

# Structure and production mechanism of the enigmatic $X(3872)$ in high-energy hadronic reactions

Anna Cisek,<sup>1,\*</sup> Wolfgang Schäfer,<sup>2,†</sup> and Antoni Szczurek<sup>‡2,§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*College of Natural Sciences, Institute of Physics,  
University of Rzeszów, ul. Pigonia 1, PL-35-310 Rzeszów, Poland*

<sup>2</sup>*Institute of Nuclear Physics, Polish Academy of Sciences,  
ul. Radzikowskiego 152, PL-31-342 Kraków, Poland*

## Abstract

We calculate the total cross section and transverse momentum distributions for the production of enigmatic  $\chi_{c,1}(3872)$  (or  $X(3872)$ ) assuming different scenarios:  $c\bar{c}$  state and  $D^{0*}\bar{D}^0 + D^0\bar{D}^{0*}$  molecule. The derivative of the  $c\bar{c}$  wave function needed in the first scenario is taken from a potential model calculations. Compared to earlier calculation of molecular state we include not only single parton scattering (SPS) but also double parton scattering (DPS) contributions. The latter one seems to give smaller contribution than the SPS one. The upper limit for the DPS production of  $\chi_{c,1}(3872)$  is much below the CMS data. We compare results of our calculations with existing experimental data of CMS, ATLAS and LHCb collaborations. Reasonable cross sections can be obtained in either  $c\bar{c}$  or molecular  $D\bar{D}^*$  scenarios for  $X(3872)$ . Also a hybrid scenario is not excluded.

---

<sup>‡</sup> also at University of Rzeszów, PL-35-959 Rzeszów, Poland

\*Electronic address: acisek@ur.edu.pl

†Electronic address: Wolfgang.Schafer@ifj.edu.pl

§Electronic address: Antoni.Szczurek@ifj.edu.pl

## I. INTRODUCTION

The  $X(3872)$  state was discovered already some time ago by the Belle collaboration [1]. Since then its existence has been confirmed in several other processes and numerous theoretical studies have been performed, see for example the review articles [2–4]. There is at present agreement that the  $X(3872)$  has the axial vector quantum numbers  $J^{PC} = 1^{++}$ , and accordingly the state is named as  $\chi_{c1}(3872)$  [5].

The internal structure of  $X(3872)$  stays rather enigmatic. While its quantum numbers are not exotic – it could indeed be a quarkonium  $c\bar{c}$  state, e.g. a radial excitation of the  $\chi_{c1}$ , there are strong arguments for a non- $c\bar{c}$  scenario, manifested e.g. by the violation of isospin in its decays [5].

More importantly, the mass of  $X$  is very close to the  $D\bar{D}^*$  threshold. It is therefore rather popular to consider  $X(3872)$  as very weakly bound state of the  $D\bar{D}^*$  system - a hadronic molecule, see the review [6]. A tetraquark scenario was considered in [7]. The  $c\bar{c}$  quarkonium scenario, where  $X(3872)$  is the  $\chi_{c1}(2P)$  state has been advocated in [8]. Other approaches treat the  $X(3872)$  as a  $c\bar{c}$  bound state in the meson-meson continuum taking into account coupling of  $c\bar{c}$  and meson-meson channels [9–11]. The possible mixture of quarkonium and molecule/virtual state is considered in [12] and found to be consistent with current data.

Recently, the transverse momentum distributions of  $X(3872)$  were measured at the LHC [13–15] by the CMS, ATLAS and LHCb collaborations.

There is a debate in the literature [16–19], whether the rather large production rate at large  $p_T$  allows one to exclude the molecular scenario. With few exceptions [20–22] the discussion in the literature is limited to estimates of orders of magnitude.

In this paper we shall consider two scenarios of prompt  $X(3872)$  production, which are not mutually exclusive and in fact both can contribute depending on the structure of  $X(3872)$ . Both scenarios have in common that the production is initiated by the production of a  $c\bar{c}$  pair in a hard process.

In the first scenario we shall consider that the  $X(3872)$  is a pure  $c\bar{c}$  state, the first radial excitation of  $\chi_{c1}$ . The corresponding wave function and its derivative were calculated in potential models e.g. in [23].

In the second scenario, where the  $X(3872)$  is treated as a weakly bound  $s$ -wave state

in the  $D\bar{D}^* + D^*\bar{D}$ -system, we exploit the connection between the low-energy scattering amplitude in the continuum and at the bound state pole below threshold, well known from effective range theory. In this work we follow [17] and give an estimate of a  $p_T$ -dependent upper bound for  $X(3872)$  production in the molecule scenario.

As far as the hard production mechanism is concerned, we employ the  $k_T$ -factorization framework [24–26]. For the quarkonium scenario, the dominant mechanism of  $C = +1$  is probably color singlet two virtual gluon fusion. The production of  $\chi_{c0}, \chi_{c1}, \chi_{c2}$  production was considered e.g. in [27–29]. Recently we have shown that the transverse momentum distribution of  $\eta_c$  measured by the LHCb [30] can be nicely described as  $g^*g^* \rightarrow \eta_c$  fusion within  $k_T$ -factorization approach [31].

For the molecular scenario, in addition to the single-parton scattering (SPS) mechanism of fusion of two off-shell gluons  $g^*g^* \rightarrow c\bar{c}$ , we will also consider production through the double-parton scattering (DPS) mode.

## II. FORMALISM

In Fig.1 we show two generic Feynman diagrams for  $X(3872)$  quarkonium production in proton-proton collision via gluon-gluon fusion: for the quarkonium (left) and molecule (right). These diagrams illustrate the situation adequate for the  $k_T$ -factorization calculations used in the present paper.

The inclusive cross section for  $X(3872)$ -production via the  $2 \rightarrow 1$  gluon-gluon fusion




FIG. 1: Generic diagrams for the inclusive process of  $X(3872)$  production in proton-proton scattering via two gluons fusion.

mode is obtained from

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma}{dy d^2\vec{p}_T} &= \int \frac{d^2\vec{q}_{T1}}{\pi\vec{q}_{T1}^2} \mathcal{F}(x_1, \vec{q}_{T1}^2, \mu_F^2) \int \frac{d^2\vec{q}_{T2}}{\pi\vec{q}_{T2}^2} \mathcal{F}(x_2, \vec{q}_{T2}^2, \mu_F^2) \delta^{(2)}(\vec{q}_{T1} + \vec{q}_{T2} - \vec{p}_T) \\ &\times \frac{\pi}{(x_1 x_2 s)^2} \overline{|\mathcal{M}_{g^*g^* \rightarrow X(3872)}|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

Here the matrix element squared for the fusion of two off-shell gluons into the  $^3P_1$  color singlet  $c\bar{c}$  charmonium is (see e.g. [27, 32] for a derivation):

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{|\mathcal{M}_{g^*g^* \rightarrow X(3872)}|^2} &= (4\pi\alpha_S)^2 \frac{4|R'(0)|^2}{\pi M_X^3} \frac{\vec{q}_{T1}^2 \vec{q}_{T2}^2}{(M_X^2 + \vec{q}_{T1}^2 + \vec{q}_{T2}^2)^4} \\ &\times \left( (\vec{q}_{T1}^2 + \vec{q}_{T2}^2)^2 \sin^2 \phi + M_X^2 (\vec{q}_{T1}^2 + \vec{q}_{T2}^2 - 2|\vec{q}_{T1}||\vec{q}_{T2}| \cos \phi) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\phi$  is the azimuthal angle between  $\vec{q}_{T1}, \vec{q}_{T2}$ . The momentum fractions of gluons are fixed as  $x_{1,2} = m_T \exp(\pm y) / \sqrt{s}$ , where  $m_T^2 = \vec{p}_T^2 + M_X^2$ . The derivative of the radial quarkonium wave function at the origin is taken for the first radial  $p$ -wave excitation from Ref.[23],  $|R'(0)|^2 = 0.1767 \text{ GeV}^5$ .

The unintegrated gluon parton distribution functions (gluon uPDFs) are normalized such, that the collinear glue is obtained from

$$xg(x, \mu_F^2) = \int^{\mu_F^2} \frac{d^2\vec{k}_T}{\pi\vec{k}_T^2} \mathcal{F}(x, \vec{k}_T^2, \mu_F^2). \quad (2.3)$$

The hard scale is taken to be always  $\mu_F = m_T$ , the transverse mass of the  $X(3872)$ . In order to estimate the production cross section for the molecule we also start from a hard production of a  $c\bar{c}$ -pair, which we then hadronize into a  $D\bar{D}^* + h.c$  system using a prescription given below.

The parton-level differential cross section for the  $c\bar{c}$  production, formally at leading-order, reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma(pp \rightarrow Q\bar{Q} X)}{dy_1 dy_2 d^2\vec{p}_{T1} d^2\vec{p}_{T2}} &= \int \frac{d^2\vec{k}_{T1}}{\pi\vec{k}_{T1}^2} \mathcal{F}(x_1, \vec{k}_{T1}^2, \mu_F^2) \int \frac{d^2\vec{k}_{T2}}{\pi\vec{k}_{T2}^2} \mathcal{F}(x_2, \vec{k}_{T2}^2, \mu_F^2) \\ &\times \delta^{(2)}(\vec{k}_{T1} + \vec{k}_{T2} - \vec{p}_{T1} - \vec{p}_{T2}) \frac{1}{16\pi^2 (x_1 x_2 s)^2} \overline{|\mathcal{M}_{g^*g^* \rightarrow c\bar{c}}^{\text{off-shell}}|^2} \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}_{g^*g^* \rightarrow Q\bar{Q}}^{\text{off-shell}}$  is the off-shell matrix element for the hard subprocess [24], we use its implementation from [33].

Here, one keeps exact kinematics from the very beginning and additional hard dynamics coming from transverse momenta of incident partons. Explicit treatment of the

transverse momenta makes the approach very efficient in studies of correlation observables. The two-dimensional Dirac delta function assures momentum conservation. The gluon uPDFs must be evaluated at longitudinal momentum fractions:

$$x_1 = \frac{m_{T1}}{\sqrt{s}} \exp(+y_1) + \frac{m_{T2}}{\sqrt{s}} \exp(+y_2) , \quad (2.5)$$

$$x_2 = \frac{m_{T1}}{\sqrt{s}} \exp(-y_1) + \frac{m_{T2}}{\sqrt{s}} \exp(-y_2) , \quad (2.6)$$

where  $m_{Ti} = \sqrt{p_{Ti}^2 + m_c^2}$  is the quark/antiquark transverse mass.

In the present analysis we employ the heavy  $c$ -quark approximation and assume that three-momenta in the  $pp$ -cm frame are equal:

$$\vec{p}_D = \vec{p}_c . \quad (2.7)$$

This approximation could be relaxed in future. The hadronization is then included only via fragmentation branching fractions:

$$P(c \rightarrow D^0) = P(\bar{c} \rightarrow \bar{D}^0) = 0.56 , \quad (2.8)$$

$$P(c \rightarrow D^+) = P(\bar{c} \rightarrow D^-) = 0.225 , \quad (2.9)$$

$$P(c \rightarrow D^{*0}) = P(\bar{c} \rightarrow \bar{D}^{*0}) = 0.236 , \quad (2.10)$$

$$P(c \rightarrow D^{*+}) = P(\bar{c} \rightarrow \bar{D}^{*-}) = 0.236 . \quad (2.11)$$

The first number is from [34] while the other numbers are from [35].

The cross section for  $c\bar{c}$  production are then multiplied by

$$\frac{1}{2} [P(c \rightarrow D^0)P(\bar{c} \rightarrow \bar{D}^{*0}) + P(c \rightarrow D^{*0})P(\bar{c} \rightarrow \bar{D}^0)] = 0.1322 \quad (2.12)$$

and, when comparing to experimental data by the relevant branching fraction i.e. by  $\text{BR}(X \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-)$  for the case of CMS and LHCb, and by  $\text{BR}(X \rightarrow J/\psi \pi^+ \pi^-) \text{BR}(J/\psi \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-)$  for the ATLAS data. The branching fractions are taken from [5]. The factor  $\frac{1}{2}$  is related to the factor  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  in the definition of the molecular wave function,

$$|\Psi_{mol}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( |D^0 \bar{D}^{*0}\rangle + |D^{*0} \bar{D}^0\rangle \right) . \quad (2.13)$$

In our calculation, we control the dependence on the relative momentum of quark and antiquark in the rest frame of the pair:

$$k_{rel} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{M_{c\bar{c}}^2 - 4m_c^2} , \quad (2.14)$$




FIG. 2: A generic diagram for the inclusive process of  $X(3872)$  production in proton-proton scattering via the double parton scattering mode.

where  $M_{c\bar{c}}$  is invariant mass of the  $c\bar{c}$  system and  $m_c$  is the quark mass. In order to obtain an upper bound for the molecule production cross section, we should integrate the  $D\bar{D}^*$  cross section over the relative momentum  $k_{rel}^{D\bar{D}^*}$  up to a cutoff  $k_{max}^{D\bar{D}^*}$  [17]. We will instead impose a cutoff  $k_{max}$  on the relative momentum  $k_{rel}$ . Within our kinematics the latter will be similar to  $k_{rel}^{D\bar{D}^*}$ , but somewhat larger. In reality, for larger  $\vec{p}_{TX} \approx \vec{p}_{T1} + \vec{p}_{T2}$ , we have  $k_{DD} < k_{rel}$ . We therefore estimate, that  $k_{max} = 0.2 \text{ GeV}$  corresponds roughly to  $k_{max}^{DD} \approx 0.13 \text{ GeV}$ . A better approximation would be to add simultaneous  $c \rightarrow D$ ,  $\bar{c} \rightarrow \bar{D}$  fragmentation to our Monte Carlo code, which however means at least two more integrations. We do not consider here any model of the  $D\bar{D}^*$  wave function.

What is the appropriate choice for  $k_{max}^{D\bar{D}^*}$  was a matter of discussion in the literature. In Ref. [16] it was suggested, that  $k_{max}^{D\bar{D}^*}$  should be of the order of the binding momentum  $k_X = \sqrt{2\mu\epsilon_X}$ , where  $\mu$  is the reduced mass of the  $D\bar{D}^*$ -system, and  $\epsilon_X$  is the binding energy of  $X(3872)$ . This would lead to a very small value for  $k_{max}^{D\bar{D}^*}$ , similar to  $k_{max}^{D\bar{D}^*} = 35 \text{ MeV}$  used in [16]. However problems with this estimate have been pointed out in [17–19]. As has been argued in these works, the integral should be extended rather to a scale  $k_{max}^{D\bar{D}^*} \sim m_\pi$ . In our choice of  $k_{max}$ , we follow this latter prescription.

In the following for illustration we shall therefore assume  $k_{max} = 0.2 \text{ GeV}$ . The calculation for the SPS molecular scenario is done using the VEGAS algorithm for Monte-Carlo integration [36].

We also include double parton scattering contributions (see Fig.2). The corresponding

cross section is calculated in the so-called factorized ansatz as:

$$\Delta\sigma = \frac{1}{2\sigma_{\text{eff}}} \int \frac{d\sigma_{c\bar{c}}}{dy_1 d^2\vec{p}_{T1}} \frac{d\sigma_{c\bar{c}}}{dy_2 d^2\vec{p}_{T2}} dy_1 d^2\vec{p}_{T1} dy_2 d^2\vec{p}_{T2} \Big|_{k_{\text{rel}} < k_{\text{max}}} . \quad (2.15)$$

Above the differential distributions of the first and second parton scattering  $\frac{d\sigma}{dy_i d^2\vec{p}_{T_i}}$  are calculated in the  $k_T$ -factorization approach as explained above. In the following we take  $\sigma_{\text{eff}} = 15 \text{ mb}$  as in [37]. The differential distributions (in  $p_T$  of the  $X(3872)$  or  $y_{\text{diff}} = y_1 - y_2$ , etc.) are obtained by binning in the appropriate variable. We include all possible fusion combinations leading to  $X(3872)$ :

$$c_1 \rightarrow D^0, \bar{c}_2 \rightarrow \bar{D}^{*0} , \quad (2.16)$$

$$c_1 \rightarrow D^{*0}, \bar{c}_2 \rightarrow \bar{D}^0 , \quad (2.17)$$

$$\bar{c}_1 \rightarrow \bar{D}^0, c_2 \rightarrow D^{*0} , \quad (2.18)$$

$$\bar{c}_1 \rightarrow \bar{D}^{*0}, c_2 \rightarrow D^0 . \quad (2.19)$$

This leads to the multiplication factor two times bigger than for the SPS contribution (see Eq.(2.12)).

### III. RESULTS

In this section we shall show our results for recent CMS [13] ATLAS [14] and LHCb [15] data. The CMS data is for  $\sqrt{s} = 7 \text{ TeV}$  and  $-1.2 < y_X < 1.2$ , the ATLAS data for  $\sqrt{s} = 8 \text{ TeV}$ ,  $-0.75 < y_X < 0.75$  and the LHCb data for  $\sqrt{s} = 13 \text{ TeV}$ ,  $2 < y_X < 4.5$ . In all cases the  $X(3872)$  was measured in the  $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$  channel. We have used a number of different unintegrated gluon distributions, firstly a distribution obtained from the solution of a BFKL equation with kinematic constraints by Kutak and Staśto denoted KS [38], secondly a gluon uPDF obtained from a modified Kimber-Martin-Ryskin (KMR) procedure [39, 40] based on Durham group collinear PDFs [41]. Finally we also employ a gluon uPDF obtained by Hautmann and Jung [42] from a description of precise HERA data on deep inelastic structure function by a solution of the CCFM evolution equations.

#### A. $c\bar{c}$ state

Here we show our results for  $\chi_{c1}(3872)$  production treated as a pure  $c\bar{c}$  state. In Figs.3, 4,5 we show the transverse momentum distribution of the  $X(3872)$  together with the data




FIG. 3: Transverse momentum distribution of  $X(3872)$  for the CMS experiment. Shown are results for 3 different gluon uPDFs. Here  $BR = 0.038$ . The upper limit for the SPS molecular scenario is shown as the solid line. We also show corresponding distribution for the DPS mechanism (dotted line).

from the CMS, ATLAS and LHCb experimental data. A surprisingly good description is obtained with different gluon uPDFs specified in the figure legend without any free parameters. It is worth to mention approximately good slope of the  $p_{TX}$  distributions which is due to effective inclusion of higher-order corrections. The corresponding result within the collinear leading-order approximation would be equal to zero! A slightly different slope is obtained for the molecular scenario (solid line) discussed in detail somewhat below.






FIG. 4: Transverse momentum distribution of  $X(3872)$  for the ATLAS experiment. Shown are results for 3 different gluon uPDFs. Here  $BR = 0.038 \cdot 0.0596$ . The upper limit for the SPS molecular scenario is shown as the solid line.

### B. Molecular picture

Here we show our predictions for  $\chi_{c,1}(3872)$  production treated as the  $\bar{D}^{*0}D^0 + h.c.$  molecule. Then the  $\chi_{c,1}(3872)$  can be produced if  $k_{rel}$  is small, and an estimate (or upper bound) for its production cross section can be obtained from the continuum cross section at small  $k_{rel}$ . In Fig.6 we show the distribution in this variable for different windows of  $|\vec{p}_{T_{c\bar{c}}}|$  (0,5 GeV), (5,10 GeV), (10,15) GeV, (15,20) GeV, (20,25) GeV, (25,30) GeV.

Similar shapes in  $k_{rel}$  are obtained for the different windows of  $p_{T_{c\bar{c}}}$ .

To visualize this better we show in the right panel of Fig.6  $k_{rel}^{-2} d\sigma/dk_{rel}$ . As expected, the so-obtained distributions closely follow phase-space, and are almost flat in a broad




FIG. 5: Transverse momentum distribution of  $X(3872)$  for the LHCb experiment. Shown are results for 3 different gluon uPDFs. Here  $BR = 0.038$ . The upper limit for the SPS molecular scenario is shown as the solid line.

range of  $k_{rel}$ . Therefore, the cross section has essentially the phase-space behaviour

$$d\sigma \propto k_{rel}^2 dk_{rel}, \quad (3.1)$$

which implies the strong, cubic dependence  $\propto k_{max}^3$  on the upper limit  $k_{max}$  of the  $k_{rel}$ -integration.

The calculation in the whole phase space  $p_{T1} \in (0, 20)$  GeV and  $p_{T2} \in (0, 20)$  GeV leads to fluctuations at large  $p_{Tc\bar{c}} > 20$  GeV. This can be understood as due to steep dependence of the cross section on  $p_{T1}, p_{T2}, y_1, y_2, \phi$ . Only a narrow range in the  $p_{T1} \otimes p_{T2}$  space with  $p_{T1} \approx p_{T2}$  fulfills the condition  $k_{rel} < k_{max} = 0.2$  GeV.

We remind the reader that this value of  $k_{max}$  is imposed on the  $c\bar{c}$  final state, and would




FIG. 6: Distribution in  $k_{rel}$  for different windows of  $p_{t,c\bar{c}} = p_{t,X}$  (left panel) for the CMS kinematics as specified in the main text. In the right panel we show the cross sections divided by  $k_{rel}^2$ . In these calculations the KMR UGDF with the MMHT NLO collinear gluon distribution was used. Branching fractions are included here.

correspond to a smaller  $k_{max}^{DD^*} \sim 0.14 \text{ GeV}$  for the  $D\bar{D}^*$  mesons. Due to the behaviour shown in Eq.(3.1), the cross section for  $k_{max} = 0.14 \text{ GeV}$  or  $k_{max} = 0.1 \text{ GeV}$  imposed on the  $c\bar{c}$  state would go down by a factor three or eight, respectively.

The distribution in relative azimuthal angle between  $c\bar{c}$  in the  $pp$ -frame with the cut  $k_{rel} < 0.2 \text{ GeV}$  is shown in Fig.7. This is rather a steep distribution around  $\phi = 0^\circ$ . This is not a typical region of the phase space. Recall, that in the leading-order collinear approach  $\phi = 180^\circ$ . It is obvious that the region of  $\phi \approx 0$  cannot be obtained easily in the collinear approach. As discussed in [33] the  $k_T$ -factorization approach gives a relatively good description of  $D^0\bar{D}^0$  correlations in this region of the phase space.

Having understood the kinematics of the  $X(3872)$  production we can improve the description of transverse momentum distribution of  $X(3872)$ . The rather strong correlation  $p_{T1} \approx p_{T2}$  allows to perform VEGAS calculation simultaneously limiting to




FIG. 7: Azimuthal correlations between  $c\bar{c}$  that fullfill the condition  $k_{rel} < 0.2$  GeV. Here the CMS cuts were imposed. We show contribution of SPS (solid line) and DPS (dashed line).

$p_{T1}, p_{T2} > p_{Tmin}$ . We have also verified that

$$p_{T1} + p_{T2} \approx p_{Tc\bar{c}} = |\vec{p}_{T1} + \vec{p}_{T2}|. \quad (3.2)$$

Therefore imposing lower limits on  $p_{T1} > p_{Tmin}$  and  $p_{T2} > p_{Tmin}$  means also lower limit on  $p_{Tc\bar{c}} > 2p_{Tmin}$ . The solid line in Fig.3 shows result of such a calculation. The fluctuations are gone. Combining the two calculations at say  $p_{Tc\bar{c}} = 15$  GeV gives a smooth result everywhere.

### C. Hybrid approach

Still another option is to assume that  $X$  is the combination:

$$|X(3782)\rangle = \alpha|c\bar{c}\rangle + \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}}(|D\bar{D}^*\rangle + |\bar{D}D^*\rangle). \quad (3.3)$$

Such a state could be called hybrid. Since the cross section for production of conventional and molecular  $X(3872)$  are rather similar, it is difficult to select one combination of  $\alpha$  and




FIG. 8: Transverse momentum distribution of  $X(3872)$  for the CMS, ATLAS and LHCb experiments. Shown are results for the KMR UGDF. Here  $BR = 0.038$  for CMS and LHCb, and  $BR = 0.038 \cdot 0.0596$  for ATLAS. We show results for different combinations of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  as specified in the figure legend.

$\beta$ . For example in Fig.8 we show also such a result for  $\alpha^2 = \beta^2 = 0.5$  (dash-dotted line). The corresponding result is similar to the result for  $\alpha^2 = 1, \beta^2 = 0$  (pure  $c\bar{c}$  state) and  $\alpha^2 = 0, \beta^2 = 1$  (pure molecular state) calculated for the KMR UGDF. The fifty-fifty mixture gives quite good representation of all the experimental data.

In summary, it is very difficult at present to definitely conclude what is the mechanism of the  $X(3872)$  production. The same is true for the wave function of the  $X(3872)$  meson (see Eq.(3.3)). At present we cannot answer the question whether  $X(3872)$  is of

conventional, molecular or hybrid type. More work is definitely needed in future.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have performed the calculation of  $X(3872)$  production at the LHC energies. We have performed two independent calculations: one within nonrelativistic QCD approach assuming pure  $c\bar{c}$  state and second assuming a coalescence of  $D$  and  $\bar{D}^*$  or  $\bar{D}$  and  $D^*$ , consistent with molecular state assumption. The first calculation requires usage of derivative of the  $c\bar{c}$  wave function. In the present analysis we have used the wave function obtained in [23]. The resulting cross section was calculated within the  $k_T$ -factorization approach with a few unintegrated gluon distributions. In the second approach first the hard production of a  $c\bar{c}$  pair is calculated. Next a simple hadronization is performed giving a correlation distribution of  $D$  and  $D^*$  mesons. Imposing limitations (upper limit) on relative momenta of  $D$  and  $\bar{D}^*$  we get a  $p_T$ -dependent upper limit of the cross section for  $D$ - $\bar{D}^*$  or  $\bar{D}$ - $D^*$  fusion (coalescence). We compare, for the first time, to all available experimental data on the  $p_T$ -dependent cross section. The both, quite different, scenarios give the cross section of the right order of magnitude, very similar to the CMS, ATLAS and LHCb experimental data.

Also a mixture of both mechanism leads to correct description of the CMS, ATLAS and LHCb data. Our study within  $k_T$ -factorization approach shows that all the options are in the game.

#### Acknowledgments

This work is partially supported by the Polish National Science Centre under Grant No. 2018/31/B/ST2/03537 and by the Center for Innovation and Transfer of Natural Sciences and Engineering Knowledge in Rzeszów (Poland).

- 
- [1] S.K. Choi et al. (Belle collaboration), "Observation of a narrow charmonium-like state in exclusive  $B^+ \rightarrow K^+ \pi^+ \pi^- J/\psi$  decays", Phys. Rev. Lett. **91** (2003) 262001.

- [2] R. F. Lebed, R. E. Mitchell and E. S. Swanson, “Heavy-Quark QCD Exotica,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **93** (2017), 143-194 [arXiv:1610.04528 [hep-ph]].
- [3] S. L. Olsen, T. Skwarnicki and D. Zieminska, “Nonstandard heavy mesons and baryons: Experimental evidence,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90** (2018) no.1, 015003 [arXiv:1708.04012 [hep-ph]].
- [4] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, C. Hanhart, A. Nefediev, C. P. Shen, C. E. Thomas, A. Vairo and C. Z. Yuan, “The XYZ states: experimental and theoretical status and perspectives,” *Phys. Rept.* **873** (2020), 1-154 [arXiv:1907.07583 [hep-ex]].
- [5] P.A. Żyła et al. (Particle Data Group), “The Review of Particle Physics (2021)”, *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2020** (2020) no.8, 083C01 and 2021 update.
- [6] F. K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U. G. Meißner, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao and B. S. Zou, “Hadronic molecules,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90** (2018) no.1, 015004 [arXiv:1705.00141 [hep-ph]].
- [7] L. Maiani, F. Piccini, A. D. Polosa and V. Riquer, “Diquark-antidiquark with hidden or open charm and the nature of  $X(3872)$ ”, *Phys. Rev.* **D71** (2005) 014028.
- [8] N. N. Achasov and E. V. Rogozina, “ $X(3872)$ ,  $I^G(J^{PC}) = 0^+(1^{++})$ , as the  $\chi_{1c}(2P)$  charmonium,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **30** (2015) no.33, 1550181 [arXiv:1501.03583 [hep-ph]].
- [9] E. Cincioglu, J. Nieves, A. Ozpineci and A. U. Yilmazer, “Quarkonium Contribution to Meson Molecules,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) no.10, 576 [arXiv:1606.03239 [hep-ph]].
- [10] S. Coito, G. Rupp and E. van Beveren, “ $X(3872)$  is not a true molecule”, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2351.
- [11] F. Giacosa, M. Piotrowska and S. Coito, “ $X(3872)$  as virtual companion pole of the charm-anticharm state  $\chi_{c1}(2P)$ ,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **34** (2019) no.29, 1950173 [arXiv:1903.06926 [hep-ph]].
- [12] X. W. Kang and J. A. Oller, “Different pole structures in line shapes of the  $X(3872)$ ,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) no.6, 399 [arXiv:1612.08420 [hep-ph]].
- [13] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS], “Measurement of the  $X(3872)$  Production Cross Section Via Decays to  $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$  in  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV,” *JHEP* **04** (2013), 154 [arXiv:1302.3968 [hep-ex]].
- [14] M. Aaboud *et al.* (ATLAS collaboration), “Measurement of  $\psi(2S)$  and  $X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$  production in  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV with the ATLAS detector”, *JHEP* **01**(2017) 117.
- [15] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], “Measurement of  $\chi_{c1}(3872)$  production in proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  and 13 TeV,” [arXiv:2109.07360 [hep-ex]].

- [16] C. Bignamini, B. Grinstein, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa and C. Sabelli, “Is the  $X(3872)$  Production Cross Section at Tevatron Compatible with a Hadron Molecule Interpretation?,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** (2009), 162001 [arXiv:0906.0882 [hep-ph]].
- [17] P. Artoisenet and E. Braaten, “Production of the  $X(3872)$  at the Tevatron and the LHC,” *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010), 114018 [arXiv:0911.2016 [hep-ph]].
- [18] M. Albaladejo, F. K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U. G. Meißner, J. Nieves, A. Nogga and Z. Yang, “Note on  $X(3872)$  production at hadron colliders and its molecular structure,” *Chin. Phys. C* **41** (2017) no.12, 121001 [arXiv:1709.09101 [hep-ph]].
- [19] W. Wang, “On the production of hidden-flavored hadronic states at high energy,” *Chin. Phys. C* **42** (2018) no.4, 043103 [arXiv:1709.10382 [hep-ph]].
- [20] M. Butenschoen, Z. G. He and B. A. Kniehl, “NLO NRQCD disfavors the interpretation of  $X(3872)$  as  $\chi_{c1}(2P)$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013), 011501 [arXiv:1303.6524 [hep-ph]].
- [21] C. Meng, H. Han and K. T. Chao, “ $X(3872)$  and its production at hadron colliders,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) no.7, 074014 [arXiv:1304.6710 [hep-ph]].
- [22] P. Ilten and M. Uthm, “Forming molecular states with hadronic rescattering,” *Eur. Phys. J. A* **58** (2022) no.1, 1 [arXiv:2108.03479 [hep-ph]].
- [23] E.J. Eichten and C. Quigg, “Quarkonium wave function at the origin: an update”, arXiv:1904.11542.
- [24] S. Catani, M. Ciafaloni and F. Hautmann, “High-energy factorization and small  $x$  heavy flavor production,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **366** (1991), 135-188
- [25] E. M. Levin, M. G. Ryskin, Y. M. Shabelski and A. G. Shuvaev, “Heavy quark production in semihard nucleon interactions,” *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **53** (1991), 657
- [26] J. C. Collins and R. K. Ellis, “Heavy quark production in very high-energy hadron collisions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **360** (1991), 3-30
- [27] B.A. Kniehl, D.V. Vasin and V.A. Saleev, “Charmonium production at high energy in the  $k_t$ -factorization approach”, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 074022 (2006).
- [28] S. P. Baranov, A. V. Lipatov and N. P. Zotov, “Prompt charmonia production and polarization at LHC in the NRQCD with  $k_t$ -factorization. Part II:  $\chi_c$  mesons,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) no.9, 094012 [arXiv:1510.02411 [hep-ph]].
- [29] A. Cisek and A. Szczurek, “Prompt inclusive production of  $J/\psi$ ,  $\psi'$  and  $\chi_c$  mesons at the LHC in forward directions within the NRQCD  $k_t$ -factorization approach: Search for the onset



- of gluon saturation”, Phys. Rev. **D97** (2018) 034035.
- [30] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb], “Measurement of the  $\eta_c(1S)$  production cross-section in proton-proton collisions via the decay  $\eta_c(1S) \rightarrow p\bar{p}$ ,” Eur. Phys. J. C **75** (2015) no.7, 311 [arXiv:1409.3612 [hep-ex]].
- [31] I. Babiarz, R. Pasechnik, W. Schäfer and A. Szczurek, “Hadroproduction of  $\eta_c(1S, 2S)$  in the  $k_T$ -factorization approach”, JHEP **2002** (2020) 037.
- [32] A. Cisek, W. Schäfer and A. Szczurek, “Production of  $\chi_c$  pairs with large rapidity separation in  $k_T$  factorization,” Phys. Rev. D **97** (2018) no.11, 114018 [arXiv:1711.07366 [hep-ph]].
- [33] R. Maciula and A. Szczurek, “Open charm production at the LHC -  $k_t$ -factorization approach”, Phys. Rev. **D87** (2013) 094022.
- [34] M. Lisovyi, A. Verbytskyi and O. Zenaiev, “Combined analysis of charm-quark fragmentation-fraction measurements,” Eur. Phys. J. C **76**, no.7, 397 (2016) [arXiv:1509.01061 [hep-ex]].
- [35] G Aad et al. (ATLAS collaboration), “Measurement of  $D^{*\pm}$ ,  $D^\pm$  and  $D_s^\pm$  meson production cross section in  $pp$  collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  TeV with the ATLAS detector”, Nucl. Phys. **B907** (2016) 717.
- [36] G. P. Lepage, “A New Algorithm for Adaptive Multidimensional Integration,” J. Comput. Phys. **27**, 192 (1978).
- [37] R. Maciula and A. Szczurek, “Production of  $c\bar{c}c\bar{c}$  in double-parton scattering within  $k_t$ -factorization approach – meson-meson correlations,” Phys. Rev. D **87**, no.7, 074039 (2013) [arXiv:1301.4469 [hep-ph]].
- [38] K. Kutak and A. M. Stasto, “Unintegrated gluon distribution from modified BK equation,” Eur. Phys. J. C **41** (2005), 343-351 [arXiv:hep-ph/0408117 [hep-ph]].
- [39] M. A. Kimber, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, “Unintegrated parton distributions,” Phys. Rev. D **63**, 114027 (2001) [hep-ph/0101348].
- [40] A. D. Martin, M. G. Ryskin and G. Watt, “NLO prescription for unintegrated parton distributions,” Eur. Phys. J. C **66**, 163 (2010) [arXiv:0909.5529 [hep-ph]];  
G. Watt, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, “Unintegrated parton distributions and electroweak boson production at hadron colliders,” Phys. Rev. D **70**, 014012 (2004) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **70**, 079902 (2004)] [hep-ph/0309096].
- [41] L. A. Harland-Lang, A. D. Martin, P. Motylinski and R. S. Thorne, “Parton distributions in the

- LHC era: MMHT 2014 PDFs," *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, no. 5, 204 (2015) [arXiv:1412.3989 [hep-ph]].
- [42] F. Hautmann and H. Jung, "Transverse momentum dependent gluon density from DIS precision data," *Nucl. Phys. B* **883**, 1 (2014) [arXiv:1312.7875 [hep-ph]].