

Partial wave effects in the heavy quarkonium radiative electromagnetic decays

Su-Yan Pei^{1,2*}, Wei Li^{1,2}, Ting-Ting Liu^{1,2}, Meng
Han^{1,2}, Guo-Li Wang^{1,2†}, Tianhong Wang^{3‡}

¹ *Department of Physics and Technology,
Hebei University, Baoding 071002, China*

² *Key Laboratory of High-precision Computation and Application
of Quantum Field Theory of Hebei Province, Baoding, China*

³ *School of Physics, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin 150001, China*

Abstract

In a previous paper [1], it was pointed out that the wave functions of all particles are not pure waves, besides the main partial waves, they all contain other partial waves. It is very interesting to know what role these different partial waves play in particle transitions. Therefore, by using the Bethe-Salpeter equation method, we study the radiative electromagnetic decays $\psi \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{cJ}$ and $\Upsilon \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{bJ}$ ($J = 0, 1, 2$). Find that for the S and P wave dominated states, like the $\psi(2S)$, $\Upsilon(2S)$, $\chi_{cJ}(1P)$ and $\chi_{bJ}(1P)$, etc, the dominant S and P waves provide main and non-relativistic contribution to the decays, other partial waves mainly contribute to the relativistic correction. For the states, like the $\psi(1D)$, $\Upsilon(2D)$, $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ and $\chi_{b2}(1F)$, etc, they are the $S - P - D$ mixing states dominated by the D wave or the $P - D - F$ mixing states dominated by the F wave. The contribution of P wave in the former and D wave in the later are small. So in a rough calculation, their contribution can be ignored, then the mixing states degenerate into the usual $S - D$ and $P - F$ mixtures. And large mixing angles around $|\theta| \sim 30^\circ$ for them are obtained. Large decay widths are found in the transitions $\psi(2D) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1F)$, $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(1P)$ and $\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(2P)$, etc, which may be helpful to study the missing states $\chi_{c2}(1F)$, $\Upsilon(1D)$ and $\Upsilon(2D)$.

* peisuya@163.com

† wgl@hbu.edu.cn, corresponding author

‡ thwang@hit.edu.cn, corresponding author

I. INTRODUCTION

In a previous paper [1], we pointed out that the wave functions of all particles are not pure waves. For example, the wave function of a 0^- state is S wave dominant, but it also contains a small amount of P partial wave. For the 1^- case, there are two kinds of states. One is dominated by the S wave, and contains small amounts of P and D waves. The other is dominated by the D wave, while contains considerable S and P wave components.

In order to know the behavior of each component of wave function in particle transition, we study the radiative electromagnetic decays of heavy quarkonia, namely the transition $1^{--} \rightarrow 0^{++}, 1^{++}, 2^{++}$, which includes the decays of $\psi(nS) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{cJ}(mP)$, $\Upsilon(nS) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{bJ}(mP)$ ($n = 2, 3, m = 1, 2$), $\psi(n'D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{cJ}(m'P)$, $\Upsilon(n'D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{bJ}(m'P)$ ($n' = 1, 2, m' = 1, 2$), $\psi(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c2}(1F)$ and $\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b2}(1F)$, etc, where $J = 0, 1, 2$. We will first give the contents of different partial waves in the wave functions of the heavy quarkonia involved, and then show the details of the contributions of each partial wave in the decay process.

Heavy quarkonia have attracted great interest both in theory and experiment since they were discovered [2–5]. So far, great progress has been made in experiment [6–13] and theory [14–24]. However, there are still some radiative decays that have not been detected experimentally, for example, $\psi(4040) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(2P)\gamma$ and $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(2P)\gamma$ ($J = 0, 1, 2$), etc. There are even some particles that have not been discovered such as the $\Upsilon(1D)$, $\Upsilon(2D)$, $\Upsilon(1F)$ and $\psi(1F)$, etc. Therefore, the study of the radiative transitions will help to detect the missing channels and discover the missing particles experimentally.

In this paper, we choose the Bethe-Salpeter (BS) equation method. BS equation [25] is a relativistic dynamic equation dealing with bound states in quantum field theory. The Salpeter equation [26] is its instantaneous approximation, which is suitable for heavy quarkonia. Since we solve the complete Salpeter equation without other approximations, we can obtain the meson wave function which contains components of multiple partial waves. This method has been proved to have good results in many aspects [27–33].

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we will show the method to calculate the transition matrix element of the EM decay. The emphasis is given on the partial waves

of the wave functions. In Sec. III, we give the results of the EM decay and discuss the contribution of different partial waves to the decay width.

II. THEORETICAL METHOD

A. Transition matrix element

The transition matrix for the single-photon radiative decay of a 1^{--} quarkonium can be written as:

$$\langle P_f; k, \epsilon_0 | S | P, \epsilon \rangle = (2\pi)^4 e e_q \delta^4(P - P_f - k) \epsilon_0^\mu M_\mu, \quad (1)$$

where P , P_f and k are the momenta of the initial meson, the final meson and the final photon, respectively; $e e_q$ are the charge of the quark, $e_q = 2/3$ and $1/3$ for the charm and bottom quarks, respectively; ϵ and ϵ_0 are the polarization vectors of the initial quarkonium and the final photon, respectively.

In the BS equation method, the transition amplitude M^μ can be expressed as the overlapping integral over the initial and final state wave functions

$$M^\mu = \int \frac{d^4 q d^4 q_1}{(2\pi)^4} \delta^4(p_2 - p_{f2}) Tr \left[\bar{\chi}_{P_f}(q_1) \gamma^\mu \chi_P(q) S_2^{-1}(-p_2) \right] - \int \frac{d^4 q d^4 q_2}{(2\pi)^4} \delta^4(p_1 - p_{f1}) Tr \left[\bar{\chi}_{P_f}(q_2) S_1^{-1}(p_1) \chi_P(q) \gamma^\mu \right], \quad (2)$$

where the subscript f means the final state; χ_P and $\bar{\chi}_{P_f}$ are respectively the BS wave functions of the initial and final mesons with $\bar{\chi} = \gamma_0 \chi^\dagger \gamma_0$. $S_1(p_1)$ and $S_2(-p_2)$ are the propagators of quark 1 with momentum p_1 and antiquark 2 with momentum p_2 , respectively; q , q_1 and q_2 are the relative momenta between quark and antiquark in the mesons, for example, $q = p_1 - \frac{1}{2}P = \frac{1}{2}P - p_2$. The final state relative momentum q_1 or q_2 is related to the initial relative momentum q by the δ -function for the spectator, so we have the relations $q_1 = q + \frac{1}{2}(P_f - P)$ and $q_2 = q + \frac{1}{2}(P - P_f)$.

Since both the charmonium and bottomonium are double heavy mesons, the instantaneous approximation is a good choice to avoid solving the complicated full BS equation. With instantaneous approximation, the BS equation becomes the Salpeter equation, and

the BS wave function becomes the Salpeter wave function. Then the transition amplitude can be written as [33],

$$M^\mu = \int \frac{d^3 q_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} Tr \left[\frac{\not{P}}{M} \bar{\varphi}_{P_f}^{++}(q_{1\perp}) \gamma^\mu \varphi_P^{++}(q_\perp) \right] - \int \frac{d^3 q_\perp}{(2\pi)^3} Tr \left[\bar{\varphi}_{P_f}^{++}(q_{2\perp}) \frac{\not{P}}{M} \varphi_P^{++}(q_\perp) \gamma^\mu \right], \quad (3)$$

where $q_\perp = q - \frac{q \cdot P}{M^2} P$, M is the mass of initial meson. In the center of mass frame of the initial state, we have $q_\perp = (0, \vec{q})$. Note that in Eq.(3), we only keep the dominant contribution of positive energy wave function φ^{++} , but ignore other tiny contributions from negative wave functions, etc.

B. The positive wave functions and their partial waves

The wave function will be given in the center of mass system of the corresponding meson. q_\perp is the relative momentum between quark and anti-quark. P and M are the momentum and mass of the meson, respectively.

1. 1^{--} quarkonium

The positive energy wave function of the initial 1^{--} heavy quarkonium can be expressed as [34],

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{1^{--}}^{++}(q_\perp) = & (\epsilon \cdot q_\perp) \left[A_1 + \frac{\not{P}}{M} A_2 + \frac{\not{q}_\perp}{M} A_3 + \frac{\not{P} \not{q}_\perp}{M^2} A_4 \right] \\ & + M \not{\epsilon} \left[A_5 + \frac{\not{P}}{M} A_6 + \frac{\not{P} \not{q}_\perp}{M^2} A_7 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where ϵ^μ is the polarization vector of the 1^{--} quarkonium; A_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 7$) is related to the four independent radial wave functions a_3, a_4, a_5 and a_6 which are functions of $-q_\perp^2$ and their numerical values are solutions of full Salpeter equation for 1^{--} state,

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \frac{1}{2} \left(a_3 + \frac{m}{w} a_4 \right), \quad A_1 = \frac{q_\perp^2}{Mm} f + \frac{M}{2m} \left(a_5 - \frac{m}{w} a_6 \right), \quad A_5 = \frac{1}{2} \left(a_5 - \frac{w}{m} a_6 \right), \\ A_2 &= -\frac{M}{w} A_5, \quad A_3 = f - \frac{M^2}{2mw} a_6, \quad A_4 = \frac{w}{m} f - \frac{M^2}{2mw} a_5, \quad A_6 = -\frac{m}{w} A_5, \quad A_7 = A_2, \end{aligned}$$

where m and $w = \sqrt{m^2 - q_\perp^2}$ are the mass and energy of the quark (anti-quark), respectively.

We have pointed out that the wave function of the $1^- B_c^*$ state is not a pure S wave, it includes P and D partial waves [1]. The same conclusion is applicable to the 1^{--} quarkonium. In the wave function of Eq. (4), the terms including A_5 and A_6 are S waves, A_1 , A_2 and A_7 terms are P waves, while A_3 and A_4 terms are D waves.

TABLE I: Ratios of the partial waves in the 1^{--} wave functions for heavy quarkonia.

		1 S	2 S	1 $S - P - D$	3 S	2 $S - P - D$
ψ	$S : P : D$	1 : 0.123 : 0.0658	1 : 0.147 : 0.0793	0.573 : 0.509 : 1	1 : 0.164 : 0.0842	0.569 : 0.515 : 1
Υ	$S : P : D$	1 : 0.0415 : 0.0251	1 : 0.0458 : 0.0289	0.577 : 0.425 : 1	1 : 0.0509 : 0.0317	0.576 : 0.428 : 1

Following the method of Ref. [1], the normalization condition shows that $\int d^3q_\perp (S + P + D)^2 \rightarrow 1$. Under this condition, we can calculate the ratios between different partial waves, and the results are shown in Table I. We can see that in the solutions of Salepter equation [34], the first, second and fourth results which corresponding to the mesons of J/ψ , $\psi(3686)$ and $\psi(4040)$, are dominated by the S partial waves, so they are marked as $\psi(1S)$, $\psi(2S)$ and $\psi(3S)$ in Table I. The third and fifth results which are corresponding to $\psi(3770)$ and $\psi(4160)$ indicate that the components of D waves are the dominant ones in their wave functions, while the components of S and P partial waves are sizable. So different from the widely known $S - D$ mixing states in literature, we mark them the $S - P - D$ mixing states in Table I. We obtain similar conclusions for the bottomonia.

In Table I, taking the $1S$ states as examples, we can see that the content of the P or D partial wave in the wave function of J/ψ is much larger than those of $\Upsilon(1S)$, which means the relativistic correction of J/ψ is much larger than that of $\Upsilon(1S)$. Since in the non-relativistic limit, the small components of P and D partial waves are all disappear, they are relativistic corrections. The same conclusion is applicable to the small partial wave in other states, and we will not mention again.

2. 0^{++} quarkonium

The positive energy wave function of the 0^{++} state is expressed as [35]

$$\varphi_{0^{++}}(q_{\perp}) = \not{q}_{\perp} B_1 + \frac{\not{P}\not{q}_{\perp}}{M} B_2 + B_3, \quad (5)$$

with

$$B_1 = \frac{1}{2}(b_1 + \frac{m}{w}b_2), \quad B_2 = \frac{w}{m}B_1, \quad B_3 = \frac{q_{\perp}^2}{m}B_1,$$

where b_1 and b_2 are function of $-q_{\perp}^2$, and they are two independent radial parts of the 0^{++} wave function which will be obtained numerically by solving the Salpeter equation for a 0^{++} state [35]. In Eq.(5), the B_1 and B_2 terms are P waves, while the B_3 term is S wave. We show the partial wave ratios of $P : S$ for χ_{c0} and χ_{b0} in Table II. We can see that, they are all P wave dominant states.

TABLE II: Ratios of the partial waves in the 0^{++} and 1^{++} wave functions for heavy quarkonia.

		1 P	2 P	3 P
χ_{c0}	$P : S$	1 : 0.127	1 : 0.142	1 : 0.157
χ_{b0}	$P : S$	1 : 0.0361	1 : 0.0399	1 : 0.0444
χ_{c1}	$P : D$	1 : 0.137	1 : 0.150	1 : 0.165
χ_{b1}	$P : D$	1 : 0.0358	1 : 0.040	1 : 0.0463

3. 1^{++} quarkonium

The positive energy wave function of 1^{++} state is expressed as [35]

$$\varphi_{1^{++}}(q_{\perp}) = i\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} P^{\nu} q_{\perp}^{\alpha} \epsilon^{\beta} \gamma^{\mu} \left[D_1 M + D_2 \not{P} + D_3 \not{P}\not{q}_{\perp} \right] / M^2, \quad (6)$$

with

$$D_1 = \frac{1}{2}(d_1 + \frac{w}{m}d_2), \quad D_2 = -\frac{m}{w}D_1, \quad D_3 = -\frac{1}{w}D_1,$$

where $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}$ is the Levi-Civita symbol, ϵ^{β} is the polarization vector of the 1^{++} state. The two radial wave functions d_1 and d_2 are solutions of the corresponding Salpeter equation [35].

In Eq. (6), the terms including D_1 and D_2 are P waves, while the D_3 term is D wave. We obtain the ratios of $P : D$ for χ_{c1} and χ_{b1} and show them in Table II. The results indicate that they are all P wave dominant states.

4. 2^{++} quarkonium

The positive energy wave function of 2^{++} state is expressed as [36]

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{2^{++}}^{++}(q_{\perp}) = & \epsilon_{\mu\nu} q_{\perp}^{\nu} q_{\perp}^{\mu} \left[F_1 + \frac{\not{P}}{M} F_2 + \frac{\not{q}_{\perp}}{M} F_3 + \frac{\not{P}\not{q}_{\perp}}{M^2} F_4 \right] \\ & + M \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \gamma^{\mu} q_{\perp}^{\nu} \left[F_5 + \frac{\not{P}}{M} F_6 + \frac{\not{P}\not{q}_{\perp}}{M^2} F_7 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\epsilon_{\mu\nu}$ is the polarization tensor of the 2^{++} state. F_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 7$) is a function of the four independent radial wave functions f_3, f_4, f_5 and f_6 which are solutions of the Salpeter equation for 2^{++} state [36],

$$\begin{aligned} g &= \frac{1}{2} \left(f_3 + \frac{m}{w} f_4 \right), \quad F_1 = \frac{q_{\perp}^2}{Mm} g + \frac{M}{2m} \left(f_5 - \frac{m}{w} f_6 \right), \quad F_5 = \frac{1}{2} \left(f_5 - \frac{w}{m} f_6 \right), \\ F_2 &= -\frac{M}{w} F_5, \quad F_3 = g - \frac{M^2}{2mw} f_6, \quad F_4 = \frac{w}{m} g - \frac{M^2}{2mw} f_5, \quad F_6 = -\frac{m}{w} F_5, \quad F_7 = F_2. \end{aligned}$$

In the wave function of Eq.(7), F_5 and F_6 terms are P waves, F_1, F_2 and F_7 terms are D waves, F_3 and F_4 terms are F waves. The ratios $P : D : F$ of partial waves for some 2^{++} heavy quarkonia are shown in Table III. Similar to the case of 1^{--} , the first, second and fourth solutions correspond with the P wave dominant states, and they are marked as $1P$, $2P$ and $3P$ states, respectively. In the third and fifth results, the largest components are F waves, and the components of P and D partial waves are also sizable. So different from the literature, they are not $P - F$ mixing states, but typical $P - D - F$ mixing states.

C. Form factors

With the positive energy wave functions, the transition amplitude in Eq. (3) are calculated straightly, and they are expressed as functions of the form factors. For the transitions

TABLE III: Ratios of the partial waves in the 2^{++} wave functions for heavy quarkonia.

		1 P	2 P	1 $P - D - F$	3 P	2 $P - D - F$
χ_{c2}	$P : D : F$	1 : 0.145 : 0.070	1 : 0.168 : 0.0856	0.630 : 0.533 : 1	1 : 0.186 : 0.0930	0.628 : 0.538 : 1
χ_{b2}	$P : D : F$	1 : 0.0428 : 0.0251	1 : 0.0532 : 0.0327	0.663 : 0.491 : 1	1 : 0.0511 : 0.0329	0.621 : 0.457 : 1

of $1^{--} \rightarrow 0^{++}, 1^{++}, 2^{++}$, the transition amplitudes can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_{1^{--} \rightarrow 0^{++}}^\mu &= P^\mu(\epsilon \cdot P_f)t_1 + \epsilon^\mu t_2, \\
 M_{1^{--} \rightarrow 1^{++}}^\mu &= P^\mu \epsilon^{\epsilon_f P P_f} x_1 + (\epsilon \cdot P_f) \epsilon^{\mu \epsilon_f P P_f} x_2 + \epsilon^{\mu \epsilon_f P_f} x_3, \\
 M_{1^{--} \rightarrow 2^{++}}^\mu &= P^\mu(\epsilon \cdot P_f) \epsilon_f^{P P} y_1 + \epsilon^\mu \epsilon_f^{P P} y_2 + P^\mu \epsilon_f^{\epsilon P} y_3 + (\epsilon \cdot P_f) \epsilon_f^{\mu P} y_4 + \epsilon_f^{\mu \epsilon} y_5, \quad (8)
 \end{aligned}$$

where t_1, t_2, x_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) and y_j ($j = 1, 2, \dots, 5$) are the form factors; P_f is the momentum of the final state; ϵ_f^μ or $\epsilon_f^{\mu\nu}$ is the polarization vector or tensor of the final quarkonium. In the upper formula, we have used the following shorthand notations $\epsilon_f^{P P} \equiv \epsilon_f^{\mu\nu} P_\mu P_\nu$ and $\epsilon^{\epsilon_f P P_f} = \epsilon^{\rho\sigma\alpha\beta} \epsilon_\rho \epsilon_{f\sigma} P_\alpha P_{f\beta}$, etc.

In the transition amplitude, because of the relation $k \cdot \epsilon_0 = 0$, where $k = P - P_f$ and ϵ_0 are the momentum and polarization vector of the photon, some of the expressions do not exist at the same time. For example, in the transition $1^{--} \rightarrow 0^{++}$, there is the term of $P^\mu(\epsilon \cdot P_f)$, but no $P_f^\mu(\epsilon \cdot P_f)$ term. For the same reason, there are no P_f^μ terms in the transitions of $1^{--} \rightarrow 1^{++}$ and $1^{--} \rightarrow 2^{++}$. Since the transition amplitude must meet the gauge invariance, we also have the following relations

$$\begin{aligned}
 t_2 &= M(M - E_f)t_1, \\
 x_3 &= -M(M - E_f)x_1, \\
 y_2 &= y_4 + M(M - E_f)y_1, \\
 y_5 &= -M(M - E_f)y_3. \quad (9)
 \end{aligned}$$

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Charmonium's radiative decays

The masses of most low excited charmonia have experimental measurement, including $\psi(1D)$ and $\psi(2D)$, so we use the experimental values in our calculation. However, there are still some particles that have not been detected by experiments, such as $\psi(1F)$. For such particles, our theoretical predictions are used, for example, the mass of $\psi(1F)$ is predicted as 4037 MeV [37].

TABLE IV: The decay widths (keV) of $\psi \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}\gamma$. Where $\chi_{c0}(3860)$, $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ and $\chi_{c2}(3930)$ are treated as the $2P$ states; $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ is the $1F$ dominant state with sizable P and D partial waves, our theoretical prediction about its mass is 4037 MeV.

Process	Ours	[18]	[38]	[39]	[40]	[41]	[42]a	[42]b	PDG[43]
$\psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c0}(1P)$	39.9	50	26.3	47.0	25.2	26	22	22	28.8 ± 1.4
$\psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c1}(1P)$	35.6	45	22.9	42.8	29.1	29	42	45	28.7 ± 1.5
$\psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c2}(1P)$	24.5	29	18.2	30.1	25.2	24	38	46	28.0 ± 1.4
$\psi(3770) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c0}(1P)$	290		355	299	243.9	213	272	261	188 ± 23
$\psi(3770) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c1}(1P)$	90.8		135	99.0	104.9	77	138	135	67.7 ± 8.7
$\psi(3770) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c2}(1P)$	3.13		6.9	3.88	1.9	3.3	7.1	8.1	< 17.4
$\psi(4040) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c0}(1P)$	0.29				2.1	12.7	5.9	6.7	
$\psi(4040) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c1}(1P)$	1.42				0.3	0.85	4.0	6.7	< 272
$\psi(4040) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c2}(1P)$	2.71				2.4	0.63	0.25	2.5	< 400
$\psi(4040) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c0}(3860)$	31.0				30.1	22	19	27	
$\psi(4040) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c1}(3872)$	74.4				45.0	43	55	67	
$\psi(4040) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c2}(3930)$	46.7				36.0	48	67	82	
$\psi(4160) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c0}(1P)$	8.42				23.3	35	150	189	
$\psi(4160) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c1}(1P)$	6.66				0.02	3.4	37	63	
$\psi(4160) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c2}(1P)$	2.32				0.23	0.027	17	20	
$\psi(4160) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c0}(3860)$	462					191	332	360	
$\psi(4160) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c1}(3872)$	281					114	309	347	
$\psi(4160) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c2}(3930)$	14.7					6.3	24	29	
$\psi(4160) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{c2}(1F)$	78.0					17			

The theoretical results as well as data from Particle Data Group [43] about the charmonia radiative decays $1^{--} \rightarrow 0^{++}, 1^{++}, 2^{++}$ are shown in Table IV. $\psi(4040)$ is the state $\psi(3S)$; $\psi(3770)$ and $\psi(4160)$ are the $\psi(1D)$ and $\psi(2D)$; $\chi_{c0}(3860)$, $\chi_{c1}(3872)$ and $\chi_{c2}(3930)$ are the $\chi_{c0}(2P)$, $\chi_{c1}(2P)$ and $\chi_{c2}(2P)$, respectively. Although the masses may be different between

models, especially the $\chi_{cJ}(2P)$ states, we will not show detail masses of different models because usually the radiative decay are not very sensitive to the masses except for some special channels, for example, $\psi(4040) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(1P)\gamma$ and $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(1P)\gamma$ which we will discuss later.

At present, only the decays of $\psi(2S)$ and $\psi(3770)$ have experimental results. Our results of them are comparable to experimental data and other theoretical values. For channels $\psi(4040) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(2P)\gamma$ and $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(2P)\gamma$, the values between different theoretical models are also comparable. Compared with the case of bottomonium, where the predictions of different models are in good agreement, the results of charmonium differ slightly between different models. We believe that this is mainly due to the large relativistic correction in the charmonium system.

For other processes, such as $\psi(4040) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(1P)\gamma$ and $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(1P)\gamma$, there are huge differences between the results predicted by different models. We find that the huge difference comes from the uncertainty of theory. We take the decay $\psi(4040) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(1P)\gamma$ as an example to illustrate this. The radial wave function of initial state has two nodes. The contributions of wave functions on both sides of the node to the amplitude are cancelled. The decay width of this channel is much smaller than those of other processes, which indicates that the cancellation is very strong, and lead to the strong dependence of the results on model parameters. Therefore, the theoretical error of this process is huge and this is the reason that the predictions of different models differ greatly.

B. Contributions of different partial waves in Chamonia decays

1. $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(1P)\gamma$

In Sec.II, we show the $\psi(2S)$ is a $2S$ dominant state with small admixtures of P and D partial waves. The ratio of its partial waves is $S : P : D = 1 : 0.147 : 0.0793$. For the $\chi_{c0}(1P)$, its wave function is $1P$ dominant but mixing with a small amount of S wave since we have $P' : S' = 1 : 0.127$ (here and later, the superscript ‘prime’ is used to denote the partial wave in the final state). In Table V, we show the detailed contributions of the

different partial waves to the decay width of $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(1P)\gamma$. Where the ‘whole’ means the result is obtained using the complete wave function, while the ‘S wave’ in column or row means the corresponding result is obtained only using the S partial wave and ignoring others, etc.

TABLE V: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(1P)\gamma$.

$0^{++} \backslash 1^{--}$	whole ($P' + S'$)	P' wave (B_1, B_2)	S' wave (B_3)
whole ($S + P + D$)	39.9	33.6	0.269
S wave (A_5, A_6)	34.4	34.4	0
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	0.215	4.2×10^{-3}	0.279
D wave (A_3, A_4)	1.8×10^{-4}	1.4×10^{-5}	9.0×10^{-5}

From Table V, we can see that, the dominant S partial wave in $\psi(2S)$ state and P' wave in $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ provide the overwhelming contribution. The small P wave in $\psi(2S)$ and S' wave in $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ give small contribution, while the D partial wave in $\psi(2S)$ has tiny contribution, which can be ignored safely.

In non-relativistic limit, only S partial wave in $\psi(2S)$ and P' wave in $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ survive. Their contribution $S \times P'$ to the decay width is 34.4 keV, which is closer to the data than the relativistic case of 39.9 keV. Using the relativistic decay width Γ_{rel} and non-relativistic $\Gamma_{non-rel}$, we predict the relativistic effect

$$\frac{\Gamma_{rel} - \Gamma_{non-rel}}{\Gamma_{rel}} = 14\%,$$

which is not as large as we expected. The reason may be due to that, see Table V, the main contribution of the relativistic correction does not come from the interaction $S \times S'$ between the dominant S wave in $\psi(2S)$ with the small S' wave in $\chi_{c0}(1P)$, or those of the small P wave in $\psi(2S)$ with dominant P' wave in $\chi_{c0}(1P)$, $P \times P'$, but from the interaction between the two small terms $P \times S'$. We also note that there is no interaction (zero in Table V) between the S partial wave in $\psi(2S)$ with the S' wave in $\chi_{c0}(1P)$, since $S \times S' = 0$.

2. $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c1}(1P)\gamma$

TABLE VI: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c1}(1P)\gamma$.

$1^{--} \backslash 1^{++}$	whole ($P' + D'$)	P' wave (D_1, D_2)	D' wave (D_3)
whole ($S + P + D$)	35.6	27.8	0.484
S wave (A_5, A_6)	31.1	26.9	0.155
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	0.137	4.8×10^{-4}	0.122
D wave (A_3, A_4)	5.9×10^{-4}	5.0×10^{-3}	2.1×10^{-3}

The ratio of the partial waves in $\chi_{c1}(1P)$ is $P' : D' = 1 : 0.15$, where the small term is not a S' wave like in $\chi_{c0}(1P)$, but a D' partial wave. In Table VI, we show the details of decay $\Psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c1}\gamma$. Where the largest contribution comes from the interaction $S \times P'$ between the dominant partial waves, the S wave in $\Psi(2S)$ and the P' wave in $\chi_{c1}(1P)$. The small P wave in $\psi(2S)$ and D' wave in $\chi_{c1}(1P)$ have small contribution. Similar to the previous case, the smallest D partial wave in $\psi(2S)$ has tiny contribution, and can be safely ignored.

When we take the non-relativistic limit, only the dominant S partial wave in $\psi(2S)$ and P' wave in $\chi_{c1}(1P)$ have contribution, the obtained decay width is 26.9 keV. The relativistic effect is calculated as

$$\frac{\Gamma_{rel} - \Gamma_{non-rel}}{\Gamma_{rel}} = 24\%,$$

which is about 1.4 times larger than the those of $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ case. In this decay, the relativistic corrections come from the interaction $S \times D'$ between the dominant S wave in $\psi(2S)$ and the small D' wave in $\chi_{c1}(1P)$, also from the interaction $P \times D'$ between the small P wave in $\psi(2S)$ and the D' wave in $\chi_{c1}(1P)$. Their contributions are comparable, $S \times D' \sim P \times D'$, which indicates that the interaction between the later ($P \times D'$) is much stronger than those of the former ($S \times D'$) since the component of P partial wave is one order smaller than those of S wave in $\psi(2S)$. Similar to the case of $\Psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}\gamma$, the interaction between P waves, $P \times P'$, is very small in the $\Psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c1}\gamma$.

3. $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1P)\gamma$

The wave function of χ_{c2} is more complicated than those of $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ and $\chi_{c1}(1P)$. Besides the dominant P' partial wave, it also contains small amounts of D' and F' partial waves, and their ratios are $P' : D' : F' = 1 : 0.145 : 0.070$. In Table VII, we show the contributions of different partial waves to the decay $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1P)\gamma$. We can see, the dominant S and P' partial waves from initial $\psi(2S)$ and final $\chi_{c2}(1P)$ states give main contributions to the decay width, the P partial wave in $\psi(2S)$ and D' wave in $\chi_{c2}(1P)$ give small contributions, while the contributions from the D wave in $\psi(2S)$ and F' wave in $\chi_{c2}(1P)$ are tiny, which can be ignored safely.

TABLE VII: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1P)\gamma$.

2^{++} \diagdown 1^{--}	whole ($P' + D' + F'$)	P' wave (F_5, F_6)	D' wave (F_1, F_2, F_7)	F' wave (F_3, F_4)
whole ($S + P + D$)	24.5	22.5	0.0496	2.3×10^{-4}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	21.4	20.4	0.0137	2.2×10^{-4}
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	0.0950	0.0519	6.3×10^{-3}	6.0×10^{-6}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	1.5×10^{-4}	7.2×10^{-5}	1.0×10^{-3}	1.3×10^{-4}

In the non-relativistic limit, only S partial wave in $\psi(2S)$ and P' wave in $\chi_{c2}(1P)$ have contribution, their interaction $S \times P'$ contribute 20.4 keV, which is close to the relativistic result. The relativistic corrections mainly come from the interactions of $S \times D'$, $P \times D'$ and $P \times P'$. And the relativistic effect in this decay is

$$\frac{\Gamma_{rel} - \Gamma_{non-rel}}{\Gamma_{rel}} = 17\%.$$

4. $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(1P)\gamma$

$\psi(3770)$ is usually treated as $1D$ dominant state with a component of $2S$ partial wave, so it is famous as the $1D - 2S$ mixing state. But in our solution of the corresponding Salpeter

equation for the 1^{--} charmonium, we find besides the D and S wave, there is also the P partial wave in its wave function, their ratios are $S : P : D = 0.573 : 0.509 : 1$. So it is indeed a D wave dominant state, but its wave function also contains sizable and comparable S and P partial waves. It is a $S - P - D$ mixing state in our method.

In Table VIII, we show the contributions of different partial waves to the radiative decay $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(1P)\gamma$. In the column of ‘whole’, where the wave function of $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ is complete, we show the contributions of S , P and D partial waves of $\psi(3770)$ separately. We can see that, the D partial wave provides the dominant contribution, S wave give sizable result, while the contribution from P wave is small. But based on this, we cannot simply draw a conclusion that the contribution of P wave is ignorable. Because the whole decay width, 290 keV, is much larger than the summed contributions from lines of D , S and P , which are 180 keV, 6.69 keV and 0.944 keV, separately. This indicates that the cross interaction terms which are not listed in the Table VIII should have sizable contributions, for example, $(S \times P') \times (D \times P')$ and $(P \times S') \times (D \times P')$. We find the decay width will change from 290 keV to 257 keV if we ignore the contribution of P partial wave. So in a rough estimate, P partial wave can be ignored, but in a precise calculation, its contribution should be taken into account.

TABLE VIII: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(1P)\gamma$.

$1^{--} \backslash 0^{++}$	whole ($P' + S'$)	P' wave (B_1, B_2)	S' wave (B_3, B_4)
whole ($S + P + D$)	290	257	0.925
D wave (A_3, A_4)	180	177	0.0206
S wave (A_5, A_6)	6.69	6.69	0
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	0.944	0.0235	0.670

5. $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c1}(1P)\gamma$

Table IX shows the detail contributions of different partial waves to the decay $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c1}(1P)\gamma$. Similar to the case of $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(1P)\gamma$, here the D partial wave of $\psi(3770)$ provides the dominant contribution, S wave also give sizable contribution. Although the content of P wave is almost equal to that of S wave in the wave function, the contribution of P wave is obviously smaller than that of S wave. But the decay width changes from 90.8 keV to 69.0 keV if ignoring the P partial wave. So we draw the same conclusion, in a precise calculation, the P partial wave should be considered since its contribution may not be very small after considering the cross interaction.

TABLE IX: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c1}(1P)\gamma$.

$1^{--} \backslash 1^{++}$	whole ($P' + D'$)	P' wave (D_1, D_2)	D' wave (D_3)
whole ($S + P + D$)	90.8	91.8	2.5×10^{-3}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	106	126	0.866
S wave (A_5, A_6)	4.04	8.18	0.725
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	1.53	1.45	1.3×10^{-3}

6. $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1P)\gamma$

From Table IV, we can see that, all the theoretical results including ours show that the decay width of $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1P)\gamma$ is much smaller than those of $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(1P)\gamma$ and $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c1}(1P)\gamma$. It is very interesting to see the details of what happens to this decay.

Some details of our calculations are shown in Table X, where the contributions to the decay width from different partial waves are listed. It can be seen that it is indeed different. The column of ‘whole’ in Table X shows that for $\psi(3770)$, the main contribution is not from the largest component of its wave function, that is, the D partial wave, but from the S wave. And the contribution of P wave alone in $\psi(3770)$ is small, but this term should not be ignored

in a precise calculation. Considering the wave function of $\chi_{c2}(1P)$, its dominant component, P' partial wave, provides the largest contribution, D' wave has small contribution, while F' wave in $\chi_{c2}(1P)$ can be ignored safely.

We also note that, the maximum interaction occurs between the S wave in $\psi(3770)$ and P' in $\chi_{c2}(1P)$, $S \times P'$, which is obviously larger than that between the two dominant partial waves, $D \times P'$. The weak interaction of $D \times P'$ is responsible for the small decay width of $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1P)\gamma$.

TABLE X: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1P)\gamma$.

2^{++} 1^{--}	whole	P' wave (F_5, F_6)	D' wave (F_1, F_2, F_7)	F' wave (F_3, F_4)
whole	3.13	3.97	0.0535	8.2×10^{-5}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	1.47	1.08	0.0131	3.8×10^{-3}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	8.00	7.86	1.0×10^{-3}	3.5×10^{-5}
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	0.0274	0.0572	0.0219	4.2×10^{-3}

7. $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1F)\gamma$

In literature, $\psi(4160)$ is primarily the state $\psi(2D)$ with admixtures of $\psi(3S)$, that is, it is a $3S - 2D$ mixing state. In our method, $\psi(4160)$ is the $2D$ dominant state, but mixed with sizable S and P partial waves, so it is a $S - P - D$ mixing state. Its main radiative decays are the channels of $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(2P)\gamma$ ($J = 0, 1, 2$). We will not show the details of these decays since they are similar to those of $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(1P)\gamma$.

As the $2D$ dominant state, its mass is heavier than the $1F$ dominant state $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ in our theoretical prediction, so the decay process $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1F)\gamma$ exists. This channel is another typical process not encountered before in this article, since the final meson $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ is also a typical mixed state. In literature, $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ is the $2P - 1F$ mixing state, $1F$ dominant but mixed with sizable $2P$ component. But in our method, it is $1F$ dominant state mixed

with sizable P and D components, namely a $P-D-F$ mixing state. $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ is not available in experiment, so for its mass, we use our theoretical prediction, 4038 MeV [37].

Some details of the contributions of different partial waves to the decay channel $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1F)\gamma$ are listed in Table XI. First, we note that the main components of the initial and final states, namely, the D wave in $\psi(4160)$ and the F' wave in $\chi_{c2}(1F)$, give the maximum contribution. Second, both the S wave of the initial state and the P' wave of the final state play an important role. For example, the interactions $S \times F'$, $S \times P'$ and $D \times P'$ are all strong, but their contribution to the overall result is cancelled due to the existence of cancellation. Third, the contributions of P wave and the D' wave are small.

TABLE XI: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\psi(4160) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1F)\gamma$, where $\psi(4160)$ and $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ are $2D$ and $1F$ dominant states, respectively.

2^{++} 1^{--}	whole	F' wave(F_3, F_4)	P' wave(F_5, F_6)	D' wave(F_1, F_2, F_7)
whole	78.0	73.0	0.25	0.62
D wave (A_3, A_4)	64.6	141	15.4	0.0162
S wave (A_5, A_6)	9.0×10^{-4}	12.5	12.0	0.0075
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	0.65	0.055	0.0019	0.384

C. Discussions about the charmonia

1. $\psi(2S)$ and $\psi(3S)$

Their wave functions have similar partial wave content, that is, dominant S partial wave, small amount of P and D partial waves. Although the component of D partial wave is not tiny in the wave function, especially compared with that of P wave, the contribution of D wave in the radiative decay can be ignored safely. So we point out that the result of radiative decay seems not support the $2S - 1D$ mixing mode for $\psi(2S)$ and $\psi(3770)$, and $3S - 2D$ mixing for $\psi(3S)$ and $\psi(4160)$, since the D partial wave can be ignored safely.

2. $\psi(3770)$ and $\psi(4160)$

In our method, the wave functions of these two particles are D partial wave dominant, mixed with sizable S and P waves, so they are $S - P - D$ mixing states. In radiative decays, usually D partial wave provides the dominant contribution, and the contribution of S wave is also sizable, while those of P wave is the smallest. But in some special channel, for example $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c2}(1P)\gamma$, the contribution of S wave is larger than that of D wave, and the P wave contribution is still minimal. So in both cases, D and S waves play an important role, while P wave can be ignored when high precision calculation is not required.

If we ignore the P wave, there is only the $S - D$ mixing for $\psi(3770)$ and $\psi(4160)$, then using the definition, $\psi(3770) = |D\rangle\cos\theta + |S\rangle\sin\theta$, we obtain the mixing angle $|\theta| = 29.8^\circ$ for $\psi(3770)$, and similarly we obtain $|\theta| = 29.6^\circ$ for $\psi(4160)$. Our result support the large mixing angle in literature, $-(27 \pm 2)^\circ$ in Ref. [44], 26° in Ref. [45], or $|\theta| \approx 40^\circ$ in Ref. [46], not the small angle $(12 \pm 2)^\circ$ [44] or -13° [45].

We use the symbol $S - D$ (or the complete $S - P - D$) for mixing, but in our method, it is not the $2S - 1D$ mixing, because our result of $\psi(2S)$ does not support the $2S - 1D$ mixing mode. For example, if we artificially ignore the P wave, then $\psi(2S)$ is also $S - D$ mixing state. Using the relation $\psi(2S) = -|D\rangle\sin\theta + |S\rangle\cos\theta$, we obtain the mixing angle $|\theta| = 4.53^\circ$ for $\psi(2S)$, which does not match the large angle for $\psi(3770)$.

3. $\chi_{cJ}(1P)$ and $\chi_{cJ}(2P)$ ($J = 0, 1, 2$)

In our method, $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ and $\chi_{c0}(2P)$ are P' partial wave dominant states with small amount of S' wave. In radiative decay, the P' partial wave provides the main contribution which is also the non-relativistic result, while the S' wave mainly gives the relativistic correction of the decay. The situation of $\chi_{c1}(1P)$ and $\chi_{c1}(2P)$ is similar to that of $\chi_{c0}(1P)$ and $\chi_{c0}(2P)$. The difference is that the small component term in their wave functions is not S' partial wave, but D' wave.

For the states of $\chi_{c2}(1P)$ and $\chi_{c2}(2P)$, we draw the same conclusion, they are P' wave dominant states, but their wave functions include small amount of D' and F' wave. In

radiative decays, P' provides the main contribution which is the non-relativistic result, the relativistic correction mainly comes from the contribution of D' wave, while the contribution of F' can be ignored safely. So the tiny contribution of F' wave does not support the $2P-1F$ mixing mode for $\chi_{c2}(2P)$ and $\chi_{c2}(1F)$.

4. $\chi_{c2}(1F)$

Although we have only studied one channel containing $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ at present, we can still draw a conclusion due to the similarity between the 1^{--} state and the 2^{++} state [1]. That is, in the transition process including $\chi_{c2}(1F)$, the F' and P' partial waves in $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ play an important role, and we can ignore its D' wave in a rough calculation. If we delete the D' wave, the mixing changes from $P' - D' - F'$ to $P' - F'$, then using the relation $\chi_{c2}(1F) = |F'\rangle\cos\theta + |P'\rangle\sin\theta$, we obtain the mixing angle $|\theta| = 32.2^\circ$ for $\chi_{c2}(1F)$.

Similarly, in our method, the $P' - F'$ mixing is not the $2P' - 1F'$ mixing in literature, and our result of $\chi_{c2}(2P)$ does not support the mixing mode of $2P' - 1F'$. If we ignore the D' wave, $\chi_{c2}(2P)$ becomes to the $P' - F'$ mixing state. With the definition $\chi_{c2}(2P) = -|F'\rangle\sin\theta + |P'\rangle\cos\theta$, the mixing angle is calculated as $|\theta| = 4.89^\circ$ for $\chi_{c2}(2P)$, which is much different from the large mixing angle $|\theta| = 32.2^\circ$ of $\chi_{c2}(1F)$.

D. Bottomonium's radiative decays

At present, the $\Upsilon(1D)$, $\Upsilon(2D)$ and $\Upsilon(1F)$ have not been detected by the experiment. So in our calculation, their masses are taken from our previous study [37], $M_{\Upsilon(1D)} = 10130$ MeV, $M_{\Upsilon(2D)} = 10435$ MeV and $M_{\Upsilon(1F)} = 10374$ MeV. Our results of bottomonium radiative decays are shown in Table XII, for comparison. Theoretical results from other models and data from PDG are also shown in the same table.

Since the mass of the bottomonium is very heavy, the relativistic correction is small. Then from Table XII, we can see that, except the channels $\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \chi_{b,J}(1P)\gamma$ which have large uncertainties in theory, the results by most of the theoretical models are in agreement, at least comparable with each other, and also consist with data from PDG. For example, Our

results of $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(1P)\gamma$ and $\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(2P)\gamma$ consist very well with experimental data and the theoretical predictions in Refs. [39, 48, 49].

For the mixing states $\Upsilon(1D)$ and $\Upsilon(2D)$, we must point out that in other models, these particles are treated as pure D waves, while in our model, they are all mixed particles, including the final state $\Upsilon(1F)$. Therefore, our results about the $\Upsilon(1D)$ and $\Upsilon(2D)$ decays are comparable with other theoretical predictions, but there are some small differences. For example, our results are close to those in Refs. [39, 48, 49], but not as good as the processes $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(1P)\gamma$ and $\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(2P)\gamma$.

Similar to the case of charmonium, because the contributions of wave functions on the two sides of the nodes strongly cancel each other out, the theoretical errors of processes $\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(1P)\gamma$ and $\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(1P)\gamma$, especially the former, are large, resulting in large differences between the results of different models.

E. Contributions of different partial waves in bottomonia decays

For the decays of bottomonia which have the same quantum numbers with charmonia, the calculations are similar, and we will not repeat them one by one, but focus on some different contents. The bottomonium is much heavier than charmonium, so the relativistic correction of bottomonium is much smaller than that of charmonium. This leads to the fact that the content of the small partial wave in bottomonium is much smaller than the corresponding charmonium case, except for the mixing state (we will discuss this when considering $\Upsilon(1D)$), see Tables I,II,III for details.

1. $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b0}(1P)\gamma$

As expected, we note that in Table XIII, the small component terms, namely, P wave and D wave of $\Upsilon(2S)$, and S' wave of $\chi_{b0}(1P)$ make very little contribution to the decay $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b0}(1P)\gamma$. And the D partial wave in $\Upsilon(2S)$ can be ignored safely. The relativistic effect

$$\frac{\Gamma_{rel} - \Gamma_{non-rel}}{\Gamma_{rel}} = 4.4\%,$$

TABLE XII: The decay widths (keV) of $\Upsilon \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}\gamma$.

Process	Ours	[38]	[39]	[40]	[47]	[48]	[49]	[50]	PDG[43]
$\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b0}(1P)$	1.13	1.62	1.29	0.74	1.19	0.91	1.09	1.09	1.22 ± 0.23
$\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b1}(1P)$	1.80	2.45	2.00	1.40	2.28	1.63	1.84	2.17	2.21 ± 0.23
$\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b2}(1P)$	1.85	2.46	2.04	1.67	2.58	1.88	2.08	2.62	2.29 ± 0.30
$\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b0}(1P)$	15.5	23.4	20.1	12.5		16.5	20.98	19.8	
$\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b1}(1P)$	7.94	12.7	10.7	7.59		9.7	12.29	13.3	
$\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b2}(1P)$	0.389	0.69	0.564	0.44		0.56	0.65	1.02	
$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b0}(1P)$	0.009	0.027	0.001	0.03	0.12	0.01	0.15	0.097	0.055 ± 0.012
$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b1}(1P)$	0.071	0.067	0.008	0.003	0.0	0.05	0.16	0.0005	0.018 ± 0.012
$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b2}(1P)$	0.075	0.097	0.015	0.11	0.20	0.45	0.0827	0.14	0.203 ± 0.039
$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b0}(2P)$	1.19	1.49	1.35	1.07	1.31	1.03	1.21	3.330	1.20 ± 0.23
$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b1}(2P)$	2.18	2.41	2.20	2.05	2.66	1.91	2.13	2.61	2.56 ± 0.48
$\Upsilon(3S) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b2}(2P)$	2.52	2.67	2.40	2.51	3.18	2.30	2.56	3.16	2.66 ± 0.57
$\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b0}(1P)$	2.16		3.60			2.9	3.52	5.56	
$\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b1}(1P)$	1.70					0.9	1.58	2.17	
$\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b2}(1P)$	0.097					0.02	0.0608	0.44	
$\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b0}(2P)$	12.5		13.1			10.6	8.35	9.58	
$\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b1}(2P)$	6.14					6.5	4.84	6.74	
$\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b2}(2P)$	0.37					0.4	0.24	0.47	
$\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \gamma\chi_{b2}(1F)$	0.43		0.833			1.6	2.05		

is very small.

2. $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b1}(1P)\gamma$

Some details of the channel $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b1}(1P)\gamma$ are listed in Table 2. We can see that, similar to the process $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b0}(1P)\gamma$, the non-relativistic result plays a major role in

TABLE XIII: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b0}(1P)\gamma$.

$0^{++} \backslash 1^{--}$	whole	P' wave (B_1, B_2)	S' wave (B_3)
whole	1.13	1.08	6.9×10^{-4}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	1.08	1.08	0
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	5.8×10^{-4}	5.2×10^{-6}	7.0×10^{-4}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	4.0×10^{-8}	1.4×10^{-8}	5.7×10^{-9}

this process. The relativistic effect of this process is

$$\frac{\Gamma_{rel} - \Gamma_{non-rel}}{\Gamma_{rel}} = 7.2\%.$$

The relativistic correction mainly comes from the contributions of P wave in the initial state and D' wave in the final state, while the contribution of D wave in the initial state can be safely ignored.

TABLE XIV: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b1}(1P)\gamma$

$1^{++} \backslash 1^{--}$	whole	P' wave (D_1, D_2)	D' wave (D_3)
whole	1.80	1.67	2.2×10^{-3}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	1.73	1.67	6.0×10^{-4}
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	4.9×10^{-4}	1.2×10^{-6}	5.3×10^{-4}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	3.2×10^{-7}	2.2×10^{-6}	8.5×10^{-7}

TABLE XV: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1P)\gamma$

2^{++} 1^{--}	whole	P' wave (F_5, F_6)	D' wave (F_1, F_2, F_7)	F' wave (F_3, F_4)
whole	1.85	1.81	2.5×10^{-4}	1.8×10^{-7}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	1.79	1.76	1.2×10^{-4}	2.8×10^{-8}
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	5.7×10^{-4}	3.7×10^{-4}	2.1×10^{-5}	7.6×10^{-9}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	6.9×10^{-8}	7.7×10^{-8}	6.9×10^{-7}	8.6×10^{-8}

3. $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1P)\gamma$

In the process $\Upsilon(2S) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1P)\gamma$, see Table XV for details, the contributions of the initial D wave and the final F' wave can be ignored. The main contribution of the decay width is still non-relativistic and comes from the main partial waves of the initial and final states, that is, from the interaction of $S \times P'$. The contributions of the initial P wave and the final D' wave are mainly relativistic corrections. And the relativistic effect in this process is 4.9%.

4. $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b0}(1P)\gamma$

In our method, $\Upsilon(1D)$ is a D wave dominant state, but its wave function includes sizable S and P waves, so it is a $S - P - D$ mixing state. And the ratio is $S : P : D = 0.577 : 0.425 : 1$. Compared with the case of $\psi(3770)$, whose ratio is $S : P : D = 0.573 : 0.509 : 1$, we find that the content of S and P waves in the bottomonium dose not decrease significantly. It shows that the contributions of S and P waves can not be simply attributed to the relativistic corrections, as we did in the $\Upsilon(2S)$ case. Therefore, unlike $\Upsilon(nS)$ ($n = 1, 2, 3$), where P and D wave terms are both relativistic corrections, the mixed P wave and D wave in $\Upsilon(1D)$ still exist in the non-relativistic limit, so $S - P - D$ mixing needs to be considered even in the non-relativistic model. For the charmonium $\psi(3770)$, we have the same conclusion.

Table XVI shows some details of the decay $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b0}(1P)\gamma$. We can see that, in the

wave function of $\Upsilon(1D)$, the D wave and S wave provide the main and sizable contributions, respectively, while the contribution of P wave is the smallest. We get the same conclusion as in case of $\psi(3770)$, in a high-precision calculation, the contribution of P wave needs to be calculated, while in a rough estimation, the P wave contribution can be ignored.

TABLE XVI: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b0}(1P)\gamma$.

0^{++} / 1^{--}	whole	P' wave (B_1, B_2)	S' wave (B_3)
whole	15.5	15.0	4.1×10^{-3}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	9.94	9.87	1.2×10^{-4}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	0.517	0.517	0
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	3.9×10^{-3}	8.3×10^{-5}	2.9×10^{-3}

5. $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b1}(1P)\gamma$

In Table XVII, we show some details about the contributions to the decay width of $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b1}(1P)\gamma$ from different partial waves. It can be seen that, although there are some differences, we can get the same conclusion as in process $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b0}(1P)\gamma$, which will not be repeated here.

6. $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1P)\gamma$

This process is similar to the decay $\psi(3770) \rightarrow \chi_{c0}(2P)\gamma$, and we can draw similar conclusion. The D wave is the dominant one in the wave function of $\Upsilon(1D)$, but the main contribution to the radiative decay $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1P)\gamma$ is from S wave (see Table XVIII for details), which results in the decay width of this process is much smaller than that with $\chi_{b0}(1P)$ or $\chi_{b1}(1P)$ as the final state. And the P wave in $\Upsilon(1D)$ provides the smallest contribution.

TABLE XVII: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b1}(1P)\gamma$.

$1^{--} \backslash 1^{++}$	whole	P' wave (D_1, D_2)	D' wave (D_3)
whole	7.94	7.99	8.5×10^{-5}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	13.5	14.1	7.4×10^{-3}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	0.929	1.08	5.9×10^{-3}
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	0.0132	0.0131	2.9×10^{-7}

TABLE XVIII: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1P)\gamma$.

$1^{--} \backslash 2^{++}$	whole	P' wave (F_5, F_6)	D' wave (F_1, F_2, F_7)	F' wave (F_3, F_4)
whole	0.389	0.418	5.6×10^{-4}	9.9×10^{-8}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	0.265	0.254	9.0×10^{-5}	4.3×10^{-6}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	1.27	1.27	4.6×10^{-6}	8.8×10^{-8}
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	3.0×10^{-4}	8.3×10^{-4}	2.9×10^{-4}	4.4×10^{-6}

7. $\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1F)\gamma$

$\Upsilon(2D)$ is a state dominated by $2D$ wave and mixed with a sizable amount of S and P partial waves. Its radiative decay to the final state $\chi_{bJ}(1P)$ or $\chi_{bJ}(2P)$ ($J = 0, 1, 2$) has many similarities with $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(1P)\gamma$, and they belong to the same type of process. So we will not give details about them, only show the details of the decay $\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1F)\gamma$ in Table XIX, where $\chi_{b2}(1F)$ is the $1F'$ dominant state mixed with sizable P' and D' waves. $\chi_{b2}(1F)$ has not been detected by experiment, and we predict its mass to be about 10374 MeV [37].

From Table XIX, it is worth noting that, the large components, D wave in $\Upsilon(2D)$ and F'

wave in $\chi_{b2}(1F)$, give the maximum contribution of decay width, and the interaction $D \times F'$ is the maximum. S wave in $\Upsilon(2D)$ and the P' wave in $\chi_{b2}(1F)$ also play an important role. For example, there are sizable interactions $S \times F'$, $S \times P'$ and $D \times P'$. The contribution of P wave and the D' wave is very small, which can be ignored. In this case, the $S - P - D$ mixing for $\Upsilon(2D)$ and $P' - D' - F'$ mixing for $\chi_{b2}(1F)$ become the $S - D$ mixing and $P' - F'$ mixing, respectively.

TABLE XIX: Contributions of different partial waves to the decay width (keV) of $\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \chi_{b2}(1F)\gamma$.

2^{++} / 1^{--}	whole	F' wave(F_3, F_4)	P' wave(F_5, F_6)	D' wave(F_1, F_2, F_7)
whole	0.43	0.54	8.90×10^{-3}	1.82×10^{-4}
D wave (A_3, A_4)	0.50	1.10	0.12	4.24×10^{-5}
S wave (A_5, A_6)	3.27×10^{-3}	0.10	0.067	3.4×10^{-6}
P wave (A_1, A_2, A_7)	1.02×10^{-4}	2.7×10^{-6}	1.54×10^{-6}	3.96×10^{-5}

F. Discussions about the bottomonia

1. $\Upsilon(2S)$ and $\Upsilon(3S)$

The wave functions of them are both S wave dominant with small amount of P and D waves. In radiative decays, P wave provides the relativistic correction, which is small and indicates that the non-relativistic approximation is good for bottomonium. The contribution of D wave is tiny, which can be ignored safely. So this result also does not support the mode of $2S - 1D$ mixing.

2. $\Upsilon(1D)$ and $\Upsilon(2D)$

These two states are typical $S - P - D$ mixing states. In addition to the largest D wave component, their wave functions also contain sizable P and D wave contents. When

studying their radiative decay, it is found that both D wave and S wave play an important role, and their contributions need to be calculated even in the non-relativistic case. Although the content of P wave in wave function is not small, its contribution to radiative decay is relatively small, which can be ignored in rough calculation. In this case, the $S - P - D$ mixing becomes $S - D$ mixing. We calculated the mixing angles of $\Upsilon(1D)$ and $\Upsilon(2D)$, both of which are $|\theta| = 30.0^\circ$.

3. $\chi_{bJ}(1P)$ and $\chi_{bJ}(2P)$ ($J = 0, 1, 2$)

For the states $\chi_{bJ}(1P)$ and $\chi_{bJ}(2P)$ ($J = 0, 1, 2$), the dominant P' wave plays a major role, and only it contributes under non-relativistic conditions. Other partial wave contributions are all relativistic corrections. The F' wave in state $\chi_{b2}(1P)$ or $\chi_{b2}(2P)$ can be safely ignored. Therefore, this result does not support the $2P - 1F$ mixing mode.

4. $\chi_{b2}(1F)$

$\chi_{b2}(1F)$ is also a typical $P - D - F$ mixing state. Its wave function is mainly $1F'$ wave, and contains sizable P' and D' waves. However, in the radiation decay, only F' and P' waves give an important contribution, while D' wave has a small contribution, which can be ignored in the rough calculation. Therefore mixing mode becomes the $P - F$ mixing. The mixing angle is calculated as $|\theta| = 33.6^\circ$.

IV. SUMMARY

We study the partial waves of heavy quarkonium wave functions and their contributions to radiative electromagnetic decays. The results show that for the S and P wave dominated states, for example, $\psi(nS)$, $\Upsilon(nS)$ ($n = 2, 3$), $\chi_{cJ}(mP)$ and $\chi_{bJ}(mP)$ ($m = 1, 2$; $J = 0, 1, 2$), the dominant S and P waves provide main and non-relativistic contribution, while the partial waves of the small components mainly contribute to the relativistic correction.

The mixed states, for example $\psi(nD)$, $\Upsilon(nD)$ ($n = 1, 2$), $\chi_{c2}(1F)$ and $\chi_{b2}(1F)$ which dominated by D wave and F wave, their wave functions are mixtures of $S - P - D$ or

$P - D - F$ waves. But in the radiative decays, P partial wave in the $S - P - D$ mixture and D wave in the $P - D - F$ mixture have small contribution and can be ignored, then the mixture degenerates into the common $S - D$ or $P - F$ mixture. In this case the mixing angle can be calculated, our result support a large mixing angle around $|\theta| \sim 30^\circ$ for these mixing states. But the mixing in our method is not the $2S - 1D$ or $2P - 1F$ mixing in literature.

Our results of charmonium electromagnetic decay are comparable with the experimental data, and the results of bottomonium are in good agreement with the existing data. We calculate the radiative decays of the mixed states and find that the $\psi(2D) \rightarrow \chi_{cJ}(2P)$, $\Upsilon(1D) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(1P)$ and $\Upsilon(2D) \rightarrow \chi_{bJ}(2P)$ ($J = 0, 1$) transitions have large partial decay widths, which may be helpful to find these undiscovered particles.

Acknowledgments This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under the Grants Nos. 12075073 and 11865001, the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei province under the Grant No. A2021201009, Post-graduate's Innovation Fund Project of Hebei University under the Grant No. HBU2022BS002.

-
- [1] G.-L. Wang, T. Wang, Q. Li, C.-H. Chang, JHEP 05, 006 (2022).
 - [2] J. J. Aubert et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 33, 1404 (1974).
 - [3] J. E. Augustin et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 33, 1406 (1974).
 - [4] S. W. Herb et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 252 (1977).
 - [5] W. R. Innes et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 33, 1240 (1977).
 - [6] S. K. Choi et al. (Belle Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 262001 (2003).
 - [7] J. P. Lees et al. (BaBar Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 84, 072002 (2011).
 - [8] M. Ablikim et al. (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 104, 092001 (2021).
 - [9] M. Ablikim et al. (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B 753, 103 (2016).
 - [10] R. A. Briere et al. (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 74, 031106 (2006).
 - [11] M. Ablikim et al. (BESIII Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 96, 032001 (2017).
 - [12] D. M. Asner et al. (CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D 78, 091103 (2008).

- [13] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, C. Hanhart, A. Nefediev, C.-P. Shen, C. E. Thomas, A. Vairo, C.-Z. Yuan, Phys. Rept. 873, 1 (2020).
- [14] J. Richardson, Phys. Lett. B 82, 272 (1979).
- [15] G. T. Bodwin, E. Braaten and P. G. Lepage, Phys. Rev. D 51, 1125 (1995).
- [16] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, B. K. Heltsley, R. Vogt, G. T. Bodwin, E. Eichten et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 71, 1534 (2011).
- [17] J. Amal, D. Nikhil, R. Sushruth, K. Shivam, M. Amruta, Phys. Rev. C 98, 065202 (2018).
- [18] E. Eichten, K. Gottfried, T. Kinoshita, K. D. Lane and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D 21, 203 (1980).
- [19] B.-Q. Li, K.-T. Chao, Phys. Rev. D 79, 094004 (2009).
- [20] B. Pandya, M. Shah, P.C. Vinodkumar, Eur. Phys. J. C 81, 116 (2021).
- [21] N. R. Soni, B. R. Joshi, R. P. Shah, H. R. Chauhan, J. N. Pandya, Eur. Phys. J. C 78, 592 (2018).
- [22] Z. Cao, M. Cleven, Q. Wang, and Q. Zhao, Eur. Phys. J. C 76, 601 (2016).
- [23] H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, S.-L. Zhu, Phys. Rept. 639, 1 (2016).
- [24] H.-X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, Y.-R. Liu, S.-L. Zhu, Rept. Prog. Phys. 80, 076201 (2017).
- [25] E. E. Salpeter, H. A. Bethe, Phys. Rev. 84, 1232 (1951).
- [26] E. E. Salpeter, Phys. Rev. 87, 328 (1952).
- [27] W. Li, Y.-L. Wang, T.-F. Feng, G.-L. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C 80 721 (2020).
- [28] G.-L. Wang, Q. Li, T. Wang, T.-F. Feng, X.-G. Wu, C.-H. Chang, Eur. Phys. J. C 82, 1027 (2022).
- [29] G.-L. Wang, T.-F. Feng, X.-G. Wu, Phys. Rev. D 101, 116011 (2020).
- [30] G.-L. Wang, X.-G. Wu, Chin. Phys. C 44, 063104 (2020).
- [31] C. S. Kim, G.-L. Wang, Phys. Lett. B 584, 285(2004).
- [32] X.-H. Wang, Y. Jiang, T. Wang, X.-Z. Tan, G. Li, and G.-L. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. C 79, 997 (2019).
- [33] C.-H. Chang, J.-K. Chen, G.-L. Wang, Commun. Theor. Phys. 46, 467 (2006).
- [34] G.-L. Wang, Phys. Lett. B 633, 492 (2006).
- [35] G.-L. Wang, Phys. Lett. B 650, 15 (2007).

- [36] G.-L. Wang, Phys. Lett. B 674, 172 (2009).
- [37] C.-H. Chang, G.-L. Wang, Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron. 53, 2005 (2010).
- [38] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov, V. O. Galkin, Phys. Rev. D 67, 014027 (2003).
- [39] N. Brambilla et al. (Quarkonium Working Group), CERN Yellow Reports: Monographs (2004).
- [40] S. F. Radford, W. W. Repko, Phys. Rev. D 75, 074031 (2007).
- [41] T. Barnes, S. Godfrey, E. S. Swanson, Phys. Rev. D 72, 054026 (2005).
- [42] W. J. Deng, H. Liu, L. C. Gui, and X. H. Zhong, Phys. Rev. D, 95, 034026 (2016).
- [43] R. L. Workman et al. (Particle Data Group), Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys. 2022, 083C01 (2022).
- [44] J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D 64, 094002 (2001).
- [45] Y.-B. Ding, D.-H. Qin, K.-T. Chao, Phys. Rev. D 44, 3562 (1991).
- [46] K.-Y. Liu, K.-T. Chao, Phys. Rev. D 70, 094001 (2004).
- [47] V. Ananyev, I. Danilkin, M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. D 102, 096019 (2020).
- [48] S. Godfrey, K. Moats, Phys. Rev. D 92, 054034 (2015).
- [49] J. Segovia, P. G. Ortega, D. R. Entem, F. Fernandez, Phys. Rev. D 93, 074027 (2016).
- [50] W.-J. Deng, H. Liu, L.-C. Gui, X.-H. Zhong, Phys. Rev. D 95, 074002 (2017).