

Semi-inclusive electroproduction of hidden-charm and double-charm hadronic molecules

Pan-Pan Shi,^{1,2,*} Feng-Kun Guo,^{1,2,†} and Zhi Yang^{3,‡}

¹*CAS Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

²*School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

³*School of Physics, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China,
Chengdu 610054, China*

(Dated: August 5, 2022)

The semi-inclusive electroproduction of exotic hadrons, including the T_{cc} states, P_{cs} states, and hidden-charm baryon-antibaryon states, is explored under the assumption that they are S -wave hadronic molecules of a pair of charmed hadrons. We employ the Monte Carlo event generator Pythia to produce the hadron pairs and then bind them together to form hadronic molecules. With the use of such production mechanism, the semi-inclusive electroproduction rates are estimated at the order-of-magnitude level. Our results indicate that a larger number of P_{cs} states and $\Lambda_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$ molecules can be produced at the proposed electron-ion colliders in China and in the US, EicC and US-EIC, respectively. The results also suggest that the T_{cc} states and other hidden-charm baryon-antibaryon states can be searched for at US-EIC. Besides, the potential 24 GeV upgrade of CEBAF at Jefferson Lab can play an important role in the search of the hidden-charm tetraquark and pentaquark states due to its high luminosity.

* shipanpan@itp.ac.cn

† fkguo@itp.ac.cn

‡ zhiyang@uestc.edu.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

In the last two decades, a number of hadron structures have been observed in various high-energy experiments, such as BESIII [1], LHCb [2], Belle [3] and so on. Many of these structures possess properties incompatible with the predictions of the traditional quark model for quark-antiquark mesons and three-quark baryons, and therefore are excellent candidates of the so-called exotic hadrons. These structures have been extensively studied with different models, but the debates about their nature still exist (for recent reviews, see Refs. [4–13]).

So far most of the exotic states were observed at hadron-hadron and electron-positron collisions. To understand the nature of the exotic states, other production processes are proposed to search for these states. Notably, the photoproduction or leptonproduction processes have the advantage that the possible resonant signals are free of triangle singularities (for a review see Ref. [12]). Pioneering works of searching for exotic hadrons in the photoproduction processes have been done by the COMPASS and GlueX Collaborations. The COMPASS Collaboration searched for the $Z_c(3900)^\pm$ in the $J/\psi\pi^\pm$ invariant mass distribution, but there was no signal [14]. Later, the COMPASS Collaboration observed a peak around 3.86 GeV in the $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ invariant mass distribution with a 4.1σ statistical significance, the $\tilde{X}(3872)$, in the muoproduction process [15], and the measured $\pi^+\pi^-$ invariant mass distribution indicates a negative C parity for this structure. The GlueX Collaboration found no evidence of hidden-charm pentaquark P_c states in the near-threshold J/ψ exclusive photoproduction off the proton in Hall D at Jefferson Lab (JLab) and set model-dependent upper limits (using a vector-meson dominance model) for the branching fractions $\text{Br}[P_c^+ \rightarrow J/\psi p]$ [16].

The proposed Electron-ion collider in China (EicC) [17], the Electron-Ion Collider in the US (US-EIC) [18], and a potential 24 GeV upgrade of the Continuous Beam Accelerator Facility (CEBAF) at JLab [19], provide new opportunities to search for exotic hadron structures and to study the nature of such states. The center-of-mass (c.m.) energies at EicC and US-EIC are much higher than the thresholds of charmed hadron pairs, so that they permit semi-inclusive electroproductions of hidden-charm (and even double-charm) exotic states. For CEBAF (24 GeV), the c.m. energy of the electron-proton system with a 24 GeV electron beam hitting at the proton target is about 6.7 GeV and thus much lower than that at EicC and US-EIC; yet, its luminosity is much higher. The energy configurations and luminosities of these facilities are listed in Table I.

Many works have estimated the cross sections for the exclusive photoproduction of the hidden-

charm pentaquark states [20–32] and hidden-charm tetraquark states [33–38] with the vector-meson dominance model, which assumes that the photon emitted from the electron converts into a J/ψ which then interacts with the proton to produce the hidden-charm states. Yet, since the production of a heavy quarkonium, such as the J/ψ , in high-energy reactions requires the heavy quark and anti-quark pair to be confined in a small phase space, its production rate is much lower than that of a pair of open-charm hadrons. In view of this, the open-charm hadron pair might be a crucial component in producing the exotic hadrons with hidden-charm of double-charm. In particular, in Ref. [39], it was pointed out that the GlueX measured total cross section for the near-threshold photoproduction of the J/ψ in $\gamma J/\psi \rightarrow J/\psi p$ is consistent with assuming that the reaction is dominated by the $\Lambda_c \bar{D}^{(*)}$ channels through $\gamma J/\psi \rightarrow \Lambda_c \bar{D}^{(*)} \rightarrow J/\psi p$. Furthermore, the results for the heavy vector quarkonia, calculated by solving the Dyson-Schwinger equation, are incompatible with the assumption of the vector-meson dominance model in the electroproduction process [40]. Therefore, it is necessary to explore the photoproduction of the exotic states with other methods.

Based on the hadronic molecular picture, the semi-inclusive lepton production rates of the hidden-charm hadrons at COMPASS, EicC, and US-EIC were estimated in Ref. [41]. The considered production mechanism is such that the charmed hadron pairs are semi-inclusively generated with the use of a Monte Carlo (MC) event generator and then bound together to form hadronic molecules through the final state interaction (FSI) [42–44]. This mechanism has been employed to estimate the cross sections at an order-of-magnitude level for the productions of the $X(3872)$ [45–47], the spin partner and bottom analogues of the $X(3872)$ [44], the charm-strange hadronic molecules [43], the charged charmonium-like and bottomonium-like states [48], the P_c states [49], and the dionium (the $D^+ D^-$ hadronic atom) [50]. The so-obtained cross sections for the production of the $X(3872)$ [8] at hadron colliders are in line with the measurements at CDF [51] and CMS [52].

In this work, we employ the same mechanism to estimate the cross sections for the semi-inclusive electroproduction of the double-charm T_{cc} states, the hidden-charm P_{cs} states, and hidden-charm baryon-antibaryon states at EicC and US-EIC, and the semi-inclusive electroproduction rates of the $X(3872)$, $Z_c(3900)^{0(+)}$, P_c states, and the $P_{cs}(4459)$ at JLab.¹ Among the exotic states discussed in this work, the $P_c(4312)$, $P_c(4440)$, $P_c(4457)$, $P_{cs}(4459)$, and T_{cc}^+ were observed by the LHCb Collaboration [53–56]; the $X(3872)$ was firstly reported by the Belle Collaboration [57];

¹ The P_c states at the running JLab experiments are hardly produced due to the low c.m. energy (up to about 4.8 GeV) and thus small cross sections. In this work, we only discuss the possible upgrade of CEBAF with the electron energy being 24 GeV.

TABLE I. Energy configurations and luminosities for EicC, US-EIC, and the proposed 24 GeV upgrade of CEBAF. The integrated luminosities correspond to about a year of operations for EicC, US-EIC and CEBAF (24 GeV).

	EicC [17]	US-EIC [18]	CEBAF (24 GeV) [19]
e [GeV]	3.5	18	24
p [GeV]	20	275	0
Luminosity [$\text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$]	2×10^{33}	10^{34}	10^{36}
Integrated luminosity [fb^{-1}]	60	300	3×10^4

the $Z_c(3900)^+$ was discovered by the BESIII and Belle Collaborations [58, 59]; the $Z_c(3900)^0$ was observed by the BESIII Collaboration [60]. The rest of states are predicted in the hadronic molecular picture; see Refs. [61, 62] for a survey of the spectrum of hidden-charm and double-charm hadronic molecules.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce the semi-inclusive electroproduction mechanism of hadronic molecules. Our numerical results, the production rates for the exotic states at EicC, US-EIC, and the 24 GeV upgrade of CEBAF, are presented in Section III. We briefly summarize this work in Section IV. Appendix A contains the derivation of the production cross section of the spin-3/2 molecule, which is composed of a baryon and a vector meson.

II. THE SEMI-INCLUSIVE PRODUCTION MECHANISM

As shown in Fig. 1, the mechanism for the semi-inclusive electroproduction of a hadronic molecule is that a virtual photon, radiated by the electron, interacts with the proton to produce the hadron pair HH' and other particles denoted by “all” [41], and then the HH' pair is bound together to form a hadronic molecule through the FSI. The amplitude of the semi-inclusive production of the hadronic molecule X , therefore, can be factorized into a short-distance part and a long-distance part [43, 44, 46, 63],

$$\mathcal{M}[X + \text{all}] = \mathcal{M}[HH' + \text{all}] \cdot G \cdot T_X, \quad (1)$$




FIG. 1. The semi-inclusive electroproduction of the HH' hadronic molecule X in ep collisions. The other particles produced in this process are generally denoted by “all.”

where T_X denotes the amplitude for the long-distance process of fusing the HH' pair into the hadronic molecule X , which can be approximated by the effective coupling constant for X to its constituents in the case of loosely bound hadronic molecules, and the rest is the short-distance part. $\mathcal{M}[HH' + \text{all}]$ denotes the amplitude for the short-distance process $ep \rightarrow HH' + \text{all}$, and G denotes the Green's function of the HH' pair, which is ultraviolet divergent and the divergence can be absorbed by $\mathcal{M}[HH' + \text{all}]$ [63].

For the production process $ep \rightarrow HH' + \text{all}$, the semi-inclusive production of HH' at short distances may be simulated by the MC event generator Pythia [64]. The general differential cross section for the inclusive production of HH' in the MC event generator is

$$d\sigma[HH'(k)]_{\text{MC}} = K_{HH'} \frac{1}{\text{flux}} \sum_{\text{all}} \int d\phi_{HH'+\text{all}} |\mathcal{M}[HH' + \text{all}]|^2 \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2\mu}, \quad (2)$$

where k and μ are the three-momentum in the c.m. frame and the reduced mass of the HH' system, respectively. The difference between the MC simulation and the experimental data is amended by an overall factor $K_{HH'}$. To estimate the cross sections for the semi-inclusive electroproduction of hadronic molecules at the order-of-magnitude level, we roughly set $K_{HH'} \simeq 1$. The total cross section for the semi-inclusive production of a hadronic molecule X can be derived from Eqs. (1) and (2),

$$\sigma[X + \text{all}] \simeq \frac{\mathcal{N}}{4m_H m_{H'}} |GT_X|^2 \left(\frac{d\sigma[HH' + \text{all}]}{dk} \right)_{\text{MC}} \frac{4\pi^2 \mu}{k^2}, \quad (3)$$

where $m_H(m_{H'})$ is the mass of $H(H')$, and $\mathcal{N} = 2/3$ for the production of the $\Sigma_c \bar{D}^*$ and $\Xi_c \bar{D}^*$ molecular states with quantum numbers $J^P = 3/2^-$ (see Appendix A) and $\mathcal{N} = 1$ for the other hadronic molecules considered in this work. Here we neglect the scattering between $H(H')$ and

other final-state particles. Then the differential cross section for the HH' production in the MC event generator is

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma[HH' + \text{all}]}{dk}\right)_{\text{MC}} \propto k^2. \quad (4)$$

The Green's function G in Eq. (3) is ultraviolet divergent and can be regularized by a Gaussian regulator as [65]

$$G(E, \Lambda) = -\frac{\mu}{\pi^2} \left\{ \sqrt{2\pi} \frac{\Lambda}{4} + \frac{k\pi}{2} e^{-2k^2/\Lambda^2} \left[i - \operatorname{erfi} \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}k}{\Lambda} \right) \right] \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where the three-momentum k is related to the energy E of the HH' pair, i.e., $k^2 = 2\mu(E - m_H - m_{H'})$, and $\operatorname{erfi}(x) = 2/\sqrt{\pi} \int_0^x e^{t^2} dt$ is the imaginary error function. The short-distance amplitude for producing the HH' pair in Eq. (1) should scale as Λ^{-1} so as to absorb the leading Λ dependence in Eq. (5) [63]. Here since we have taken the short-distance amplitude to be fixed from the MC event generator, which does not have a Λ dependence, we choose the cutoff Λ to be in a reasonable range $0.5 \sim 1.0$ GeV for an estimate [61, 66–68].

For all the considered hadronic molecules, the mass is close to the threshold of HH' which couples to the hadronic molecule in an S wave. Thus, the amplitude T_X in Eq. (3) can be approximated by an effective coupling constant g_{eff} . The coupling constant g_{eff} can be extracted from the T -matrix for the low-energy scattering process $HH' \rightarrow HH'$,

$$g_{\text{eff}}^2 = \lim_{E \rightarrow E_0} (E^2 - E_0^2) T(E), \quad (6)$$

with E_0 the pole position in the complex E plane of the HH' scattering T matrix. We have $E_0 = M_X$ for a bound or virtual state (with the pole on the first or second Riemann sheet) and $E_0 = M_X - i\Gamma/2$ for a resonance (with the pole on the second Riemann sheet). Here M_X and Γ are the mass and decay width of the hadronic molecule X , respectively. Near the threshold, we only consider a constant contact term as the interaction kernel V for the scattering process $HH' \rightarrow HH'$. Then, the T -matrix for the scattering of $HH' \rightarrow HH'$ can be calculated by solving the Lippmann-Schwinger equation,

$$T(E) = \frac{V}{1 - VG(E, \Lambda)}. \quad (7)$$

Poles of T -matrix on the first or second Riemann sheet of the complex E plane satisfy the equation $\det[1 - VG(E_0, \Lambda)] = 0$. Note that in the evaluation of the effective coupling, Eq. (6), $T(E)$ should take its value according to the specific Riemann sheet where the pole is located.

We consider isospin breaking effects for the $X(3872)$ by considering both the $D^0\bar{D}^{0*} + c.c.$ and $D^+D^{*-} + c.c.$ channels, and the V -matrix is

$$V = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} C_0 + C_1 & C_0 - C_1 \\ C_0 - C_1 & C_0 + C_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where C_0 and C_1 are the low-energy constants for the isoscalar and isovector $D\bar{D}^* + c.c.$ channels, respectively. The two low-energy constants can be solved using the $X(3872)$ mass [69] and the isospin violation ratio [70] for the $X(3872)$ decays to $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^-$ and $J/\psi\pi^+\pi^0\pi^-$ as inputs [71]. We also take the contact term as the potential for the $Z_c(3900)^0$ and $Z_c(3900)^+$, where the values of the low-energy constants are fixed in Ref. [68] from fitting to the BESIII data of the $Z_{cs}(3985)$ [72]. For the other exotic states discussed in this work, we neglect the isospin breaking effects and extract the coupling constants from the single channel T -matrix.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

The production mechanism discussed in Section II is applied to estimate the cross sections for the semi-inclusive electroproduction of hadronic molecules. We simulate the ep collisions at EicC, US-EIC, and CEBAF (24 GeV) with the MC event generator Pythia [64] and get the differential cross sections for the semi-inclusive production of the HH' pair, $(d\sigma[HH' + \text{all}]/dk)_{\text{MC}}$. As discussed in Eq. (4), the differential cross section for producing the HH' pair is proportional to k^2 in the small momentum region (in this work, we choose $|k| < 350$ MeV). For instance, the differential MC cross sections for the $\Xi_c^0\bar{D}^{*0}$ pair production at EicC, US-EIC, and fixed-target ep collisions,² as shown in Fig. 2, are exactly proportional to k^2 .

For the long-distance part, as discussed above, we use the cutoff-dependence formula in Eq. (3) with the cutoff $\Lambda \in [0.5, 1.0]$ GeV for an order-of-magnitude estimate of the cross section. To extract the effective coupling g_{eff} , the masses and quantum numbers of the hadronic molecules in Tables II and III are fixed to experimental observations, whenever possible, and theoretical predictions. For the T_{cc} states, the mass of T_{cc}^+ is set by the central value reported by the LHCb Collaboration [55, 56], while the T_{cc}^* mass is set to the theoretical prediction in Ref. [73]. The $P_{cs}(4459)$, which was observed by the LHCb Collaboration [54], might be a $\Xi_c\bar{D}^*$ bound state

² The c.m. collision energy for the 24 GeV upgrade of CEBAF [19] is lower than 10 GeV, the lower limit for the use of Pythia [64]. To estimate the cross sections, we calculate the cross sections at the electron energies $E_e = 60, 80, 100$, and 150 GeV, and then extrapolate the results to $E_e = 24$ GeV.




FIG. 2. Differential cross sections $d\sigma/dk$ for the production of $\Xi_c^0 \bar{D}^{*0}$ at ep collisions. The histograms are generated using Pythia and the dashed curves are from fits using $d\sigma/dk \propto k^2$. In the lower four plots, the proton is at rest and E_e denotes the energy of the electron beam.

with $J^P = 1/2^-$ or $3/2^-$ or the signal of both states [61, 75–78], and thus we estimate its production rates with both $J^P = 1/2^-$ and $3/2^-$. In Ref. [61], more than 200 hidden-charm hadronic molecules were predicted. In addition to the ones whose production rates have been estimated in Ref. [41],

TABLE II. Order-of-magnitude estimates of the cross sections (in units of pb) for $ep \rightarrow X + \text{all}$ at EicC and US-EIC, where X denotes one of the two T_{cc} states, three P_{cs} states, and some hidden-charm baryon-antibaryon molecules. The quantum numbers for those states are listed in the third column. The binding energies, defined as $m_1 + m_2 - M$ with $m_{1,2}$ the masses of the constituents and M the mass of the hadronic molecule, are listed in the fourth column. The results outside (inside) parentheses denote the cross sections with $\Lambda = 0.5$ GeV (1.0 GeV).

	Constituents	$IJ^{P(C)}$	Binding energy [MeV]	EicC [pb]	US-EIC [pb]
T_{cc}^+	DD^*	01^+	0.273 [55, 56]	0.3×10^{-3} (1.2×10^{-3})	0.1 (0.5)
T_{cc}^*	D^*D^*	01^+	0.503 [73]	0.2×10^{-3} (1.0×10^{-3})	0.1 (0.4)
P_{cs}	$\Xi_c \bar{D}$	$0\frac{1}{2}^-$	0.3 (3.53) [61]	0.1 (1.6)	1.8 (30)
P_{cs}	$\Xi_c \bar{D}^*$	$0\frac{1}{2}^-$	18.83 [74]	0.1 (0.5)	1.3 (8.8)
P_{cs}	$\Xi_c \bar{D}^*$	$0\frac{3}{2}^-$	18.83 [74]	0.1 (0.9)	2.6 (18)
	$\Lambda_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$	00^{++}	1.98 (33.8) [61]	0.3 (3.0)	9.6 (110)
	$\Sigma_c \bar{\Sigma}_c$	00^{++}	11.1 (60.8) [61]	0.7×10^{-3} (5.2×10^{-3})	0.04 (0.29)
	$\Sigma_c \bar{\Sigma}_c$	10^{++}	8.28 (53) [61]	0.7×10^{-3} (5.3×10^{-3})	0.04 (0.29)
	$\Xi_c \bar{\Xi}_c$	00^{++}	4.72 (42.2) [61]	1.4×10^{-3} (1.1×10^{-2})	0.1 (0.5)
	$\Xi_c \bar{\Xi}_c$	10^{++}	18.2 (0.39) [61]	0.1×10^{-3} (1.7×10^{-3})	3.9×10^{-3} (7.1×10^{-2})
	$\Lambda_c \bar{\Sigma}_c$	10^-	2.19 (33.9) [61]	0.01 (0.12)	0.5 (5.5)
	$\Lambda_c \bar{\Xi}_c$	$\frac{1}{2}0^-$	1.29 (8.42) [61]	0.01 (0.14)	0.2 (5.3)
	$\Xi_c \bar{\Sigma}_c$	$\frac{1}{2}0^-$	5.98 (46.4) [61]	0.8×10^{-3} (7.3×10^{-3})	0.04 (0.36)

we consider here the $\Xi_c \bar{D}$ molecule and a set of hidden-charm baryon-antibaryon molecules, composed of $\Lambda_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$, $\Sigma_c \bar{\Sigma}_c$, $\Xi_c \bar{\Xi}_c$, $\Lambda_c \bar{\Sigma}_c$, $\Lambda_c \bar{\Xi}_c$ and $\Xi_c \bar{\Sigma}_c$. Among these states predicted in Ref. [61], the $\Xi_c \bar{\Xi}_c$ molecule with $IJ^{PC} = 10^{++}$ is a virtual state; the $\Xi_c \bar{D}$ and $\Lambda_c \bar{\Xi}_c$ molecules are virtual states when $\Lambda = 0.5$ GeV, while they are bound states when $\Lambda = 1$ GeV; the other states are bound states. Following Refs. [79–81], we assign the $P_c(4312)$ and the narrow $P_c(4380)$ [80] as the $\Sigma_c \bar{D}$

molecule with $J^P = 1/2^-$ and the $\Sigma_c^* \bar{D}$ molecule with $J^P = 1/2^-$, respectively, and the $P_c(4440)$ and $P_c(4457)$ as the $\Sigma_c \bar{D}^*$ molecules with $J^P = 3/2^-$ and $1/2^-$. Following Ref. [41], we use the P_c masses from scheme II in Ref. [80] as inputs to extract the effective coupling constants g_{eff} .

We estimate the cross sections for the production of the molecules, as shown in Table II, at EicC and US-EIC with the energy configurations in Table I. Our results show that the cross sections at US-EIC are roughly one-order-of-magnitude larger than that at EicC for producing hidden-charm hadronic molecules, which are in line with the estimates in Ref. [41]. However, as shown in Table II, this difference increases to two orders of magnitude for the T_{cc} states. Such a difference is caused by the different charm numbers between the T_{cc} states and hidden-charm states. In the processes for the production of the T_{cc} states, at least two charm quarks and two anti-charm quarks should be generated in ep collisions. Comparing with the production of the hidden-charm exotic states, higher c.m. collision energies are required to efficiently produce the T_{cc} states. With the energy configurations listed in Table I, the c.m. collision energy for EicC is about 17 GeV, which is smaller than that of US-EIC (about 141 GeV), so the cross sections for producing the T_{cc} states are reasonably small.

As listed in Table II, the cross sections for the double-charm states, T_{cc}^+ and T_{cc}^* , are at the level of 1 fb and 0.1 pb for EicC and US-EIC, respectively. Thus, the estimated numbers of T_{cc}^+ events are $18 \sim 72$ at EicC and $3 \times 10^4 \sim 1.5 \times 10^5$ at US-EIC with the integral luminosities listed in Table I. In particular, our estimate of the T_{cc}^+ event number is significantly smaller than the number of the double-charm baryon Ξ_{cc} events (about 4.0×10^5 in a year) estimated in Ref. [17]. Given that the event numbers of the T_{cc}^+ [56] and the Ξ_{cc}^+ [82] observed by the LHCb Collaboration are of the same order of magnitude,³ investigations are needed to understand the large difference. The cross sections for the P_{cs} states are around 1 pb at EicC, and tens of pb at US-EIC, so that we expect at least 6×10^3 and 3.9×10^5 events for the P_{cs} states produced at EicC and US-EIC, respectively. The estimated cross sections of the P_{cs} states are of the same order as those of the P_c states estimated in Ref. [41].

Our results indicate that, at EicC and US-EIC, the production rates for the $\Lambda_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$ molecule with quantum numbers $IJ^{PC} = 00^{-+}$ are significantly larger than those for the other baryon-antibaryon molecules listed in Table II. The events for the $\Lambda_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$ molecule are about $2 \times 10^4 \sim 2 \times 10^5$ and $3 \times 10^6 \sim 3 \times 10^7$ at EicC and US-EIC, respectively. Therefore, it is promising to find the $\Lambda_c \bar{\Lambda}_c$

³ The event number for $\Xi_{cc}^{++} \rightarrow \Lambda_c^+ (\rightarrow pK^- \pi^+) K^- \pi^+ \pi^+$ is 313 ± 33 with an integrated luminosity of 1.7 fb^{-1} [82]; the event number for $T_{cc}^+ \rightarrow D^0 (\rightarrow K^- \pi^+) \bar{D}^0 (\rightarrow K^+ \pi^-) \pi^+$ is 117 ± 16 with an integrated luminosity of 9 fb^{-1} [56].

molecule and study in detail its properties at EicC and US-EIC. Besides, for the $\Xi_c \bar{\Xi}_c$ molecule with $IJ^{PC} = 10^{-+}$, we expect that about $10 \sim 100$ and $1 \times 10^3 \sim 2 \times 10^4$ events can be produced at EicC and US-EIC, respectively, and thus it can be searched for at US-EIC.

As for CEBAF (24 GeV), because the c.m. collision energy is below the applicability energy range of Pythia, we estimate the cross sections for producing the hidden-charm hadronic molecules at higher electron energies (60, 80, 100 and 150 GeV) and then extrapolate the results to 24 GeV. The extrapolation, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4, is further constrained by requiring the cross section to vanish at the relevant threshold. The so-estimated cross sections for the production of a set of hidden-charm hadronic molecules at the proposed 24 GeV upgrade of CEBAF are listed in Table III. The cross sections are around 1 pb for producing $X(3872)$, and 0.01 pb for producing the P_c and P_{cs} states. Although the cross sections at CEBAF (24 GeV) are significantly smaller than those at EicC and US-EIC, its much higher integrated luminosity listed in Table I still permits a large number of events for certain hidden-charm exotic hadrons to be produced. For instance, $\mathcal{O}(10^7 \sim 10^8)$ $X(3872)$ can be produced through the semi-inclusive processes. Considering the branching fractions $\text{Br}(X(3872) \rightarrow J/\psi \pi \pi) = (3.8 \pm 1.2)\%$ and $\text{Br}(J/\psi \rightarrow l^+ l^-) = 12\%$ [83], the event numbers will be $\mathcal{O}(10^5 \sim 10^6)$ for one year of operation. Besides, the cross sections for the Z_c states are one order of magnitude larger than that for $X(3872)$, which are compatible with the estimate at EicC and US-EIC [41].

IV. SUMMARY

In this work, based on the hadronic molecular picture, we have estimated the semi-inclusive electroproduction rates of the typical multiquark states at EicC, US-EIC, and the proposed 24 GeV upgrade of CEBAF.

We have employed the MC event generator Pythia to simulate the production of charmed hadron pairs at short distances. Then the hadron pairs are bound together to form hadronic molecules through FSI at long distances. The production rates for typical tetraquarks, hidden-charm pentaquarks, and hidden-charm baryon-antibaryon molecules are estimated with such a production mechanism at EicC, US-EIC, and CEBAF (24 GeV). Since the c.m. energy CEBAF (24 GeV) is below the applicability energy range of Pythia, we have calculated the production rates with the electron energy at $E_e = 60, 80, 100$ and 150 GeV and then extrapolated the results to 24 GeV.

TABLE III. Order-of-magnitude estimates of the cross sections for $ep \rightarrow X + \text{all}$ at the proposed 24 GeV upgrade of CEBAF, where X denotes one of the hidden-charm hadronic molecules, $X(3872)$, $Z_c(3900)^{0(+)}$, four P_c states and two P_{cs} states. The results outside (inside) the parentheses are the cross sections estimated with $\Lambda = 0.5$ GeV (1.0 GeV).

	Constituents	$IJ^{P(C)}$	Binding energy [MeV]	σ_X [pb]
$X(3872)$	$D\bar{D}^*$	01^{++}	4.15	1.3 (5.5)
$Z_c(3900)^0$	$D\bar{D}^*$	11^{+-}	-12.57	22.9 (82.4)
$Z_c(3900)^+$	$D^{*+}\bar{D}^0$	11^+	-13.30	16.2 (59.2)
$P_c(4312)$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}$	$\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}^-$	6.68	0.02 (0.08)
$P_c(4440)^+$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}^*$	$\frac{1}{2}\frac{3}{2}^-$	21.06	0.01 (0.06)
$P_c(4457)^+$	$\Sigma_c\bar{D}^*$	$\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{2}^-$	3.06	3.4×10^{-3} (16.4×10^{-3})
$P_c(4380)^+$	$\Sigma_c^*\bar{D}$	$\frac{1}{2}\frac{3}{2}^-$	7.18	0.03 (0.15)
$P_{cs}(4459)$	$\Xi_c\bar{D}^*$	$0\frac{3}{2}^-$	18.83	4.9×10^{-3} (33.2×10^{-3})
$P_{cs}(4459)$	$\Xi_c\bar{D}^*$	$0\frac{1}{2}^-$	18.83	2.4×10^{-3} (16.6×10^{-3})

Our order-of-magnitude estimates indicate that many T_{cc} states, hidden-charm pentaquarks, and hidden-charm baryon-antibaryon states can be produced at US-EIC. While EicC will have little chance to observe double-charm T_{cc} states, lots of events can be collected in the study of hidden-charm pentaquarks and certain baryon-antibaryon molecules such as the $\Lambda_c\bar{\Lambda}_c$ molecular state. In addition, the high luminosity of the proposed 24 GeV upgrade allows CEBAF to play an important role in the search of the hidden-charm tetraquarks and pentaquarks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Jorgivan Morais Dias, Shu-Ming Wu, Mao-Jun Yan and Zhen-Hua Zhang for useful discussions. The numerical calculations was done at the HPC Cluster of ITP-CAS. This work is supported in part by the Chinese Academy of Sciences under Grant No. XDB34030000; by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grants No. 12125507, No. 11835015,




FIG. 3. Semi-inclusive cross sections for producing $X(3872)$ and $Z_c(3900)^{0(+)}$ through the $ep \rightarrow X + \text{all}$ reactions with the proton at rest. E_e denotes the electron energy in the process, and X denotes $X(3872)$ or Z_c . The blue points represent the cross sections estimated at different electron energies and the red points are the cross sections extrapolated to $E_e = 24$ GeV.

No. 12047503, and No. 11961141012; and by the NSFC and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) through the funds provided to the TRR110 ‘‘Symmetries and the Emergence of Structure in QCD’’ (NSFC Grant No. 12070131001, DFG Project-ID 196253076).




FIG. 4. Semi-inclusive cross sections for producing hidden-charm pentaquarks through the $e p \rightarrow X + \text{all}$ reactions with the proton at rest. E_e denotes the electron energy in the process, and X denotes P_c or P_{cs} . The blue points represent the cross sections estimated at different electron energies and the red points are the cross sections extrapolated to $E_e = 24$ GeV. In the last row, the left and right plots are the results assuming the spin of the $P_{cs}(4459)$ to be 1/2 and 3/2, respectively.

Appendix A: The cross section formula for the spin-3/2 molecule composed of a baryon and vector meson

The differential cross section for the inclusive production of the BV pair in c.m. frame, where B and V denote a baryon with spin $S = 1/2$ and a vector meson, respectively, is

$$\begin{aligned}
& d\sigma[\text{all} + BV^*(k)]_{\text{MC}} \\
&= \frac{1}{\text{flux}} \sum_{\text{all}} \int d\phi_{\text{all}+BV} \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{M}_i[\text{all} + BV] \bar{u}[B] u[B] \mathcal{M}_j^*[\text{all} + BV] \right) \epsilon^i[V] \epsilon^{*j}[V] \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2\mu} \\
&\simeq 2m_B \frac{1}{\text{flux}} \sum_{\text{all}} \int d\phi_{\text{all}+BV} \text{Tr} \left(\mathcal{M}^i[\text{all} + BV] \mathcal{M}_i^*[\text{all} + BV] \right) \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2\mu}, \tag{A1}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon^i[V]$ is the polarization vector of the vector meson V , and $u[B]$ is the Dirac spinor of the baryon B . The m_B , m_V , and μ are the masses of B , V , and the reduced mass of the BV pair, respectively. The cross section for the inclusive production of the BV molecule with spin $S = 3/2$, denoted by X_1 , is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sigma[X_1 + \text{all}] \\
&= \frac{1}{\text{flux}} \sum_{\text{all}} \int d\phi_{\text{all}+BV} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathcal{M}_i[\text{all} + BV] (\not{k}_1 + m_B) \delta^{ii'} 2m_B G_{\text{R}g_X} \bar{u}_{i'}[X_1] \right. \\
&\quad \left. u_{j'}[X_1] g_X \delta^{jj'} (\not{k}_1 + m_B) G_{\text{R}}^* \mathcal{M}_j^*[\text{all} + BV] \right\} \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2\mu} \\
&\simeq \frac{2m_{X_1} 4m_B^2}{16m_V^2 m_B^2} \frac{1}{\text{flux}} \sum_{\text{all}} \int d\phi_{\text{all}+BV} \text{Tr} \left[\mathcal{M}_j[\text{all} + BV] P^{(3/2)ij} \mathcal{M}_i^*[\text{all} + BV] \right] |G(E, \Lambda) g_X|^2 \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2\mu} \\
&= \frac{2}{3} \frac{m_{X_1}}{2m_V^2} \frac{1}{\text{flux}} \sum_{\text{all}} \int d\phi_{\text{all}+BV} \text{Tr} \left[\mathcal{M}^i[\text{all} + BV] \mathcal{M}_i^*[\text{all} + BV] \right] |G(E, \Lambda) g_X|^2 \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3 2\mu} \\
&\simeq \frac{m_{X_1}}{3m_V m_B} |G(E, \Lambda) g_{\text{eff}}|^2 \left(\frac{d\sigma[\text{all} + BV]}{dk} \right)_{\text{MC}} \frac{4\pi^2 \mu}{k^2}, \tag{A2}
\end{aligned}$$

where G_{R} is the relativistic scalar two-point loop function, m_X is the mass of X_1 , k_1 is the four-momentum of the baryon B , g_{eff} is the effective coupling constant in Eq. (6), and $G(E, \Lambda)$ is the Green's function in Eq. (5). $u_i[X_1]$ is the spinor of X_1 , and $P_{ij}^{(3/2)}$ is the nonrelativistic projection operator of a spin-3/2 particle [84],

$$P_{ij}^{(3/2)} = \frac{2}{3} \delta_{ij} - \frac{i}{3} \epsilon_{ijk} \sigma^k. \tag{A3}$$

Matching Eq. (A2) with the general cross section formula of Eq. (3), one can get $\mathcal{N} = 2/3$ for the production of X_1 . Using the same method, one can get $\mathcal{N} = 1$ for the other hadronic molecules discussed in this work.

-
- [1] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), *Chin. Phys. C* **44**, 040001 (2020), [arXiv:1912.05983 \[hep-ex\]](#).
 - [2] A. Cerri *et al.*, *CERN Yellow Rep. Monogr.* **7**, 867 (2019), [arXiv:1812.07638 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [3] W. Altmannshofer *et al.* (Belle-II), *PTEP* **2019**, 123C01 (2019), [Erratum: *PTEP* 2020, 029201 (2020)], [arXiv:1808.10567 \[hep-ex\]](#).
 - [4] H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, *Phys. Rep.* **639**, 1 (2016), [arXiv:1601.02092 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [5] A. Hosaka, T. Iijima, K. Miyabayashi, Y. Sakai, and S. Yasui, *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2016**, 062C01 (2016), [arXiv:1603.09229 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [6] R. F. Lebed, R. E. Mitchell, and E. S. Swanson, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **93**, 143 (2017), [arXiv:1610.04528 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [7] A. Esposito, A. Pilloni, and A. D. Polosa, *Phys. Rep.* **668**, 1 (2016), [arXiv:1611.07920 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [8] F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, Q. Wang, Q. Zhao, and B.-S. Zou, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015004 (2018), [arXiv:1705.00141 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [9] S. L. Olsen, T. Skwarnicki, and D. Zieminska, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 015003 (2018), [arXiv:1708.04012 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [10] Y.-R. Liu, H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **107**, 237 (2019), [arXiv:1903.11976 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [11] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, C. Hanhart, A. Nefediev, C.-P. Shen, C. E. Thomas, A. Vairo, and C.-Z. Yuan, *Phys. Rep.* **873**, 1 (2020), [arXiv:1907.07583 \[hep-ex\]](#).
 - [12] F.-K. Guo, X.-H. Liu, and S. Sakai, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **112**, 103757 (2020), [arXiv:1912.07030 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [13] H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, Y.-R. Liu, and S.-L. Zhu, (2022), [arXiv:2204.02649 \[hep-ph\]](#).
 - [14] C. Adolph *et al.* (COMPASS), *Phys. Lett. B* **742**, 330 (2015), [arXiv:1407.6186 \[hep-ex\]](#).
 - [15] M. Aghasyan *et al.* (COMPASS), *Phys. Lett. B* **783**, 334 (2018), [arXiv:1707.01796 \[hep-ex\]](#).
 - [16] A. Ali *et al.* (GlueX), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 072001 (2019), [arXiv:1905.10811 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
 - [17] D. P. Anderle *et al.*, *Front. Phys. (Beijing)* **16**, 64701 (2021), [arXiv:2102.09222 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
 - [18] R. Abdul Khalek *et al.*, (2021), [arXiv:2103.05419 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).

- [19] J. Arrington *et al.*, (2021), [arXiv:2112.00060 \[nucl-ex\]](#).
- [20] Y. Huang, J. He, H.-F. Zhang, and X.-R. Chen, *J. Phys. G* **41**, 115004 (2014), [arXiv:1305.4434 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [21] Q. Wang, X.-H. Liu, and Q. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 034022 (2015), [arXiv:1508.00339 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] Y. Huang, J.-J. Xie, J. He, X. Chen, and H.-F. Zhang, *Chin. Phys. C* **40**, 124104 (2016), [arXiv:1604.05969 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [23] A. N. Hiller Blin, C. Fernández-Ramírez, A. Jackura, V. Mathieu, V. I. Mokeev, A. Pilloni, and A. P. Szczepaniak, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 034002 (2016), [arXiv:1606.08912 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [24] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, *Phys. Lett. B* **752**, 329 (2016), [arXiv:1508.01496 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] V. Kubarovsky and M. B. Voloshin, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 031502 (2015), [arXiv:1508.00888 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] D. Winney, C. Fanelli, A. Pilloni, A. N. Hiller Blin, C. Fernández-Ramírez, M. Albaladejo, V. Mathieu, V. I. Mokeev, and A. P. Szczepaniak (JPAC), *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 034019 (2019), [arXiv:1907.09393 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] E. Y. Paryev and Y. T. Kiselev, *Nucl. Phys. A* **978**, 201 (2018), [arXiv:1810.01715 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [28] X.-Y. Wang, X.-R. Chen, and J. He, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 114007 (2019), [arXiv:1904.11706 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] V. P. Gonçalves and M. M. Jaime, *Phys. Lett. B* **805**, 135447 (2020), [arXiv:1911.10886 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [30] J.-J. Wu, T. S. H. Lee, and B.-S. Zou, *Phys. Rev. C* **100**, 035206 (2019), [arXiv:1906.05375 \[nucl-th\]](#).
- [31] Y.-P. Xie, X. Cao, Y.-T. Liang, and X. Chen, *Chin. Phys. C* **45**, 043105 (2021), [arXiv:2003.11729 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [32] Z. Yang, X. Cao, Y.-T. Liang, and J.-J. Wu, *Chin. Phys. C* **44**, 084102 (2020), [arXiv:2003.06774 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [33] X.-H. Liu, Q. Zhao, and F. E. Close, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 094005 (2008), [arXiv:0802.2648 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [34] G. Galata, *Phys. Rev. C* **83**, 065203 (2011), [arXiv:1102.2070 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [35] Q.-Y. Lin, X. Liu, and H.-S. Xu, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 114009 (2013), [arXiv:1308.6345 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [36] Q.-Y. Lin, X. Liu, and H.-S. Xu, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 034016 (2014), [arXiv:1312.7073 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [37] X.-Y. Wang, X.-R. Chen, and A. Guskov, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 094017 (2015), [arXiv:1503.02125 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [38] M. Albaladejo, A. N. H. Blin, A. Pilloni, D. Winney, C. Fernández-Ramírez, V. Mathieu, and A. Szczepaniak (JPAC), *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 114010 (2020), [arXiv:2008.01001 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [39] M.-L. Du, V. Baru, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, A. Nefediev, and I. Strakovsky, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 1053 (2020), [arXiv:2009.08345 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [40] Y.-Z. Xu, S. Chen, Z.-Q. Yao, D. Binosi, Z.-F. Cui, and C. D. Roberts, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 895 (2021), [arXiv:2107.03488 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [41] Z. Yang and F.-K. Guo, *Chin. Phys. C* **45**, 123101 (2021), [arXiv:2107.12247 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [42] P. Artoisenet and E. Braaten, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 014019 (2011), [arXiv:1007.2868 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [43] F.-K. Guo, U.-G. Meißner, W. Wang, and Z. Yang, *JHEP* **05**, 138 (2014), [arXiv:1403.4032 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [44] F.-K. Guo, U.-G. Meißner, W. Wang, and Z. Yang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 3063 (2014), [arXiv:1402.6236 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [45] C. Bignamini, B. Grinstein, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa, and C. Sabelli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 162001 (2009), [arXiv:0906.0882 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [46] P. Artoisenet and E. Braaten, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 114018 (2010), [arXiv:0911.2016 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [47] M. Albaladejo, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, J. Nieves, A. Nogga, and Z. Yang, *Chin. Phys. C* **41**, 121001 (2017), [arXiv:1709.09101 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [48] F.-K. Guo, U.-G. Meißner, and W. Wang, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **61**, 354 (2014), [arXiv:1308.0193 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] P. Ling, X.-H. Dai, M.-L. Du, and Q. Wang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 819 (2021), [arXiv:2104.11133 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [50] P.-P. Shi, Z.-H. Zhang, F.-K. Guo, and Z. Yang, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 034024 (2022), [arXiv:2111.13496 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] G. Bauer (CDF), *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **20**, 3765 (2005), [arXiv:hep-ex/0409052](#).
- [52] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* (CMS), *JHEP* **04**, 154 (2013), [arXiv:1302.3968 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [53] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 222001 (2019), [arXiv:1904.03947 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [54] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Sci. Bull.* **66**, 1278 (2021), [arXiv:2012.10380 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [55] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Nature Commun.* **13**, 3351 (2022), [arXiv:2109.01056 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [56] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Nature Phys.* **18**, 751 (2022), [arXiv:2109.01038 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [57] S. K. Choi *et al.* (Belle), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 262001 (2003), [arXiv:hep-ex/0309032](#).
- [58] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 252001 (2013), [arXiv:1303.5949 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [59] Z. Q. Liu *et al.* (Belle), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 252002 (2013), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 111, 019901 (2013)], [arXiv:1304.0121 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [60] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 112003 (2015), [arXiv:1506.06018 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [61] X.-K. Dong, F.-K. Guo, and B.-S. Zou, *Progr. Phys.* **41**, 65 (2021), [arXiv:2101.01021 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [62] X.-K. Dong, F.-K. Guo, and B.-S. Zou, *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **73**, 125201 (2021), arXiv:2108.02673 [hep-ph].
- [63] E. Braaten and M. Kusunoki, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 014012 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0506087.
- [64] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, *JHEP* **05**, 026 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0603175.
- [65] J. Nieves and M. P. Valderrama, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 056004 (2012), arXiv:1204.2790 [hep-ph].
- [66] F.-K. Guo, C. Hidalgo-Duque, J. Nieves, and M. P. Valderrama, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 054007 (2013), arXiv:1303.6608 [hep-ph].
- [67] M.-Z. Liu, Y.-W. Pan, F.-Z. Peng, M. Sánchez Sánchez, L.-S. Geng, A. Hosaka, and M. Pavon Valderrama, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 242001 (2019), arXiv:1903.11560 [hep-ph].
- [68] Z. Yang, X. Cao, F.-K. Guo, J. Nieves, and M. P. Valderrama, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 074029 (2021), arXiv:2011.08725 [hep-ph].
- [69] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 092005 (2020), arXiv:2005.13419 [hep-ex].
- [70] C. Hanhart, Y. S. Kalashnikova, A. E. Kudryavtsev, and A. V. Nefediev, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 011501 (2012), arXiv:1111.6241 [hep-ph].
- [71] C. Hidalgo-Duque, J. Nieves, and M. P. Valderrama, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 076006 (2013), arXiv:1210.5431 [hep-ph].
- [72] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126**, 102001 (2021), arXiv:2011.07855 [hep-ex].
- [73] M.-L. Du, V. Baru, X.-K. Dong, A. Filin, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, A. Nefediev, J. Nieves, and Q. Wang, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 014024 (2022), arXiv:2110.13765 [hep-ph].
- [74] M.-L. Du, Z.-H. Guo, and J. A. Oller, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 114034 (2021), arXiv:2109.14237 [hep-ph].
- [75] M.-Z. Liu, Y.-W. Pan, and L.-S. Geng, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 034003 (2021), arXiv:2011.07935 [hep-ph].
- [76] R. Chen, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 054007 (2021), arXiv:2011.07214 [hep-ph].
- [77] F.-Z. Peng, M.-J. Yan, M. Sánchez Sánchez, and M. P. Valderrama, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 666 (2021), arXiv:2011.01915 [hep-ph].
- [78] H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, and X.-H. Liu, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 409 (2021), arXiv:2011.01079 [hep-ph].
- [79] S. Sakai, H.-J. Jing, and F.-K. Guo, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 074007 (2019), arXiv:1907.03414 [hep-ph].
- [80] M.-L. Du, V. Baru, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, J. A. Oller, and Q. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 072001 (2020), arXiv:1910.11846 [hep-ph].
- [81] M.-L. Du, V. Baru, F.-K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U.-G. Meißner, J. A. Oller, and Q. Wang, *JHEP* **08**, 157 (2021), arXiv:2102.07159 [hep-ph].

- [82] R. Aaij *et al.* (LHCb), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 112001 (2017), [arXiv:1707.01621 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [83] R. L. Workman (Particle Data Group), *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [84] S. U. Chung, *CERN-71-08* (1971), [10.5170/CERN-1971-008](#).