UC San Diego
UC San Diego Previously Published Works

Title

Comment on 'Note on X(3872) production at hadron colliders and its molecular structure'**This material is based upon work supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics (DE-AC05-06OR23177) and the U.S...

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1xp784xb

Journal

Chinese Physics C, 42(11)

ISSN

1674-1137

Authors

Esposito, A
Grinstein, B
Maiani, L
et al.

Publication Date

2018-10-01

DOI

10.1088/1674-1137/42/11/114107

Peer reviewed

Comment on 'Note on $X(3872)$ production at hadron colliders and its molecular structure'

A. Esposito[a], B. Grinstein[b], L. Maiani[c], F. Piccinini[d], A. Pilloni[e], A.D. Polosa[f], V. Riquer[c]

[a] Center for Theoretical Physics and Dept. of Physics, Columbia University, New York, NY, 10027, USA
[b] Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093-0315, USA
[c] CERN, Theory Department, Geneva 1211, Switzerland
[d] INFN Sezione di Pavia, Via A. Bassi 6, 27100 Pavia, Italy
[e] Theory Center, Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility, Newport News, VA 23606, USA
[f] Dipartimento di Fisica and INFN, Sapienza Università di Roma, P.le Aldo Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy

Abstract

We briefly comment on the paper by Albaladejo et al. [arXiv:1709.09101], rejecting its conclusions.

The inequality (1) of the comment by Albaladejo *et al.* [1] was introduced in Ref. [2] in order to estimate the upper bound of the $X(3872)$ prompt production cross section at CDF without resorting to hadronic models for the calculation of the amplitude $\Psi(\boldsymbol{p}) = \langle X | D^0 \bar{D}^{*0}(\boldsymbol{p}) \rangle$. We are still convinced that this is the correct way to proceed and we do not see any progress made in [1].

To the effect of computing the cross section mentioned, we used the uncertainty principle to estimate the size of the allowed ball $\mathcal{R}$ in the space of relative $\boldsymbol{p}$ momenta in the center of mass of the generic $D^0 \bar{D}^{*0}$ pair produced in a $pp(\bar{p})$ collision. The size of $\mathcal{R}$ must be compatible with the 'coalescence' of a meson pair into a loosely bound meson molecule. Hence the radius of the $\mathcal{R}$ ball is determined *a priori* and equation (3) in [2], once $\mathcal{R}$ is determined, simply reads

$$
\sigma(p\bar{p} \to X) \;\; \simeq \;\; \left| \int_{\mathcal{R}} \Psi(\boldsymbol{p}) \, \langle D^0 \bar{D}^{*0}(\boldsymbol{p}) | \bar{p}p \rangle d^3 p \right|^2 \lesssim \int_{\mathcal{R}} |\Psi(\boldsymbol{p})|^2 \, d^3 p \int_{\mathcal{R}} \left| \langle D^0 \bar{D}^{*0}(\boldsymbol{p}) | \bar{p}p \rangle \right|^2 d^3 p
$$
$$
\lesssim \;\; \int_{\mathcal{R}} \left| \langle D^0 \bar{D}^{*0}(\boldsymbol{p}) | \bar{p}p \rangle \right|^2 d^3 p. \tag{1}
$$

Even if it were known how to compute from first principles the amplitude $\Psi(\boldsymbol{p})$ (which is not the case), the size of the $\mathcal{R}$ ball in momentum space should be understood on the basis of physical arguments as the ones reported below, suggesting its radius to be $\bar{p} \sim 20$ MeV. These arguments involve square moduli of the amplitudes only.

We first briefly analyze the case of the deuteron, where more experimental information is available. The attractive Yukawa potential can be parameterized as

$$
V = -g \, \frac{e^{-r/r_0}}{r} \tag{2}
$$

where $r_0 \sim 1/m_\pi = 1.4$ fm and

$$
g = \frac{f_{\pi N}^2}{4\pi} \tag{3}
$$

with $f_{\pi N} \approx 2.1$, as can be computed solving the Schrödinger problem to get a binding energy of 2.2 MeV[1]. The quantum version of the virial theorem is

$$
2\overline{T} = \left(\Psi, \sum_{i=1}^{3} r_i \frac{\partial V}{\partial r_i} \Psi \right) = -\overline{V} + \frac{g}{r_0} \overline{e^{-r/r_0}} \tag{4}
$$

therefore the mean $\overline{E} = \overline{T} + \overline{V}$ is

$$
\overline{E} = -\frac{\bar{p}^2}{2\mu} + \frac{g}{r_0} \overline{e^{-r/r_0}} \tag{5}
$$

where μ is the reduced mass of the bound state.

Both the radius, $\overline{r} = 2.1$ fm [3], and the binding energy, $\overline{E} \simeq -2.2$ MeV, are known for the deuteron. Eq. (5) then gives $\bar{p}_D \approx 105$ MeV. It is this that determines the radius of the ball $\mathcal{R}$, significantly smaller than the value given in [1], $\bar{p} \gtrsim 300$ MeV.

---

[1]The following results are also found using a square well potential and well documented in the literature.

The $X(3872)$ is a more extreme case. The binding energy is found below $|\overline{E}| \lesssim 0.1$ MeV and, as commented in a large number of papers (see reviews [4] and references therein), for such a small binding energy the expected size of the state is $\bar{r} \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{2\mu|\overline{E}|} \sim 10$ fm. This allows us to neglect the second term in (5), finding $\bar{p} \approx 20$ MeV, in agreement with the radius of the region $\mathcal{R}$ used in [2]. We have checked that the value of g cannot be large enough to spoil the approximation used. This can be done either extracting g from $D^* \to D\pi$ decay rate [5] or by solving the bound state problem.

In contrast, Albaladejo *et al.* [1], to estimate the radius $\bar{p}$ of $\mathcal{R}$ corresponding to the production of $X(3872)$, assume that $\langle D^0 \bar{D}^{*0}(\boldsymbol{p})|\bar{p}p\rangle$ in (1) is almost independent of $\boldsymbol{p}$ and study the quantity

$$I(\bar{p}) = \int_{\mathcal{R}} \Psi(\boldsymbol{p})\, d^3p \tag{6}$$

seeking the $\bar{p}$ value such that $I(\bar{p})$ gets constant from there on. As an example, the normalizable wave function for shallow bound states used by Artoisenet and Braaten [6] to describe the $X(3872)$ molecule decreases like p^{-2} so that, for large $\bar{p}$

$$I(\bar{p}) \sim \bar{p} \tag{7}$$

which indeed does not indicate any region at all. This makes the approach in [1] totally useless. To circumvent this obvious problem, a cutoff Λ is introduced to manipulate the wave-function $\Psi(\boldsymbol{p}) \to \Psi_\Lambda(\boldsymbol{p})$ in (6).

This cannot be the way of determining the size of $\mathcal{R}$ which, in our view, must be obtained with arguments involving the binding energy and the interaction coupling constant, independently of any educated guesses on the explicit form of $\Psi(\boldsymbol{p})$. One should also notice that the *ad hoc* treatment of the cutoff introduces a change of sign in $\Psi(\boldsymbol{p})$ depending on Λ (see Fig. 1 of Albaladejo *et al.* [1]) — as if the amplitude for projecting the state $|D\bar{D}^*\rangle$ onto the observed $|X\rangle$ could go through some spurious zeroes. Also the S-wave wave function of the deuteron in Fig. 2 of [1], displays zeroes for some particular choices of the cutoff and the model, in contradiction with the fact that the ground state wave function should not present any node.

Disregarding for a moment all these adverse considerations on [1], the bare minimum one can conclude from it, is that deuterons should be produced equally or more abundantly than molecular $X(3872)$ resonances. For a definitive test one should then compare the production of these two particles at high transverse momenta, say, $p_\perp > 15$ GeV, where the $X(3872)$ is copiously observed at CMS.

Extrapolation of the fits shown in [8] suggest an extremely low deuteron production cross section at high transverse momenta, in agreement with our estimate of the size $\bar{p}$ of the deuteron as a pn molecule and in contrast with the large observed cross-section for $X(3872)$ production. There are no currently available data for deuteron production at such high transverse momenta, however measurements might be possible at ALICE and LHCb run II.

This paper was prepared at the request of a journal editor.

References

[1] M. Albaladejo, F. K. Guo, C. Hanhart, U. G. Meiner, J. Nieves, A. Nogga and Z. Yang, arXiv:1709.09101 [hep-ph].

[2] C. Bignamini, B. Grinstein, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa and C. Sabelli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 162001 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.162001 [arXiv:0906.0882 [hep-ph]].

[3] R. Pohl *et al.*, Metrologia **54**, L1 (2017) doi:10.1088/1681-7575/aa4e59 [arXiv:1607.03165 [physics.atom-ph]].

[4] A. Esposito, A. L. Guerrieri, F. Piccinini, A. Pilloni and A. D. Polosa, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **30**, 1530002 (2015) doi:10.1142/S0217751X15300021 [arXiv:1411.5997 [hep-ph]]; A. Esposito, A. Pilloni and A. D. Polosa, Phys. Rept. **668**, 1 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2016.11.002 [arXiv:1611.07920 [hep-ph]].

[5] R. Casalbuoni, A. Deandrea, N. Di Bartolomeo, R. Gatto, F. Feruglio and G. Nardulli, Phys. Rept. **281** (1997) 145.

[6] P. Artoisenet and E. Braaten, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 114018 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.81.114018 [arXiv:0911.2016 [hep-ph]].

[7] C. Bignamini, B. Grinstein, F. Piccinini, A. D. Polosa, V. Riquer and C. Sabelli, Phys. Lett. B **684**, 228 (2010) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.01.037 [arXiv:0912.5064 [hep-ph]]. See also A. Esposito, F. Piccinini, A. Pilloni and A. D. Polosa, J. Mod. Phys. **4**, 1569 (2013) doi:10.4236/jmp.2013.412193 [arXiv:1305.0527 [hep-ph]]. A. L. Guerrieri, F. Piccinini, A. Pilloni and A. D. Polosa, Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 3, 034003 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.034003 [arXiv:1405.7929 [hep-ph]].

[8] A. Esposito, A. L. Guerrieri, L. Maiani, F. Piccinini, A. Pilloni, A. D. Polosa and V. Riquer, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 3, 034028 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.034028 [arXiv:1508.00295 [hep-ph]].