

Light-quark components analysis and the nature of the $Y(4260)$

Yun-Hua Chen

*School of Mathematics and Physics, University of Science and Technology Beijing,
Beijing 100083, China*

Ling-Yun Dai

School of Physics and Electronics, Hunan University, Changsha 410082, China

Feng-Kun Guo

*CAS Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese
Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China
School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing
100049, China*

Bastian Kubis

*Helmholtz-Institut für Strahlen- und Kernphysik (Theorie) and
Bethe Center for Theoretical Physics, Universität Bonn, 53115 Bonn, Germany*

We study the processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow Y(4260) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi\pi(K\bar{K})$. The strong final-state interactions, especially the coupled-channel ($\pi\pi$ and $K\bar{K}$) final-state interaction in the S -wave are taken into account in a model-independent way using dispersion theory. It is found that the light-quark $SU(3)$ octet state plays a significant role in these transitions, implying that the $Y(4260)$ contains a large light-quark component. Our findings suggest that the $Y(4260)$ is neither a hybrid nor a conventional charmonium state. Furthermore, through an analysis of the ratio of the light-quark $SU(3)$ octet and singlet components, we show that the $Y(4260)$ does not behave like a pure $\bar{D}D_1$ hadronic molecule as well.

Keywords: exotic states; dispersion theory; heavy quarkonium

The nature of the $Y(4260)$ has remained controversial since its discovery by the *BABAR* Collaboration in the $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ channel in the initial-state radiation process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma_{\text{ISR}}J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$. Its mass is inconsistent with the naive quark model prediction for a normal vector charmonium,¹ and it does not show strong couplings to ground-state open-charm decay modes although it is above the $D\bar{D}$ threshold. Such peculiar properties have initiated a lot of theoretical and experimental studies, see Refs. 2,3 for recent

reviews. In this work, we study the $e^+e^- \rightarrow Y(4260) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi\pi(J/\psi K\bar{K})$ processes to extract information on possible light-quark components of the $Y(4260)$. If the $Y(4260)$ contains no light quarks (as in the hybrid-state or the conventional-charmonium scenarios), the light-quark source provided by the $Y(4260)$ has to be in the form of an SU(3) flavor singlet state. Thus the study of the different light-quark SU(3) flavor eigenstate components provided by the $Y(4260)$ in these processes may help to reveal its structure.

For the $Y(4260)J/\psi\pi\pi$ and $Y(4260)J/\psi K\bar{K}$ contact couplings, the leading chiral effective Lagrangian reads⁴⁻⁷

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{Y\psi\Phi\Phi} = & g_1 \langle V_1^\alpha J_\alpha^\dagger \rangle \langle u_\mu u^\mu \rangle + h_1 \langle V_1^\alpha J_\alpha^\dagger \rangle \langle u_\mu u_\nu \rangle v^\mu v^\nu \\ & + g_8 \langle J_\alpha^\dagger \rangle \langle V_8^\alpha u_\mu u^\mu \rangle + h_8 \langle J_\alpha^\dagger \rangle \langle V_8^\alpha u_\mu u_\nu \rangle v^\mu v^\nu + \text{H.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where the parameters g_1 and h_1 correspond to the contributions from the SU(3) singlet component of the $Y(4260)$, and g_8 and h_8 are the corresponding parameters for the SU(3) octet component. The strong pion-pion final-state interactions (FSIs) as well as the $K\bar{K}$ coupled channel in the S -wave are taken into account model independently by using dispersion theory. In the dispersion theory, the left-hand-cut contributions are approximated by the sum of the $Z_c(3900)$ -exchange mechanism and the triangle diagrams $Y(4260) \rightarrow \bar{D}D_1(2420) \rightarrow \bar{D}D^*\pi(\bar{D}D_s^*K) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi\pi(J/\psi K\bar{K})$.^{8,9} The subtraction terms can be determined by matching to the chiral contact terms, since at low energies the amplitude should agree with the results required by chiral symmetry. To estimate the uncertainty due to the dispersive input for the $\pi\pi/K\bar{K}$ rescattering, we will use two different $T_0^0(s)$ matrices, the Dai-Pennington (DP)^{10,11} and the Bern/Orsay (BO)^{12,13} parametrizations, and compare the results. For details of the theoretical treatment, we refer to Ref. 14.

We fit to the experimental data of the $\pi\pi$ invariant mass spectra of $e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ and the ratios of the cross sections $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi K^+K^-)/\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-)$ measured at $E = 4.26$ GeV by the BESIII Collaboration.^{15,16} To illustrate the effect of the SU(3) octet component, we perform two fits. In Fit a we only consider the SU(3) singlet component, the Z_c -exchange terms, and the triangle diagrams, while in Fit b, the SU(3) octet component is taken into account in addition. The best fit results of the $\pi\pi$ mass spectra in $e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ are shown in Fig. 1. The fit results of the ratios of the cross sections $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi K^+K^-)/\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-)$ are given in Table 1.

One observes that Fit a, in which the SU(3) octet chiral contact terms are not included, cannot describes the experimental data well, especially for




Fig. 1. Fit results of the $\pi\pi$ invariant mass spectra in $e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ for Fit a (left) and Fit b (right). The borders of the bands represent our best fit results using two different $T_0^0(s)$ matrices. The experimental data are taken from Ref. 15.

the broad peak below 0.6 GeV. In contrast, in Fit b with the SU(3) octet chiral contact terms added, the fit quality is improved significantly. Using the fit results, we can analyze the ratio of the parameters for the SU(3) octet component relative to those for the SU(3) singlet component. In the DP parametrization we find $g_8/g_1 = 1.2 \pm 0.2$ and $h_8/h_1 = 57 \pm 76$, while in the BO parametrization we obtain $g_8/g_1 = 1.1 \pm 0.1$ and $h_8/h_1 = 102 \pm 152$, which agree well with each other within errors. Note that in the $\bar{D}D_1$ hadronic molecule scenario of the $Y(4260)$, the light-quark component is in the form of $|u\bar{u} + d\bar{d}\rangle/\sqrt{2} = (\sqrt{2}V_1^{\text{light}} + V_8^{\text{light}})/\sqrt{3}$, where $V_1^{\text{light}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} + s\bar{s})$ and $V_8^{\text{light}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(u\bar{u} + d\bar{d} - 2s\bar{s})$. They give the ratio of $1/\sqrt{2}$, which differs significantly from our results (given by the values of g_8/g_1). Therefore we conclude that the $Y(4260)$ contains a large light-quark SU(3) octet component, and the scenarios of a hybrid or conventional charmonium are disfavored since the light quarks have to be produced in an SU(3) singlet configuration inside such states. Also our study shows that the $Y(4260)$ cannot be a pure $\bar{D}D_1$ hadronic molecule as well.

In Fig. 2, we plot the moduli of the S - and D -wave amplitudes from the chiral contact terms, the Z_c -exchange terms, and the triangle diagrams for Fit b. One observes that the D -wave contribution is comparable to the S -wave contribution in almost the whole energy region. Such a large D -wave contribution again indicates that the $Y(4260)$ cannot be a conventional

Table 1. Experimental and theoretical values for the cross sections ratio $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi K^+K^-)/\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-) \times 10^2$ at $E = 4.26$ GeV.

Experiment	Fit a, DP	Fit b, DP	Fit a, BO	Fit b, BO
4.99 ± 1.10	4.46 ± 0.82	4.67 ± 0.98	5.37 ± 1.03	5.38 ± 0.82




Fig. 2. The moduli of the S - (left) and D -wave (right) amplitudes for $e^+e^- \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ in Fit b, using the DP (top) or the BO (bottom) parametrizations. The red solid lines represent our best fit results, while the blue dot-dashed, darker green dashed, and magenta dotted lines correspond to the contributions from the chiral contact terms, Z_c -exchange, and the triangle diagrams, respectively.

charmonium state, for which the $\pi\pi$ S -wave should be dominant. Also note that in the $\bar{D}D_1$ hadronic molecule interpretation,^{8,17} the $\pi\pi$ D -wave emerges naturally since the D_1 decays dominantly into $D^*\pi$.

At last, we anticipate a combined analysis of both the $Y(4260)$ and $Z_c(3900)$ data, which will be crucial to reveal the nature of both states.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under Grants No. 531107051122 and No. FRF-BR-19-001A, by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grants Nos. 11975028, 11805059, 11847612, and No. 11835015, by NSFC and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) through funds provided to the Sino-German Collaborative Research Center “Symmetries and the Emergence of Structure in QCD” (NSFC Grant No. 11621131001, DFG Grant No. TRR110), by the Thousand Talents Plan for Young Professionals, by the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) Key Research Program

of Frontier Sciences (Grant No. QYZDB-SSW-SYS013), by the CAS Key Research Program (Grant No. XDPB09), and by the CAS Center for Excellence in Particle Physics (CCEPP).

References

1. S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 189 (1985).
2. H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, Phys. Rep. **639**, 1 (2016).
3. F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao, and B.-S. Zou, Rev. Mod. Phys. **90**, 015004 (2018).
4. T. Mannel and R. Urech, Z. Phys. C **73**, 541 (1997).
5. Y.-H. Chen, J. T. Daub, F.-K. Guo, B. Kubis, U.-G. Meißner, and B.-S. Zou, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 034030 (2016).
6. Y.-H. Chen, M. Cleven, J. T. Daub, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, B. Kubis, U.-G. Meißner, and B.-S. Zou, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 034022 (2017).
7. Y.-H. Chen and F.-K. Guo, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 054035 (2019).
8. M. Cleven, Q. Wang, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, and Q. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 074039 (2014).
9. M. Albaladejo, F.-K. Guo, C. Hidalgo-Duque, and J. Nieves, Phys. Lett. B **755**, 337 (2016).
10. L.-Y. Dai and M. R. Pennington, Phys. Lett. B **736**, 11 (2014).
11. L.-Y. Dai and M. R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 116021 (2016).
12. I. Caprini, G. Colangelo, and H. Leutwyler, Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 1860 (2012).
13. P. Büttiker, S. Descotes-Genon, and B. Moussallam, Eur. Phys. J. C **33**, 409 (2004).
14. Y.-H. Chen, L.-Y. Dai, F.-K. Guo, and B. Kubis, Phys. Rev. D **99**, 074016 (2019).
15. M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 072001 (2017).
16. M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **97**, 071101 (2018).
17. Y. Lu, M. N. Anwar, and B.-S. Zou, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 114022 (2017).