\bar{s}$ tetraquark states and the newly observed structure $X(2239)$ by BESIII Collaboration,” *Chin. Phys. C* **44** (2020) no.2, 024101
- [33] B. Aubert *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], “A Structure at 2175-MeV in $e^+e^- \rightarrow \phi f_0(980)$ Observed via Initial-State Radiation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 091103 (2006)
- [34] G. J. Ding and M. L. Yan, “A Candidate for 1- strangeonium hybrid,” *Phys. Lett. B* **650**, 390 (2007)
- [35] G. J. Ding and M. L. Yan, “ $Y(2175)$: Distinguish Hybrid State from Higher Quarkonium,” *Phys. Lett. B* **657**, 49 (2007)
- [36] Z. G. Wang, “Analysis of the $Y(2175)$ as a tetraquark state with QCD sum rules,” *Nucl. Phys. A* **791**, 106 (2007)
- [37] H. X. Chen, X. Liu, A. Hosaka and S. L. Zhu, “The $Y(2175)$ State in the QCD Sum Rule,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 034012 (2008)
- [38] N. V. Drenska, R. Faccini and A. D. Polosa, “Higher Tetraquark Particles,” *Phys. Lett. B* **669**, 160 (2008)
- [39] C. P. Shen *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], “Observation of the $\phi(1680)$ and the $Y(2175)$ in $e^+e^- \rightarrow \phi\pi^+\pi^-$,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 031101 (2009)
- [40] A. Martinez Torres, K. P. Khemchandani, L. S. Geng, M. Napsuciale and E. Oset, “The $X(2175)$ as a resonant state of the ϕ K anti-K system,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 074031 (2008)
- [41] S. Gomez-Avila, M. Napsuciale and E. Oset, “ $\phi K^+ K^-$ production in electron-positron annihilation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 034018 (2009)
- [42] S. L. Zhu, “New hadron states,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **17**, 283 (2008)
- [43] L. Alvarez-Ruso, J. A. Oller and J. M. Alarcon, “On the $\phi(1020) f_0(980)$ S-wave scattering and the $Y(2175)$ resonance,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 054011 (2009)
- [44] C. Z. Yuan [BES Collaboration], “Recent BES Results on Hadron Spectroscopy,” *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **181-182**, 348 (2008)
- [45] D. Y. Chen, J. Liu and J. He, “Reconciling the $X(2240)$ with the $Y(2175)$,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) no.7, 074045
- [46] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII Collaboration], “Observation of $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta Y(2175)$ at center-of-mass energies above 3.7 GeV,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, no. 1, 012014 (2019)
- [47] D. Bisello *et al.* [DM2 Collaboration], “Search of Glueballs in the $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\phi\phi$ Decay,” *Phys. Lett. B* **179**, 294 (1986).
- [48] Z. Bai *et al.* [MARK-III Collaboration], “Observation of a Pseudoscalar State in $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\phi\phi$ Near $\phi\phi$ Threshold,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **65**, 1309 (1990).
- [49] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BES Collaboration], “Partial wave analysis of $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\phi\phi$,” *Phys. Lett. B* **662**, 330 (2008)
- [50] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII Collaboration], “Observation of pseudoscalar and tensor resonances in $J/\psi \rightarrow \gamma\phi\phi$,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no. 11, 112011 (2016)
- [51] D. M. Li and B. Ma, “eta(2225) observed by BES Collaboration,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 094021 (2008)
- [52] L. M. Wang, S. Q. Luo, Z. F. Sun and X. Liu, “Constructing new pseudoscalar meson nonets with the observed $X(2100)$, $X(2500)$, and $\eta(2225)$,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) no.3, 034013
- [53] L. Zhao, N. Li, S. L. Zhu and B. S. Zou, “Meson-exchange model for the $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ interaction,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, no. 5, 054034

- (2013)
- [54] K. Sasaki, S. Aoki, T. Doi, S. Gongyo, T. Hatsuda, Y. Ikeda, T. Inoue, T. Iritani, N. Ishii, K. Murano and T. Miyamoto, “ $\Lambda\Lambda$ and $N\Xi$ interactions from Lattice QCD near the physical point,” Nucl. Phys. A, 121737
- [55] M. M. Nagels, T. A. Rijken and Y. Yamamoto, “Extended-soft-core Baryon-Baryon ESC08 model III. $S=-2$ Hyperon-hyperon/nucleon Interaction,” arXiv:1504.02634 [nucl-th].
- [56] J. Haidenbauer, U. G. Meiner and S. Petschauer, “Strangeness $S = -2$ baryonbaryon interaction at next-to-leading order in chiral effective field theory,” Nucl. Phys. A **954**, 273 (2016)
- [57] R. J. N. Phillips, “Antinuclear Forces,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **39**, 681 (1967).
- [58] E. Klempt, C. Batty and J. M. Richard, “The Antinucleon-nucleon interaction at low energy : Annihilation dynamics,” Phys. Rept. **413**, 197 (2005)
- [59] J. Richard, “Antiproton physics,” Front. in Phys. **8** (2020), 6
- [60] C. Amsler, “Proton - anti-proton annihilation and meson spectroscopy with the crystal barrel,” Rev. Mod. Phys. **70**, 1293 (1998)
- [61] E. Klempt, F. Bradamante, A. Martin and J. M. Richard, “Antinucleon nucleon interaction at low energy: Scattering and protonium,” Phys. Rept. **368**, 119 (2002).
- [62] J. He and D. Y. Chen, “Molecular states from $\Sigma_c^{(*)}\bar{D}^{(*)} - \Lambda_c\bar{D}^{(*)}$ interaction,” Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, no. 11, 887 (2019)
- [63] H. Y. Cheng, C. K. Chua and A. Soni, “Final state interactions in hadronic B decays,” Phys. Rev. D **71**, 014030 (2005)
- [64] D. Y. Chen, X. Liu and T. Matsuki, “ η transitions between charmonia with meson loop contributions,” Phys. Rev. D **87**, no.5, 054006 (2013)
- [65] X. D. Guo, D. Y. Chen, H. W. Ke, X. Liu and X. Q. Li, “Study on the rare decays of $Y(4630)$ induced by final state interactions,” Phys. Rev. D **93**, no.5, 054009 (2016)
- [66] F. S. Yu, H. Y. Jiang, R. H. Li, C. D. L. Wang and Z. X. Zhao, “Discovery Potentials of Doubly Charmed Baryons,” Chin. Phys. C **42**, no.5, 051001 (2018)
- [67] F. Gross and A. Stadler, “Covariant spectator theory of np scattering: Effective range expansions and relativistic deuteron wave functions,” Phys. Rev. C **82** (2010) 034004
- [68] J. He, D. Y. Chen and X. Liu, “New Structure Around 3250 MeV in the Baryonic B Decay and the $D_0^*(2400)N$ Molecular Hadron,” Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 2121 (2012)
- [69] J. He and X. Liu, “The open-charm radiative and pionic decays of molecular charmonium $Y(4274)$,” Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1986 (2012)
- [70] J. He, “Nucleon resonances $N(1875)$ and $N(2100)$ as strange partners of LHCb pentaquarks,” Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 7, 074031 (2017)
- [71] V. Mull, J. Haidenbauer, T. Hippchen and K. Holinde, “Meson - baryon dynamics in the nucleon - anti-nucleon system. 2. Annihilation into two mesons,” Phys. Rev. C **44**, 1337 (1991).
- [72] T. Hippchen, J. Haidenbauer, K. Holinde and V. Mull, “Meson - baryon dynamics in the nucleon - anti-nucleon system. 1. The Nucleon - anti-nucleon interaction,” Phys. Rev. C **44**, 1323 (1991).
- [73] C. B. Dover and J. M. Richard, “Elastic, Charge Exchange, and Inelastic anti-p p Cross-Sections in the Optical Model,” Phys. Rev. C **21**, 1466 (1980).
- [74] M. Pignone, M. Lacombe, B. Loiseau and R. Vinh Mau, “Paris N anti-N potential and recent proton anti-proton low-energy data,” Phys. Rev. C **50**, 2710 (1994).
- [75] B. El-Bennich, M. Lacombe, B. Loiseau and S. Wycech, “Paris N anti-N potential constrained by recent antiprotonic-atom data and antineutron-proton total cross sections,” Phys. Rev. C **79**, 054001 (2009)
- [76] J. Carbonell, G. Ihle and J. M. Richard, “Protonium Annihilation in Optical Models,” Z. Phys. A **334**, 329 (1989).
- [77] J. Haidenbauer, K. Holinde, V. Mull and J. Speth, “Meson exchange and quark - gluon transitions in the $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda}\Lambda$ process,” Phys. Rev. C **46**, 2158 (1992).
- [78] J. Haidenbauer, T. Hippchen, K. Holinde, B. Holzenkamp, V. Mull and J. Speth, “The Reaction $\bar{p}p \rightarrow \bar{\Lambda}\Lambda$ in the meson exchange picture,” Phys. Rev. C **45**, 931 (1992).
- [79] I. S. Shapiro, “Baryon anti-baryon interactions in potential approach,” Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **8**, 100 (1989).
- [80] G. Q. Liu and F. Tabakin, “Coupled channels study of anti-proton proton reactions,” Phys. Rev. C **41**, 665 (1990).
- [81] V. Mull and K. Holinde, “Combined description of anti-N N scattering and annihilation with a hadronic model,” Phys. Rev. C **51**, 2360 (1995)
- [82] R. A. Bryan and R. J. N. Phillips, “Nucleon anti-nucleon potential from single meson exchanges,” Nucl. Phys. B **5**, 201 (1968).
- [83] M. Kohno and W. Weise, “Proton - Anti-proton Scattering and Annihilation Into Two Mesons,” Nucl. Phys. A **454**, 429 (1986).
- [84] J. M. Richard and M. E. Sainio, “Nuclear Effects in Protonium,” Phys. Lett. **110B**, 349 (1982).
- [85] M. Maruyama and T. Ueda, “ $\bar{N}N$ Bound and Scattering States Due to the Quark Rearrangement Annihilation and the One Boson Exchange,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **74**, 526 (1985).
- [86] P. Bydzovsky, R. Mach and F. Nichitiu, “Isospin effects in anti-nucleon nucleon scattering and annihilation,” Phys. Rev. C **43**, 1610 (1991).
- [87] Y. Dong, A. Faessler, T. Gutsche, Q. Lü and V. E. Lyubovitskij, “Selected strong decays of $\eta(2225)$ and $\phi(2170)$ as $\Lambda\bar{\Lambda}$ bound states,” Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 7, 074027 (2017)
- [88] S. Jia *et al.* [Belle], “Observation of a vector charmoniumlike state in $e^+e^- \rightarrow D_s^+D_{s1}(2536)^- + c.c.$,” Phys. Rev. D **100** (2019) no.11, 111103
- [89] Q. F. Cao, H. R. Qi, Y. F. Wang and H. Q. Zheng, “Discussions on the line-shape of the $X(4660)$ resonance,” Phys. Rev. D **100**, no. 5, 054040 (2019)
- [90] F. K. Guo, J. Haidenbauer, C. Hanhart and U. G. Meissner, “Reconciling the $X(4630)$ with the $Y(4660)$,” Phys. Rev. D **82**, 094008 (2010)
- [91] X. Y. Wang and J. He, “Production of $\phi(2170)$ and $\eta(2225)$ in a kaon induced reaction,” Eur. Phys. J. A **55**, no. 9, 152 (2019)